

Scriptures and Doctrine :: John Chrysostom (347-407) on 1 Corinthians.

John Chrysostom (347-407) on 1 Corinthians. - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/11 3:59

"John Chrysostom (/ˈkrɪsəstɪm, krɪˈsɛstɪm/; Greek: ἵερολόγιος, ἵερολόγος; c. 347 – 14 September 407) was an important Early Church Father who served as archbishop of Constantinople. He is known for his preaching and public speaking, his denunciation of abuse of authority by both ecclesiastical and political leaders, his Divine Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom, and his ascetic sensibilities.

The epithet ἵερολόγιος, ἵερολόγος, (Chrysostomos, anglicized as Chrysostom) means "golden-mouthed" in Greek and denotes his celebrated eloquence. Chrysostom was among the most prolific authors in the early Christian Church. He is honored as a saint in the Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, Catholic, Anglican, and Lutheran churches, as well as in some others. The Eastern Orthodox, together with the Byzantine Catholics, hold him in special regard as one of the Three Holy Hierarchs (alongside Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus)." Wiki.

I am using this thread to quote some of the writings of Chrysostom, in particular on 1 Corinthians, in the hope that some balance may be introduced regarding modern interpretations on the subject of tongues. If I put it on the Tongues thread, I fear it would soon be forgotten or passed over.

The quotes will come from:

<https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220135.htm>

if anyone wants to read it all. Starting with:

"14 verse 3: But he that prophesies speaks unto men edification, and exhortation, and comfort.

At this point he makes a comparison between the gifts, and lowers that of the tongues, showing it to be neither altogether useless, nor very profitable by itself. For in fact they were greatly puffed up on account of this, because the gift was considered to be a great one.

And it was thought great because the Apostles received it first, and with so great display; it was not however therefore to be esteemed above all the others. Wherefore then did the Apostles receive it before the rest?

Because they were to go abroad every where. And as in the time of building the tower the one tongue was divided into many; so then the many tongues frequently met in one man, and the same person used to discourse both in the Persian, and the Roman, and the Indian, and many other tongues, the Spirit sounding within him: and the gift was called the gift of tongues because he could all at once speak various languages.

See accordingly how he both depresses and elevates it. Thus, by saying, He that speaks with tongues, speaks not unto men, but unto God, for no man understands, he depressed it, implying that the profit of it was not great; but by adding, but in the Spirit he speaks mysteries he again elevated it, that it might not seem to be superfluous and useless and given in vain.

Do you see by what he signifies the choice nature of this gift? I.e., by the common benefit? And how every where he gives the higher honor to that which tends to the profit of the many? For do not the former speak unto men also? Tell me. But not so much edification, and exhortation, and comfort. So that the being powered by the Spirit is common to both, as well to him that prophesies, as to him that speaks with tongues; but in this, the one (he, I mean, who prophesies) has the advantage in that he is also profitable unto the hearers. For they who with tongues were not understood by them that had not the gift.

What then? Did they edify no man? Yes, says he, themselves alone: wherefore also he adds,

1 Corinthians 14:4

He that speaks in tongue edifies himself.

And how, if he know not what he says? Why, for the present, he is speaking of them who understand what they say & understand it themselves, but know not how to render it unto others.

But he that prophesies edifies the Church. Now as great as is the difference between a single person and the Church, so great is the interval between these two. Do you see his wisdom, how he does not thrust out the gift and make nothing of it, but signifies it to have some advantage, small though it be, and such as to suffice the possessor only?

2. Next, lest they should suppose that in envy to them he depresses the tongues, (for the more part had this gift,) to correct their suspicion he says,

So we see that Tongues was understood by the ECF's as foreign languages, not just in Acts 2 but also in this most disputed letter of Paul's. See he also references the Tower of Babel as directly connected with this, showing again that he is speaking of human languages, which if foreign in a group setting with no interpretation, would only be understood by God, and indeed really only fully understood by God in the event of an interpreter getting some of it wrong.

I can see now why modern interpreters might not like to have it referenced to the Tower of Babel as it really demolishes their argument. But let's keep it civil and offer disagreements if wished.

Hopefully, it will serve as a place of understanding where we will see where the others are coming from rather than think they just deny it without reason..

Re: John Chrysostom (347-407) on 1 Corinthians. - posted by TMK (), on: 2024/2/11 7:47

1 Corinthians 14:22-25 v 22 "Thus tongues are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers, while prophecy is a sign not for unbelievers but for believers. v 23 If, therefore, the whole church comes together and all speak in tongues, and outsiders or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are out of your minds? But if all prophesy, and an unbeliever or outsider enters, he is convicted by all, he is called to account by all, the secrets of his heart are disclosed, and so, falling on his face, he will worship God and declare that God is really among you. "

Here is the JB Phillips translation:

& & &

22**That means that tongues are a sign of God's power, not for those who are unbelievers but for those who already believe**. Preaching the word of God, on the other hand, is a sign of God's power to those who do not believe rather than to believers. So that, if at a full church meeting you are all speaking with tongues and men come in who are uninstructed or without faith, will they not say that you are insane? But if you are preaching God's word and such a man should come in to your meeting, he is convicted and challenged by your united speaking of the truth. His secrets are exposed and he will fall on his knees acknowledging God and saying that God is truly among you!

& & &

Note the difference in vs 1.

Phillips included a footnote in his translation that is fairly controversial namely that he thinks Paul made a "slip of the pen" or mis-dictated, or his scribe erred, in the traditional translation of vs 22. That verse makes no sense otherwise in the context of the following verses. He thinks he reversed what he intended to say, namely that prophecy was for unbelievers and tongues for believers.

I do believe in the inspiration of scripture but also think it is possible that there are copy errors in some places. I agree with Phillips here. The passage makes no sense otherwise.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/12 3:59

ChrisA

The Orthodox oral tradition was handed down from the Apostles and does not contradict scripture. The Roman Catholic organizations' traditions are of their own imaginations.

Agreed, the early teachings had already deviated by some (and already noted in the NT), but Chrysostom can be considered as reliable as a church historian as any, regardless as to whether his whole theology was in line with scripture.

Re: - posted by ChrisA, on: 2024/2/12 6:05

Brenda, both the Catholic and Orthodox churches claim that the Bible is a *part* of their traditions. This gives them a lot of wiggle room for extra-Biblical practices. They are quite the twins in their theology. One has a pope, the other has a patriarch. One prays to statues, the other prays to icons (flat images). Both groups pray to "Mary" and to "saints." Both groups do the sign of the cross (not Biblical). The Orthodox teach that the gifts of the Spirit ceased by the end of the 1st century, whereas the Catholic church jumped on board with the charismatic movement in the 1960s when they saw how many people were leaving their institution to be born again in Christ and Spirit-filled.

