



**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Born of water**

**Born of water - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/16 22:13**

I was talking with a bro. in Christ and we got into John 3:5-6, and he brought up something that is alien to me. He sais that Jesus was using the term "born of water" as natural child birth.

**John 3:5-6** Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

**:6** That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

This water is talking about baptism, and not saying that a man be born of natural birth and of the Spirit.

I don't think this lines up with the "Apostolic Doctrine" thread, so I am making it to be a whole new thread and see where it goes.

**Re: Born of water - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/16 23:06**

Born of water:

Jhn 4:14 But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Born of Spirit:

Rom 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.

His Body the Church, Born Again:

Ephesians 5:25-27 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

Who is the water of Life?

Who is the Spirit of Christ?

Who is the Word?

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 10:40**

Quote:

-----Christinyou wrote:

Born of water:

Who is the water of Life?

-----  
Not a who, but a what.

**1John 5:6-8** This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that bears witness, because the Spirit is truth.

**:7** For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit: and these three are one.

**:8** And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

**Re: Born of water - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/17 14:19**

Quote:

Logic wrote:

I was talking with a bro. in Christ and we got into John 3:5-6, and he brought up something that is alien to me. He said that Jesus was using the term "born of water" as natural child birth.

**John 3:5-6** Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.  
**:6** That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.  
This water is talking about baptism, and not saying that a man be born of natural birth and of the Spirit.

I don't think this lines up with the "Apostolic Doctrine" thread, so I am making it to be a whole new thread and see where it goes.

Logic, you are correct..Jesus Christ is NOT talking about natural birth. But I can tell you that almost every person who responds to this, will tell you that he is.

John 3:3 Except a man be born-**AGAIN**.."

To be born AGAIN, would have to imply that he has already been born once-being born once would be nothing less than natural birth. Jesus is not telling a grown man that he needs to be born naturally again. If this were true, then man would have to do exactly as Nicodemus said: and get back into his Mother's womb, close it up and be born-AGAIN

Jesus is not talking about being born, He is talking about being born AGAIN of water and of the Spirit.

Logic, He is, as you said, talking about water baptism.

**Re: - posted by Christin角度 (), on: 2007/10/17 16:21**

This is not natural child birth. This is the witness of Who Christ is, by the three that agree. The water is Christ's baptismal water, what was the witness? The Holy Spirit was upon Him as a dove as a witness to Him being One with the Spirit of God, and the Fathers witness was "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased".

The three that bear witnesses on earth are: The water of His beginning of His ministry on earth, The Holy Spirit on Him as One, The Fathers proclamation that in truth, This truly is my Son.

1 John 5:7-9 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.

As the Three in Heaven are One witness, so also are the Three on earth One, The witness is true, Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

Why was He baptized? Jhn 1:33 And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

Matthew 3:15 And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

"To fulfil all righteousness"; to carry into full effect every divine institution.

If you look for who the witnesses are you will see that the water testifies of the Who He is. The Person of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

This water is different from living water, but a profile of the Same Person that gives life, The water of Life and the witness that He is life.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 16:32**

I am glad that we (three) agree, I wonder how some might think that this "water" in john 3:5 means fleshly birth.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/17 17:04**

One is revealed by man.

One is revealed by the HOLY SPIRIT.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2007/10/17 17:11**

Quote:

Logic wrote:

I am glad that we (three) agree, I wonder how some might think that this "water" in john 3:5 means fleshly birth.

Hi Bro Logic

I don't understand why everyone has to be so dogmatic about this - it could mean natural birth or baptism in water or?...

Or maybe "all of the above"...

Why not? Scripture is so very rich that every verse has a great depth of meaning.

However, this question has set me to looking at the whole of John's thought on this subject, or at least his thought as revealed in the Gospel, and in the first epistle. For John's Gospel is far more than a simple account of Jesus' earthly life: With the inspiration of the Spirit he interprets as well as records.

Watch this space! :-)

Jeannette

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 17:27**

Quote:

-----LittleGift wrote:

Quote:

-----Logic wrote:

I am glad that we (three) agree, I wonder how some might think that this "water" in john 3:5 means fleshly birth.