The Orthodox teachings and traditions have been discussed at length on this forum in years past. They do not align with the Scriptures. You would not be allowed to partake of communion if you visited one of their church services, unless you went through their lengthy membership rituals.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/12 6:35

ChrisA

I am very aware of the unscriptural teachings and practices of what has become very un-Orthodox for many but not all, as time has gone on. Otherwise I would have swam the Bosphorus.

Some pray to Mary but that is not accepted by all, whereas they venerate - a different thing. Same as icons. The rest is misunderstanding regarding their mindset, for example, past saints are alive as we are.

You cannot just write them off like that as there is so much variety and false teachings, but yes they would not accept me without lengthy training to correct my errors but mine would no doubt be shortened.

The Orthodox Church was the original church which the Roman Catholics broke away from and were the ones who decided what was scripture. They produced our Bibles.

As for interpretation of the Bible, I can no longer call myself a Protestant after studying their interpretations, and have found answers to many problems I inherited by reading the writings of their 'Pillars' of the faith especially on Theosis or union with Christ which the west has merely attempted to copy.

Most of what you say is due to misunderstanding. They have always had a group of patriarchs which meet at councils and never a pope, which led to the schism.

Re: - posted by ChrisA, on: 2024/2/12 15:23

Who was the patriarch in the New Testament, Brenda? There wasn't one. The word isn't used. There are elders (bishops) and deacons, yes. Peter was the apostle to the circumcised, and Paul to the uncircumcised.

If you were correct - and you are not - then children cannot be saved. They must jump through your theological hoops first. Funny how many children know Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Many, like myself so many years ago, have seen Him and heard His voice. The Gospel that saves is SIMPLE - the riches and complexity of that same saving Gospel can be searched out for eternity and never be exhausted. The complexity never contradicts or undermines the simplicity- it only deepens it. That is how Jesus saves simple folk and children, then gives them wisdom from above as they walk with Him and mature in the faith.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/12 15:33

Quote:
----- If you understand that the appearance of tongues at Pentecost was sign of judgement for the unbelieving Jews present (Babel) and later was used for missionary purposes, then it makes perfect sense.

Can you offer some Biblical support for this doctrine? Is there anywhere I am missing in scripture that even implies that tongues on the day of Pentecost were for a sign of judgement on the Jews who did not believe in Jesus as Messiah?

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/12 16:09

Todd: Referencing your note about Phillip's commentary.

I don't really see any contradiction. Let me see if I can articulate what I see, my perspective anyway.

Verses 20-22 are almost parenthetical if you will.

Prior to verse 20, Paul has just explained that tongues without interpretation do not edify the hearer, but the speaker. In fact, unless there is an interpretation, the speaker is like a barbarian to the hearer, as a foreigner that cannot be understood.

But in verse 20, Paul inserts prophecy about the day of Pentecost. We know that Joel prophesied tongues, and Peter made this clear in his speech. But tongues were also prophesied in Isaiah 28:11, and Paul brings this up in verse 20. So verses 20-22 all speak of this prophecy. Tongues, that were prophesied) are for a sign to the unbelieving Jews, to convince them that what they are seeing is God and is the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy. Peter even reiterates this to them. But prophecy belongs to the believer, to speak forth the words of the Lord to build one another up. Tongues alone, apart from interpretation, don't serve the purpose of edifying the body.

Now on to verse 23, where Paul again returns to the general point of this part of his letter. "Therefore...". So if we are all together and we all jabber on in tongues, and an unbeliever, or an uninitiated believer (unlearned) comes in, these people will think we are crazy. But if the unlearned or the unbelieving come in and we all exercise the gift of prophecy, then they will have the secrets of their heart revealed and judged by the prophecy given. They will have to admit that God is among us.

This is my understanding of these verses. Like I said, I don't see a contradiction in it. I think the key is verse 20 and understanding that Paul is speaking of the tongues in the prophecies of Joel and Isaiah that were fulfilled at Pentecost in verses 20-22.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/12 17:39

Travis

Will have to get back later, but can you give me some scriptures that confirm some of the well known types mentioned in scripture, such as Moses being a type of Jesus, crossing the Red Sea being salvation? Thank you.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/12 17:43

ChrisA

Of course they were bishops in NT times. I never said they were otherwise.

Strange you know my theology. Please let me in on it. Children are born innocent according to my understanding. Otherwise I haven't a clue what you are on about.

Re: - posted by ChrisA, on: 2024/2/12 20:17

Your theological stance on many matters is found in your frequent posts, Brenda. That is no insult. You clearly express yourself, whether others agree or not.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/13 1:48

Travis

Sorry I have not answered your questions properly regarding Babylon/Pentecost, to your satisfaction. It has been a recent discovery for me and I haven't yet worked right through it. The more I look into it though the more it makes sense to me as I have never found the explanation for which unbelievers' tongues were a sign for, satisfying.

Hearing foreign languages which they denied knowing would probably just suggest reincarnation to them, and babbling would just imply madness as scripture says.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/13 4:22

//If you were correct - and you are not - then children cannot be saved. They must jump through your theological hoops first. Funny how many children know Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Many, like myself so many years ago, have seen Him and heard His voice. The Gospel that saves is SIMPLE - the riches and complexity of that same saving Gospel can be searched out for eternity and never be exhausted. The complexity never contradicts or undermines the simplicity- it only deepens it. That is how Jesus saves simple folk and children, then gives them wisdom from above as they walk with Him and mature in the faith.//

ChrisA

Have managed to get round to this one at last. I agree on the simplicity of knowing Jesus and that children are welcomed by Him. To know Jesus is not the same thing as Him being Lord and Saviour in my understanding though. I knew Jesus for a long period before He was my Lord and Saviour. I mean in reality and not just words.

His arms are open for all but if one does not allow the Holy Spirit free reign within us, and obeying Him immediately and absolutely, then someone or something else is Lord. That is what scripture teaches me. Everything else is another gospel and condemned by Him.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/13 10:15

Quote:
-----Will have to get back later, but can you give me some scriptures that confirm some of the well known types mentioned in scripture, such as Moses being a type of Jesus, crossing the Red Sea being salvation? Thank you.

I am not sure what you are getting at here. The well known types and antetypes are clearly given. For example, Moses lifting the serpent (the type) has the antetype "And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so shall the Son of Man be lifted up" Another would be the entrance of Israel into the promised land, the antetype of which is given in Hebrews 3 and 4.

My point is that types and antetypes are clearly given in scripture. We know them as such because of their clarity. We cannot have a theory and simply call it a type and antetype. We cannot go beyond scripture. We stay within scripture and rightly divide the word of truth.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/13 10:23

Quote:
----- Sorry I have not answered your questions properly regarding Babylon/Pentecost, to your satisfaction. It has been a recent discovery for me and I haven't yet worked right through it. The more I look into it though the more it makes sense to me as I have never found the explanation for which unbelievers tongues were a sign for, satisfying.

It is not about my satisfaction. I have no dog in this hunt. It is about what scripture says and does not say. If tongues at Pentecost is a sign of God's judgement on the Jews, and if this is so because it is related to Babel, then where does scripture teach this? If this is the way we handle scripture, to find ideas we would like to be related and make doctrines out of them, then we will quickly abandon sound doctrine and wind up in error. We must stay within scripture here. If the Bible clearly teaches it, then it is doctrine and we MUST be dogmatic about it. If the Bible teaches it, but there is some disagreement about the exact interpretation, we have some wiggle room and can discuss it. But if it is NOWHERE found in scripture, we must discard it and say that it is not Biblical. So I will leave it here. If the Bible does not teach it, then it is simply not Biblical and must be rejected.

Again, I don't have a dog in this hunt. I am simply comparing what we are discussing to the Bible and what it does and does not clearly teach. After all, don't we all want to be conformed to the truth of scripture in our thinking?

If I find that something I have believed for years is not in the Bible, then I WANT to reject that thing and conform myself to the Word. I will stand before God one of these days and be judged by what is in His word and what I have done with it. I want to be right in His presence. IF that means I must say 100 times that I was wrong and change my stance, so be it.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/13 10:26

There is more to scripture than proof texting, but might have more of an answer soon. It would just about demolish gloss alalia I think.

The judgement on the Jews at Babel was carried out in the dispersion but at Pentecost maybe it is more than that.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/13 15:38

When Babel occurred, there was no such thing as a Jew, nor was there an Israelite. Sons of Shem could be considered Semitic peoples. Jews are, specifically, descendants of Judah, who was born a long time after Babel. Babel was about two things. One was the people's idolatry, and their unification in that idolatry. The second was about their disobedience in spreading out and filling the Earth. Hence, the dispersion. So Babel was not a judgement on Jews. Jews did not even exist yet.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/13 15:46

OK thanks, I'll look into that.

Who is the 'unbeliever' that the sign of tongues is for then?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2024/2/13 16:27

Travis wrote:
/Todd: Referencing your note about Phillip's commentary.

I don't really see any contradiction. Let me see if I can articulate what I see, my perspective anyway.//

Your explanation is certainly possible. I hadn't considered that before.

Re: - posted by ChrisA, on: 2024/2/13 18:38

I am not familiar with this ministry or website, but the article speaks of Pentecost and an Old Testament event from Exod us 32:27,28 that I have heard preachers link together (as ironic opposites) in years past:

<https://centerforisrael.com/article/an-amazing-fact-about-pentecost-that-few-christians-know/#:~:text=Three%20thousand%20died%20by%20rebellling,Jewish%20foundations%20of%20our%20faith.>

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/13 20:37

Quote:

Your explanation is certainly possible. I hadnâ€™t considered that before.

I am not saying I am right. I may be totally missing something. But it makes sense to me. Please judge it and if I have missed something, correct me.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/13 20:38

Brenda: Look back a few posts in this thread. I gave what I think Paul is saying in 1 Cor. 14. I think I said it there.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/14 8:21

I donâ€™t think Brenda is going to come backâ€unless it is to divert to something elseâ€

Travis, what a blessing you are, Iâ€™m glad you are still on Slâ€

Brenda, I believe I remember you from years back alsoâ€

In kindness Brendaâ€Will you ever be more loyal to the Word of God than to the teachings of men who try to make the Word say something else?

You seem to depend on the teachings of men who support what you and your group are refusing to change your mind a bout, more than on the plain written Word of God. You donâ€™t seem to be open to change your position on anything b ut only desire to teach others your dogma.

Blessings,
rbanks

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/14 8:42

Travis

Yes found it thank you for your help. I agree it was for the Jews.

However, God complains that the Israelites were always looking for a sign, yet He provides one that needs no faith. It se ems to me that something is missing in our understanding of it.

But still looking into it as it seems there must be a connection.

rbanks

The problem with you is that you are still evangelical, as I was for a long time - even a Calvinist for goodness sake, so v ery well trained in hermeneutics and exegesis.

So I changed my position drastically from my readings which always included scriptural support and after studying it for such a long time, there is little that I have not studied like what we have been discussing.

Everybody says their version is scriptural being blind to other possibilities in theologies. I have read widely from them by

now including Determinism Patristic and Arminian, whereas I find most people have stuck it out in one denomination or perhaps two. I read nearly as much in opposition to what I believe in order to frequently check my understanding and if in doubt will drop whatever it is and have done so often in the past, until I gained a firm foundation in Orthodox spirituality. It is there that I found the most truth.

I am not in a group, the Lord seems to have given me a life away from the enormous errors of today. I depend on Christ alone to guide me in the scriptures through the Holy Spirit and found the most confirmation in Orthodox spirituality.

The church today is not steeped in spirituality which is a problem where understanding others is concerned.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/14 9:16

Brenda thanks for being honest

But Brenda the gospel is clear in Romans chapters 1-8

Paul said that he was not ashamed of the gospel because it is the power of God.

If you have a true understanding of those 8 chapters you will see that it is what Jesus did for us on the cross and how we are to place our faith completely in Him be dead to sin and alive to God receive the Holy Spirit be filled with the Holy Spirit be led by the Holy Spirit walk in the Holy Spirit etc

We are to depend on the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/14 9:29

The problem is rbanks, that we can say 'I am crucified with Christ' with a huge variety on what that means in practice. This is the sort of thing that changed for me.

I have not changed one iota on the basics from the Nicene Creed, apart from not adding the Filioque Clause which is heresy.

And again 'dead to sin' does not mean the same to all nor did it to me for a long time till Christ became my Lord and Savior fully and completely even though I followed Him.

I agree with all you said, but at another level.

We do not read scripture as much as it reads us.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/14 9:38

You claim a higher level than most others I thought so

So that is why you think you should teach others what you have come to believe.

And that is where you are definitely wrong

You read so much material outside of the Bible

It seems you don't fully trust God through the Bible you don't trust that God will lead you into all truth if you only read the Bible

You don't truly depend on the Holy Spirit but the Holy Spirit plus knowledge that you are depending on from all your studies outside the Bible

So dangerous you can't even be sure of the Holy Spirit leading you without some acquired knowledge

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/14 9:41

Quote:
----- However, God complains that the Israelites were always looking for a sign, yet He provides one that needs no faith. It seems to me that something is missing in our understanding of it.

Brenda: Jesus spoke to two distinct groups, the Saducees and the Pharisees who said, "we would see a sign from thee." Matt 12 and Matt 16. Perhaps Luke 11 is one of these instances as well, or perhaps it is a third time. The point was that these people wanted a miracle, a sign from heaven, to "prove" who Jesus was. But we know already that they had said that Jesus' miracles were from the devil and not from God. A fantastic miracle would not have convinced them. They were not looking to be convinced. They were baiting Jesus with this question. So he called them an evil and adulterous generation. He told them that they would only be given one sign, and that was Jesus' own death, burial, and resurrection. Here is your type and antetype. Just as Jonah was in the whale for three days before coming out, Jesus would be in the tomb for three days before coming out.