Hi Bro Logic

I don't understand why everyone has to be so dogmatic about this - it could mean natural birth or baptism in water or?...

Or maybe "all of the above"...

Why not? Scripture is so very rich that every verse has a great depth of meaning.

There is no where is scripture that water means anything close to physical birth.

If Jesus meant born of the flesh when HE said born of water, HE would have said it just as he did in verse 6.

The reason that HE said water is because HE meant water, not flesh.

Otherwise He would have said, "Except a man be born of flesh and of the Spirit" and/or "That which is born of the water is flesh"

This is common hermeneutics and exegesis.

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/17 17:37**

1 John 5: 5 Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? 6 This is he that came BY WATER AND BLOOD, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water AND blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. 7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness IN THE EARTH, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: AND THESE THREE AGREE IN ONE

Matt 3:13 Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. 14 But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? 15 And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him. 16 And Jesus, WHEN HE WAS BAPTIZED, went up straightway OUT OF THE WATER: and, lo, THE HEAVENS WERE OPENED UNTO HIM, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: 17 And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

The subject matter is not birth-rather, it is, to be BORN-AGAIN.

If Jesus is referring to natural birth, then none of us are born-AGAIN-because as Nic said, we would have to enter into THE SECOND TIME our mother's womb?

This is the direct statement that Nic asks. Then he even speaks naturally, he says "...how can a MAN be born (natural birth) when HE IS OLD? can he enter the second time enter his mother's womb and be born? (This is verse 4)

If Jesus was speaking of NATURAL birth, then why does he make the statement. " Except a man be born AGAIN"

If Jesus was speaking of NATURAL birth, then we ALL must get back in our mothers womb for the second time and be born again-because Christ is talking about being born-AGAIN, not being born the first time.

Also...Jesus never mentions anything in John 3:1-8 about a "Mother"

The reason why Jesus says " That which is born of the flesh is flesh" is because the man in which he was talking to was born of the flesh or, already naturally born, but needed to be born again of water and of the Spirit

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/17 17:38**

Amen and Amen. Man, its not everyday that you hear people speaking and standing up for the truth. You must be Apostolic right as all of the saints should be, holding to the teachings of the apostles doctrine not man's visions, dreams, interpretation. The biblical foundation is found in the word.

I once came across a guy that thought the same thing that being born of the water was natural birth and that is obviously out of context because everyone has already had natural birth. Jesus was stating this fact was something that should happen in the future. Jesus didn't agree with Nicodemus about getting back into his mother womb but explained the born again experience which consists of the water and the spirit. The natural birth didn't consist of the water and the spirit. Being born of the water is not complete without the birth of the spirit for they both are a part of the new birth.

There is also people that say that being born of the water is the cleansing of the word or something related to the word and that is partly true but first cleansing and being born are two different things. When a believer is baptized in the name of Jesus he is obeying Jesus' commandment so in one way you can't exclude the obedience to the word from being born of the water but being born of water and the spirit are two things in your life that you can pin point and say it happened here. They are not a continuous progression or transformation. The cleansing of the word and the perfecting of the saints through obedience of the word are life long. The New Birth is an event that may happen all at one time or in two intervals like the Samaritans who believed and were baptized and later on received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands by the apostles.

So the truth is evident, it is clear. It is just that people are not willing to accept it or they are blinded by false teaching and fear of losing the praise of men.

What do you think about the topic concerning when the Holy Spirit comes to abide? Some say that the H.S comes right when you believe and they base this off of how Jesus breathed on the Apostles and said receive the H.S thus stating that the apostles already had the h.s but not the baptism of the h.s but these are used interchangeably for a reason in the book of Acts. By the way i don't see a difference between the reception of the h.s and the baptism of the h.s from the account on the Day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit came as Jesus promised on the Day of Pentecost, (it couldn't be before b/c Jesus said that the Father wouldn't send the promise in till Jesus was glorified and at that point when Jesus breathed on the apostles he wasn't glorified yet but only resurrected) and Luke said that they received the h.s and spoke in other tongues as the spirit gave them the utterance. Also if the Apostles already had the h.s after Jesus breathed on them then Jesus physically would need to breathe on people today to fill them and in one way he does through the mighty rushing wind that's how they knew Jesus had sent the holy spirit, it clicked with them (Jesus breathed on them earlier as symbolic of the h.s and the mighty rushing wind from heaven came later to fill them) but the main point is when the holy spirit comes to take up residence, how he does it is his business whether through blowing, breathing, speaking, pouring, raining and etc.