But Jesus then went on to perform MANY more miracles. He did not stop showing "signs". He just told these people that He would not be baited into "performing" for their satisfaction and that their hearts were wicked and seeking after things that were not God.

Later, after Pentacost, we find the Apostles being given miraculous gifts to actually prove that what they were saying was from God. So it is not about the miracles or the signs. It is about the heart of man.

As far as faith is concerned, I can also attest that any gift of the Spirit in which God desires to use a person will require faith on the part of that person. Tongues and interpretation is no exception. Praying privately in tongues also requires faith.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/14 9:41

rbanks: Thank you for the kind words.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/14 9:52

rbanks

It seems that you are accusing me of what you yourself do - you think you can just read the Bible and interpret it yourself. The curse of Protestantism. I look at what others say over a range and then, whichever is confirmed within by the Holy Spirit, and which tunes in with sanctified reason, I adopt till one day it is challenged. If it is, I do not follow a denomination. You don't realize just how much of a lens you see through that way.

Anyway, to do apologetics one needs to know how others think and it has been very productive for me to do that here. If that is not your role then don't criticize others that do have it.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/14 10:04

Brenda, but you feel that you have discovered more enlightenment than the Bible.

I have witnessed to "Jehovah Witnesses" on my porch all the way to them hurrying to get in their car and leave.

I have walk up in kindness to 2 Mormons and a restaurant spending some time explaining to them the true gospel.

You are not much different than them in the fact that you read and depend on outside sources more than the Bible.

There is a difference in reading outside the Bible than depending on teachings outside the Bible—more than you do the Bible.

Blessings

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/14 10:15

Well Brend, I just got caught in trying to get you to trust God and His Word only.

Blessings to you, and I hope to stay humble in realizing I have not arrived and do fall short myself depending on Him to help me alwaysâ€not trusting in any outside teaching that is not clearly in the gospel of Christ.

I will bow outâ€blessings to allâ€

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/14 12:13

Thanks for that Travis. Yes it is about the heart and any miracle man sees, could be interpreted to be the work of the devil, if a man is determined to disprove God because of bitterness in his heart. Even the speaking of foreign languages at Pentecost, I guess. That's why I have been thinking that the sign is one of judgement.

I will consider what you have said.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiiss (), on: 2024/2/14 13:13

Hi Travis!

The things you mentioned are some important things to remember. When I came to Christ, I remember that I was often challenged by certain individuals with very strongly-held doctrinal opinions. They were primarily debating certain views about "calling and election" but also spiritual gifts.

Since I went from not believing in God to believing and then earnestly seeking him, I normally would have been uncomfortable with such fractious confrontations. However, I was diligently seeking the Lord. I had already read the Bible cover-to-cover several times. So, I felt comfortable answering their questions.

One thing that they argued was that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was simply water baptism and/or salvation.

When I read this passage to them, they initially didn't believe it was in the Bible. Then, they alleged that it was merely contained within a poorly-written translation of the Bible. I showed it to them in their Bibles and they were further bewildered. They couldn't explain it.

Here's that passage:

.....
.....

1 And it happened that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul passed through the inland country and came to Ephesus. There he found some disciples.

2 And he said to them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?"

And they said, "No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit."

3 And he said, "Into what then were you baptized?" They said, "Into John's baptism."

4 And Paul said, "John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus."

5 On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

6 And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they began speaking in tongues and prophesying. 7 There were about twelve men in all.

Acts 19:17 (ESV)

.....

.....

I pointed out that the passage clearly shows three separate experiences.

- 1.) John's baptism (of repentance)
- 2.) Baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus
- 3.) Receiving the Holy Spirit

The first is John's baptism. These disciples had already been baptized in water. However, Paul made the distinction between mere "baptism of repentance" and the Christ-focused example of water baptism -- clarified later in the epistles by Paul and Peter.

So, these men were baptized into Christ Jesus.

Yet, subsequent to this, Paul laid his hands on them. It was at the point that they "received the Holy Spirit" (verse 1). When the Holy Spirit came on them, "they began speaking in tongues and prophesying" (verse 6).

Now, I suspect that these men had already received Jesus by the time Paul laid hands on them. How? Paul baptized them in the name of Jesus. I don't think that Paul would baptize sinners. They had already repented (or, at least, been baptized with a baptism of repentance). They were subsequently baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

After Paul laid his hands upon them, "the Holy Spirit came upon them." They began to speak in tongues and prophecy.

Now, people can argue whether they began to speak in tongues so that sinners around them could hear it. However, the text doesn't say this. Rather, it simply indicates that they received the Holy Spirit when Paul laid his hands upon them (similar to what we read elsewhere in Acts when people received the Holy Spirit).

I would also point out that there was no "effort" involved among those who received the Holy Spirit. They didn't "pray through" to "receive the gifts." They were simply baptized in the name of Jesus and SUBSEQUENTLY had Paul (an apostle) lay his hands upon them. It makes you wonder about the significance of the "laying on of hands" (and Paul's exhortation to Timothy to not be "hasty" with the laying on of hands).

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/14 16:13

Chris: Agreed brother. A case for a baptism in the Holy Spirit that is subsequent to salvation, but not the same thing as salvation, is easy to make from very plainly stated scripture. Acts 19 is very clear in its distinction and differentiation of these things.

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2024/2/14 16:35

Hi Chris and Travis,

I completely agree, and have heard of instances that the one that was saved received the Baptism of the Holy Spirit simultaneously.

The Pentecostal Denomination that teaches that in order to be saved, you must be baptized in the Holy Spirit and speak in tongues has no scriptural foundation.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/14 21:34

Agreed Mike. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit can follow salvation or accompany salvation, but is NOT necessary for salvation.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2024/2/14 22:12

I agree with you Travis and Mike but when I look at the First evangelistic preaching from Peter on the day of Pentecost they asked him what must we do and he did say repent and be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins and you shall receive the gift of the holy spirit which is promise was given to you and to all those who are far off.

In Any evangelism the promise of the baptism of the holy spirit and the command to receive it is still part of the Salvation process and the gospel message somewhat but I'm a believer in the second blessing experience to some degree and it normally doesn't happen when you get saved.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/15 3:49

Brethren

As you say baptism, (not water) does not save us, I wonder what the difference is between our interpretations of this verse:

"The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. 1 Peter 3:21 KJV"

The Calvinists say it happens when we first come to Christ, so are in line with scripture logically, but I agree with others that it is a 'second' blessing. But these others say that it is the coming to Christ that saves us. Have you any proof it says that - I mean clear texts?

Also scripture says "Repent AND be baptized" which could signify two actions set apart.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/15 7:18

Brenda: Obviously that could be a totally different discussion, but I will give you my opinion. The baptism into Christ is a very real baptism of which water baptism, the physical act, is a picture. I don't believe Paul is talking about the physical act of water baptism in Rom. 6. I believe he is talking about the very real baptism into Christ's death and resurrection of which water baptism is the physical picture that we have been commanded to follow Him in doing.

Very short answer. Like I said, probably another discussion all together. But it is my opinion.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/15 7:28

Travis I agree that neither Paul nor Peter are talking about water baptism which is a sign of the Spirit baptism.

So that leaves us with the question of, does Spirit baptism ie baptized into the death of Christ save us like Peter said or not?

Re: - posted by CofG (), on: 2024/2/15 8:36

It's interesting that no one brings up the Ezekiel 36 passage on where the promise of the HS is made in the new covenant. There, one would be very hard pressed to not believe that new birth, new heart, new spirit and indwelling Spirit to cause us to obey doesn't occur at the point where we are regenerated by the word that we heard, the Gospel.

When you think of 2nd baptism or outpourings or fillings, think of greater and greater manifestations.

I realize you guys all know this, but I wonder why no mention of new birth and only mention of baptism. Plus, the greatest work of the HS is the exaltation of Jesus. The greatest exaltation of Jesus happens when His people manifest Him in likeness and image, character, displays of power completely sourced in authority and nature, and declaration.

Most of the Scriptures dealing with the work of the Spirit and the journey of the saint address the character traits of those "born again". Why is that? Many focus on 2 baptism. Seems to be a focus that cuts against the volume of NT Scripture. Be thrilled in New Birth, Transformation, and Glorification. That's where the NT spends all its time. We, for reasons I haven't understood completely, otherwise.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/15 9:08

Quote:
----- So that leaves us with the question of, does Spirit baptism ie baptized into the death of Christ save us like Peter said or not?

Sometimes confusion arises when we come from different denominational backgrounds. We might be using the same terminology, and the meanings of those words and concepts may overlap, but we wind up talking past one another without really understanding what each other is saying. Let me see if this explanation helps.

I am going to say this the way I, and probably most traditional pentacostals see it in scripture.

Salvation (being born again), a supernatural work of the Spirit of God. When we believe on the sacrifice of Christ to atone for our sins and allow us to be declared righteous in God's sight. We repent of our sins. We are baptized into Christ. We then will follow His command, out of obedience, to be water baptized. (The water baptism does not save us. It is something we do in obedience to Christ that is a physical walking out of what has happened to us inwardly. In salvation, we receive the Spirit of God. We might say there is not a fellowship with God through His Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is now our source of spiritual life.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit is a separate and subsequent baptism to salvation. We see this through various different accounts like the one in Acts 19, as well as what happened at Pentacost. This baptism has nothing to do with being made right with God or having eternal life. One is born again before this baptism. This baptism is about the power of the Holy Spirit in a person. Through this baptism we are given power for ministry and power to live a Godly life to a degree that we did not have through salvation alone.

This, in a nutshell, is how pentacostals see the word of God in the New Testament. If you have not been in pentacostal circles, you might not see this distinction which, if I am understanding your question correctly, is perhaps where your question comes from.

Mike, Gary, and Chris were all alluding to this in the discussion of when a person receives the baptism of the Holy Spirit. For me, I received this baptism at age 18, although I had been born again at age 8. Both experiences were unique and definite in my life. I was a completely changed little boy at age 8. I experienced another change in my life at age 18, after which I did notice a greater power in my life to live a godly life and a greater power for ministry to others. However, that was my experience. We have seen people who were baptized in the Holy Spirit at the same time as their conversion and again also at the same time as their water baptism.

As to tongues, many early pentacostals believed that speaking in tongues was THE evidence that a person had been baptized in the Holy Spirit. There is some Biblical support for this. In three out of four instances where people were baptized in the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, they spoke in tongues. In the fourth it is evident that something happened that was noticeable. I personally don't believe tongues is THE sign. Although, when I was baptized in the Holy Spirit, I did speak in tongues. I think we would say that a person baptized in the Holy Spirit does not have to pray in tongues, but it is available.

I will say this. There is a lunatic fringe of pentacostalism that has become more and more mainstream in the past 30 years. Their behavior and teachings have put a foul taste in the mouths of many where pentacostals are concerned. The most ridiculous fringe are those who C.Peter Wagner called the New Apostolic Reformation. Many of the leaders in this movement show signs, in my opinion, that they no longer hear from God at all and are following demonic, familiar spirits that are leading them around by the nose into all sorts of crazy, false teaching. I do not identify with this group. I believe it needs to be marked and avoided.

I say that to let you know that what I am talking about when I describe pentacostal is NOT what you see in the modern charismatic movement today.

I hope that helps with your question. Maybe it clarifies things in your mind a bit. I would encourage you to look at all of the places in the New Testament where the baptism of the Holy Spirit, tongues, and the other gifts of the Spirit are mentioned.

anted and simply ask yourself what is plainly being said by what you read. I do NOT believe the baptism of the Holy Spirit is necessary for salvation. One cannot make any sort of Biblical case for that. It's simply NOT in the Bible. But it is available and I believe God's provision for New Testament believers.

But to disagree with me on all I have just said is not reason to forego fellowship together. Its not a salvation issue.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/15 9:15

Quote:
----- It's interesting that no one brings up the Ezekiel 36 passage on where the promise of the HS is made in the new covenant. There, one would be very hard pressed to not believe that new birth, new heart, new spirit and indwelling Spirit to cause us to obey doesn't occur at the point where we are regenerated by the word that we heard, the Gospel.

When you think of 2nd baptism or outpourings or fillings, think of greater and greater manifestations.

I realize you guys all know this, but I wonder why no mention of new birth and only mention of baptism. Plus, the greatest work of the HS is the exaltation of Jesus. The greatest exaltation of Jesus happens when His people manifest Him in likeness and image, character, displays of power completely sourced in authority and nature, and declaration.

Most of the Scriptures dealing with the work of the Spirit and the journey of the saint address the character traits of those "born again". Why is that? Many focus on 2 baptism. Seems to be a focus that cuts against the volume of NT Scripture. Be thrilled in New Birth, Transformation, and Glorification. That's where the NT spends all its time. We, for reasons I haven't understood completely, otherwise.

Robert: There is much in what you said here that I agree wholeheartedly with. If the primary work of the Holy Spirit is not the personal character and Christlikeness of the believer, then what are we thinking? Ezekiel 36 is a fantastic prophecy of the New Birth, of the New Covenant. Christ and His atoning sacrifice are THE main focus of both Old and New Testament scripture.

Greater and greater manifestations might be one way to put it. I guess with the NAR issue so large, the word manifestation has come to be a bit of a pariah to me. However, the nine gifts of the Spirit are referred to as manifestations, or the way the Holy Spirit manifests His power through believers for ministry.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/15 11:07

//Sometimes confusion arises when we come from different denominational backgrounds. We might be using the same terminology, and the meanings of those words and concepts may overlap, but we wind up talking past one another without really understanding what each other is saying. Let me see if this explanation helps.

I am going to say this the way I, and probably most traditional pentacostals see it in scripture.

Salvation (being born again), a supernatural work of the Spirit of God. When we believe on the sacrifice of Christ to atone for our sins and allow us to be declared righteous in God's sight. We repent of our sins. We are baptized into Christ. We then will follow His command, out of obedience, to be water baptized. (The water baptism does not save us. It is something we do in obedience to Christ that is a physical walking out of what has happened to us inwardly. In salvation, we receive the Spirit of God. We might say there is not a fellowship with God through His Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is now our source of spiritual life.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit is a separate and subsequent baptism to salvation. We see this through various different accounts like the one in Acts 19, as well as what happened at Pentecost. This baptism has nothing to do with being made right with God or having eternal life. One is born again before this baptism. This baptism is about the power of the Holy Spirit in a person. Through this baptism we are given power for ministry and power to live a Godly life to a degree that we did not have through salvation alone.

This, in a nutshell, is how pentacostals see the word of God in the New Testament. If you have not been in pentacostal circles, you might not see this distinction which, if I am understanding your question correctly, is perhaps where your question comes from.

Mike, Gary, and Chris were all alluding to this in the discussion of when a person receives the baptism of the Holy Spirit. For me, I received this baptism at age 18, although I had been born again at age 8. Both experiences were unique and definite in my life. I was a completely changed little boy at age 8. I experienced another change in my life at age 18, after which I did notice a greater power in my life to live a godly life and a greater power for ministry to others. However, that was my experience. We have seen people who were baptized in the Holy Spirit at the same time as their conversion and again also at the same time as their water baptism.

As to tongues, many early pentacostals believed that speaking in tongues was THE evidence that a person had been baptized in the Holy Spirit. There is some Biblical support for this. In three out of four instances where people were baptized in the Holy Spirit in the New Testament, they spoke in tongues. In the fourth it is evident that something happened that was noticeable. I personally don't believe tongues is THE sign. Although, when I was baptized in the Holy Spirit, I did speak in tongues. I think we would say that a person baptized in the Holy Spirit does not have to pray in tongues, but it is available.

I will say this. There is a lunatic fringe of pentecostalism that has become more and more mainstream in the past 30 years. Their behavior and teachings have put a foul taste in the mouths of many where pentecostals are concerned. The most ridiculous fringe are those who C. Peter Wagner called the New Apostolic Reformation. Many of the leaders in this movement show signs, in my opinion, that they no longer hear from God at all and are following demonic, familiar spirits that are leading them around by the nose into all sorts of crazy, false teaching. I do not identify with this group. I believe it needs to be marked and avoided.

I say that to let you know that what I am talking about when I describe pentecostal is NOT what you see in the modern charismatic movement today.

I hope that helps with your question. Maybe it clarifies things in your mind a bit. I would encourage you to look at all of the places in the New Testament where the baptism of the Holy Spirit, tongues, and the other gifts of the Spirit are mentioned and simply ask yourself what is plainly being said by what you read. I do NOT believe the baptism of the Holy Spirit is necessary for salvation. One cannot make any sort of Biblical case for that. It's simply NOT in the Bible. But it is available and I believe God's provision for New Testament believers.

But to disagree with me on all I have just said is not reason to forego fellowship together. It's not a salvation issue.//

Travis

I appreciate the time you have taken over your reply. So if I am understanding you correctly, you are a Finished Work Pentecostal?

So at the coming to Christ, you said 'baptized into Christ, but you did not mean the baptism of the Spirit? So you talk about two baptisms not including the dip.

//The Holy Spirit is now our source of spiritual life.

The Baptism of the Holy Spirit is a separate and subsequent baptism to salvation.//

I don't get that but never mind.

My view is in accordance with scripture, there is one baptism of the Spirit and it comes post conversion, it is to make us holy - Holy Spirit makes us holy, by that I mean we are no longer operating in the world of the flesh and are now sinless, but it is much more than this, and along with that comes all of the fruit and gifts.

It is being restored in one instant to how God intended us to be like an Adam but much better as he was merely innocent. I guess that puts me in Wesley's camp but not quite as he allowed unintentional sin. I don't.

However when one is in this position it is possible to fall out of this grace but the ES'ed will not bear that for long as they miss His presence.

Oh yes I know all about NAR! Sadly it is getting everywhere. I am very well used to fellowshiping with those of other denominations Travis and never fall out for that reason. I do refuse to discuss with those that do things like post some of an email by me during a private conversation which to me is a breach of trust. Or disrespect me for another reason after

giving them one chance.

//I do NOT believe the baptism of the Holy Spirit is necessary for salvation. One cannot make any sort of Biblical case for that. It's simply NOT in the Bible.//

1 Peter 2:21 "baptism now saves you" Comment?

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/15 15:28

Quote:
----- So at the coming to Christ, you said 'baptized into Christ, but you did not mean the baptism of the Spirit? So you talk about two baptisms not including the dip.

Your summary of what I am saying is correct. This is how most pentacostals are going to see it. Baptism into Christ = the rebirth, regeneration, salvation...pick the term you like best. This is a real baptism of which water baptism is a picture. This will answer your last question. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is separate from this. Baptism into Christ IS necessary for salvation. In fact, it is by definition salvation. Baptism of the Holy Spirit is separate from this and is NOT necessary for salvation. This is the classical pentacostal view.

I have never called myself a finished work pentacostal. This issue is what split Azusa Street in the end. A man named Durham began preaching the finished work doctrine. Parham was originally a Methodist (Wesleyan) and a lot of his distinctives were a form of Wesleyan holiness with its second blessing and entire sanctification and sinless perfection ideas. Seymour also believed this way. I grew up with these being taught to me, but I do not believe them to be Biblical.

American pentacostalism then had a large split. Many of your smaller, independent pentacostal churches still follow the Wesleyan tradition. They have three experiences that follow in strict order in their teaching. Salvation, then Sanctification as a distinct second work of grace. Then, because of entire sanctification, a person is clean enough for the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit and the third experience is the Baptism of the Holy Spirit. The problem with this is that the progression is nowhere found in scripture and certain historical passages in Acts violate this order.

The second group followed Durham's lead. These are more of your mainline pentacostal groups such as the Assemblies of God. They do not hold to Wesleyan holiness and see sanctification as a progressive work of the Spirit in the life of a believer. I see this view scripturally more than I do Parham's view. So I guess you might call me a finished work pentacostal if it simply means that sanctification is an ongoing work in the life of a believer.

Here is my perspective, I guess. At least it has been my personal experience and I think I can fairly plainly see it in scripture.

Salvation: Comes through repentance and a very real baptism into Christ (the old man of sin dying with Him and being resurrected to new life). We receive the Spirit of God and can now fellowship freely with God through Christ. We have God's righteousness imputed to us and stand before Him righteous.

Sanctification: When we repent of our sins, we are obviously turning from it and submitting ourselves to God. This is our act of consecrating our lives to Him. So, in a sense, we separated ourselves from the world and its ways and separated ourselves unto God and His ways. In this sense, we initiated sanctification, but He does the work of sanctifying us and gives us the power to grow in our sanctification. From this point onward, we are walking out our salvation, ever increasing in holiness (the outward expression of the work of salvation). God continually exposes areas of our lives that are not completely His and causes us to grow, becoming more and more like Him.

Baptism of the Holy Spirit: The work of pentacost that we see three other distinct times in Acts as separate from salvation. This baptism gives us the power of the Spirit. With this comes an increased power to live a Holy life. With this also comes the potential to having God use us in the supernatural gifts of the Spirit as given in 1 Cor. 12.

The Wesleyan ideas have, in my experience caused great harm in the lives of people that I have known. My own grandf

ather questioned his salvation as he neared death because he did not see sinless perfection in his life. His brother has been plagued by the same questions. Parham's followers taught entire sanctification as a second definite work of grace almost to the degree of teaching sinless perfection. When cornered with their own shortcomings they would back pedal a little bit and say, "Well, you have to be striving toward sinless perfection." But that never really made sense to me.

Hope this helps.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/15 15:38

I just looked up "finished work pentacostalism" on Wikipedia. Surprised, but there is a pretty accurate article on it. It will give some of the American Pentacostal distinctives that I heard preached about as I was a youngster growing up. We were the Parham pentacostal group. We heard it preached that, because of their finished work doctrine, the Assemblies of God, just up the road 60 miles in Springfield, MO, was actually off spiritually and that we should not fellowship too much with them. They were seen as genuine Christians, but as ones who had their theology all goofy and that could corrupt our "pure" teachings. So I can attest to the fact that what I see in this Wiki article is correct based on what I was taught 40 years ago.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2024/2/15 16:41

Brother Travis, I have enjoyed your posts over the years, now more than ever.

I love what you have posted on this thread explaining such much truth from scripture. I agree with your position very much. God bless you brother!

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/16 3:26

Travis

It helps a great deal thank you and I hope that you are willing to continue this discussion as it is extremely helpful for me in my apologetics training. I know it is from God as I did not want to get into this area :)

//The Wesleyan ideas have, in my experience caused great harm in the lives of people that I have known. My own grandfather questioned his salvation as he neared death because he did not see sinless perfection in his life. His brother has been plagued by the same questions. Parham's followers taught entire sanctification as a second definite work of grace almost to the degree of teaching sinless perfection. When cornered with their own shortcomings they would back pedal a little bit and say, "Well, you have to be striving toward sinless perfection." But that never really made sense to me.//

I fully understand this and commiserate with those who have been damaged by it. The Holiness Movement never swept my country like it did in America so it was quite a while before I began to learn about the damage that had taken place by fake sinless perfection proponents.

I believe that a lot of this problem has been in the cross over in this teaching from the east to the west and lack of understanding what the ECF taught.

The fact that there has been so much chaos, must be expected when something so important takes place, that is, something that so damages the power of Satan in this world. There is nothing like the perfect Christian who makes him shake in his shoes, because he is barely able to deceive them whereas the 'sinning Christian' is no problems at all for him.

I know believers myself (in the UK) who have learned the truth, or what I call being enlightened or illumined, and have been seeking for the blessing for a long time and I am talking about over 15 years or more, and I can see how people could perhaps have lost their faith through it. They are Pentecostals by the way. I have some insight about this but will not say what it is for now in case I switch you off.

But so far the main problem in what you say is refuted by Ephesians 4:5 One Lord, one faith, one baptism. You are saying that there are two. Baptism into Christ and baptised by the Holy Spirit. Travis, it is the Trinity that is acting in all things. I would like to see how the Finished Work Pentecostals see the Trinity.

Thank you for your information about that denomination by the way and wiki which I read. However I don't think wiki was

right on this:

//Wesley drew on the idea of theosis to suggest that sanctification would cause a change in motivation that if nurtured would lead to a *gradual perfecting of the believer.* Thus while it was physically possible for a sanctified believer to sin, he or she would be empowered to choose to avoid sin. Wesley's teachings and Methodism gave birth to the holiness movement, which sought to propagate the Methodistic doctrine of entire sanctification (Christian perfection). Most advocates within the holiness movement, in accordance with Methodist theology, taught that sanctification had both instantaneous and progressive dimensions. They taught the availability of entire sanctification, which was a post-conversion experience. In this "second definite work of grace", the inclination to sin was removed and replaced by perfect love.//

I have studied Wesley quite a bit, and came to the conclusion that, although he got his doctrine of entire sanctification, (which does not say that it is a gradual perfection), from the early church fathers, for some reason he misread some of them, perhaps because he did not have as full as access to their writings as we do now, or some other reason.

I do absolutely think that he did not get to the full stage of Theosis or union with Christ from much of what he said. I think he also recognized that others in Methodism did like Fletcher whom he said was the holiest man alive or something like that. It makes a big difference in discernment.

So I don't start with Wesley, but go back to the source that is, the early fathers interpretation of the Bible added of course to what the Holy Spirit teaches me to my spirit on scripture..We do have to have a foundation like this.

Now, you say that Durham taught the Finished work but I read that:

"Durham wrote in his magazine, The Pentecostal Testimony:

I ... deny that God does not deal with the nature of sin at conversion. I deny that a man who is converted or born again is outwardly washed and cleansed but that his heart is left unclean with enmity against God in it ... This would not be Salvation. Salvation ... means a change of nature ... It means that all the old man or old nature, which was sinful and depraved and which was the very thing in us that was condemned, is crucified with Christ."

Faithsaves.net/welsh-revival/

Well Travis I will stop here for comments.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/16 3:43

ps //I ... deny that God does not deal with the nature of sin at conversion. I deny that a man who is converted or born again is outwardly washed and cleansed but that his heart is left unclean with enmity against God in it ... This would not be Salvation. Salvation ... means a change of nature ... It means that all the old man or old nature, which was sinful and depraved and which was the very thing in us that was condemned, is crucified with Christ."//

Faithsaves.net/welsh-revival/

Just to add, how can we be crucified with Christ if we still sin? All of these differences are just taking the benefits of being born anew, and spreading them out instead of seeing them all together as scripture shows.

Saved - born again - crucified with Christ - united with God - entirely sanctified - baptized by the Spirit.

Satan convinces men that they are in this state when first coming to Christ but reality shows it is wrong.

Then he adds into the mix confessors of ES who were fake or rather deceived.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/16 17:42

Quote:
----- But so far the main problem in what you say is refuted by Ephesians 4:5 One Lord, one faith, one baptism. You are saying that there are two. Baptism into Christ and baptised by the Holy Spirit. Travis, it is the Trinity that is acting in all things. I would like to see how the Finished Work Pentecostals see the Trinity.

It is important that we read Ephesians 4:5 in context. Paul is dealing with the subject of unity, not the subject of baptism. He is saying that we need to love one another and forbear one another because we are baptized into the same Christ and have the same Holy Spirit. This is not a proof-text for whether the baptism of the Holy Spirit is separate from salvation. This verse does not speak to that issue at all. It speaks to our COMMON baptism and our common Lord. It gives the reason why you and I, though we disagree and discuss scripture, must still view one another as genuine believers and love one another.

Quote:
----- Thank you for your information about that denomination by the way and wiki which I read. However I don't think wiki was right on this:

Wiki is notorious for having errors since it is essentially crowd-driven. But what I read agrees with the stories I heard growing up. I did hear only the Parham side of the story since that was the group I grew up in. But the Wiki article seemed to jive with all of the stories I was told as a young man. My Great Grandfather held many tent meetings with Parham's son and daughter-in-law and he was the primary source of the information I heard. You may have more accurate information about the Wesleyan side of things.

Doctrines morph over time. Case in point, Parham was a Methodist and simply added the Baptism of the Holy Spirit onto what he already believed. So Americans who are "classical" pentecostals have a three step or three tiered view of salvation, sanctification, and then the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Parham taught that one was not actually born again until one was fully sanctified by God. Salvation was, to him, only justification from past sins. Sanctification, in his doctrine, dealt with and defeated the sin nature. Only when this was done did a person have a new nature and was truly born again. (I disagree with this view). So I hope you can see how, under this teaching, a person who continued to battle the flesh would always struggle with whether or not they were actually a Christian. My grandfather struggled with this.

We have this tendency to wrap a particular group's doctrinal distinctives up into a nice, neat, little package and then say that we don't agree with the wrapping paper. But the reality is that these distinctives change over time and not every person in that group believes what we think they believe. You alluded to the finished work doctrine and it seems like you could not see how Durham preached it. But Durham's view was only a step in the direction of what is now called finished work. He probably did not believe all that more recent finished work proponents believed.

And in this is part of the problem. If a person sees all pentecostals in light of the current charismatic and NAR movements, then one will think that all pentecostals are something like (I will use an example from your part of the world here) Emma Stark. She is an absolute nut-job and, in my opinion, probably hearing from demonic, familiar spirits. But the danger is to lump all pentecostals into one group when nothing could be further from the truth. The only thing I have in common with the modern charismatic movement is that I believe in a separate work called in scripture the baptism of the Holy Spirit and that things like tongues and the gifts of the Spirit have, since the day of Pentecost, been something that God does among the church.

This modern day signs and wonders movement that thinks everyone should constantly be operating in all the gifts is an error, and a huge one at that.

One can study theology and be well versed in all that they read and hear of the "moves and groups" that exist. But that information is collected by men and it is a given that their own opinion and bias will be read into it. This is not to say they

are bad in any way. It is simply the nature of being human and we must always take it into account.

You and I may not agree. My goal is not to argue and be proven right. My goal is to simply put the information that I have out there and study the scripture in a deeper and deeper way.

Blessings.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2024/2/16 17:48

Quote:
----- Just to add, how can we be crucified with Christ if we still sin? All of these differences are just taking the benefits of being born anew, and spreading them out instead of seeing them all together as scripture shows.

Guess I would answer that with a question related to a passage of scripture. Paul tells us, believers, to be not conformed to the pattern of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of the mind. To be conformed to the pattern of this world is to sin. To be transformed is to be changed from something and to something. From what are we transformed if it is not the propensity we have, as humans with human flesh, to give in to temptation?

Now we must bring this closer to home. If you are a person who has been completely sanctified, and if you have been crucified with Christ, do you still find yourself needing to come to the Lord and say something like, "God, I am so sorry. I just gave in to that temptation. I just behaved in a way that I know to be sin. Please help me to change. Transform me. Thank you that I am forgiven by the blood of Jesus."

If you have had this happen, have you not, then, answered your own question?

These things write I unto you that you sin not. But, if any man does sin, he has an advocate with Jesus Christ the righteous.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/17 5:12

Travis

Yes I see that the context is that of brotherly love, now that we are in the same Spirit but it does say one baptism. We come into oneness through one baptism.

Eph 4:13 says: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

verse 16 From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.

So it is saying that it is in perfection or ES that shows us that we are not meant to all agree on everything and that each of us forms part of the body whereby God gives different insights to different people as we are not made to function alone, and anyone who has been through the wilderness experience knows how hard that is. Before we reach perfection, we think that differences (not on the basics) is a problem and we try to resolve them by making others see things as we do, and if they do not, we will break fellowship. Hence over 40,000 Protestant denominations.

Travis I can barely believe my fortune (gift) of being able to listen to someone who was so closely involved in the Holiness Movement!

You say that doctrines morph over time. Yes as time goes on, and error increases along with the downfall of the civilization of man towards the end of all things, men become more and more deceived and head towards the doctrines of demons. If you look at history from the perspective of those outside of westernism or really Americanism, you can see the downfall from the time the RCC split from the true church and then was split ad infinity instead of it returning to the true church.

h. You can clearly see the spirit of revolution forming through from that in France increasingly so.

But more so can you see it over the doctrine of ES or Thesosis, how it left its roots and became dispersed. This dispersi on is how satan works, scattering things so that no-one can tell the truth. But they had the faith that was handed down fr om the Apostles in the early years even amidst the error and it can be found and it is very simple - good v evil. No progr essiveness, that is satanic.

I take your point and thanks for that, that we must not put everyone in one basket and I am appreciating that not all Pent ecostals are the same. I have noticed that the 'far out ones' seem quite emotionally unstable as in any group. The Spirit i s perfectly able to over come this in ES and I have myself as witness having been severely abused in childhood. It is als o wonderful to have the discernment to separate mans' words from what is the truth.

Re: - posted by brendaM, on: 2024/2/17 5:22

//If you are a person who has been completely sanctified, and if you have been crucified with Christ, do you still find your self needing to come to the Lord and say something like, "God, i am so sorry. I just gave in to that temptation. I just beha ved in a way that I know to be sin. Please help me to change. Transform me. Thank you that I am forgiven by the blood of Jesus." If you have had this happen, have you not, then, answered your own question? These things write I unto you t hat you sin not. But, if any man does sin, he has an advocate with Jesus Christ the righteous.//

Well John does say 'if' not when. No that does not happen to one who is ES. If they fall into sin then they are not easily r estored and in fact only God can do it it is so serious as we read in Hebrews. We have in fact put Christ back on the cros s.

Once we have been delivered by the blood of Christ from the old creation and are new creatures, deliberate sin is so terr ible for that person that they will not consider and in fact have no desire for it, and Jude tells us that God keeps us: 24 N ow unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with excee ding joy.

We have no excuse.