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 17:52**

Blazed, Hi , I do disagree on 2 issues and your explanation does not change my mind.

The issue of Nicodemus question of entering into his mother's womb.

Then Jesus says that which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of spirit is spirit.

Then unless a man is born of water and spirit.....

I cannot interpret those statements apart, they must go together.....hence the water spoken of is natural childbirth.

The other issue of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit all translate into the name of Jesus.....I cannot make that jump with you. I will just choose to disagree.

I really feel this is a doctrinal issue and I would need to see the whole perspective of your teachers to see where this is going.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/17 18:33**

Let's look at the text.

"Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.

The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." John 3

Now, you say that Jesus is talking about the natural birth when he says to be born of water and you justify it by using the other text that says everyone that is born of the flesh is flesh. Jesus was not saying that being born of the water is natural birth he was explaining why we all need to be born again b/c EVERYONE THAT IS BORN OF THE FLESH IS FLESH. FLESH AND BLOOD WILL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD. Thanks for this conversation b/c I am literally receiving insight on this scripture. I never took it into thought how everyone who is born of the spirit is SPIRIT just as everyone that is born of the flesh is FLESH. As I stated above before FLESH AND BLOOD WILL NOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Now Jesus would have to be stupid to have meant by saying except a man be born of the water and he meant by that according to your beliefs on this except a man be born into this world and is born of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That doesn't make sense. Of course everyone that comes into this world comes through the flesh. Why would Jesus say that when he knows that everyone that is born by a woman is born by the flesh. What is the use of Except like it is not going to happen. Everyone will be born of the water if being born of the water means being born by the flesh. You see that it's not scriptural and it doesn't make sense. That usage of the scripture makes Jesus' words foolish and Jesus knows what he is talking about.

Concerning the other issue of the trinity the name of Jesus it is really clear. Jesus is God manifest in the flesh. He is God

with us "Immanuel". Since Jesus is God and was God the word before he came to this earth he is also the FATHER (Ex: Everlasting Father). We all know without a shadow of a doubt that Jesus is the only begotten Son of God, there need be no argument there. If Jesus was God and is God and God is a spirit and his spirit is called the holy spirit in reality Jesus is the Holy Spirit. Who's spirit did the 120 receive on the day of pentecost? God's spirit and the spirit of his dear son. These are not two spirits b/c God and the son are one and the same person and so is the spirit in unity and oneness with the Godhead. This is in no way denying the Father or the Holy Spirit. We see and accept the Father and the Holy Spirit in Jesus Christ. All the fullness of the Godhead lives in Jesus Christ Bodily right? Do you see now? Only tradition and false teaching will prevent you or fear of changing your traditions. Hope you understand the truth and that God will give you understanding on this subject.

"For unto us a CHILD is born, unto us a SON is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called WONDERFUL, COUNSELLOR, THE MIGHTY GOD, The EVERLASTING FATHER, THE PRINCE OF PEACE.

Of the increase of government and peace no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this." Isa 9:6-7

Who is this? Doesn't this sound familiar? This must be God right? But it says unto us a child is born, a son is given. Wait God is not born, God has always been unless it is talking about Jesus Christ the only begotten son of God who was God manifested in the flesh.

Can I be any more clearer?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 19:05**

Quote:  
-----psalm1 wrote:  
Blazed, Hi , I do disagree on 2 issues and your explanation does not change my mind.  
The issue of nicodemus question of entering into his mothers womb.  
Then Jesus says that which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of spirit is spirit.  
Then unless a man is born of water and spirit.....  
I cannot interpret those statements apart, they must go together.....hence the water spoken of is natural childbirth.  
The other issue of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit all translate into the name of Jesus.....I cannot make that jump with you . I will just choose to disagree.  
I really feel this is a doctrinal issue and I would need to see the whole perspective of your teachers to see where this is going.

Please, in order to confirm your theory, show in scripture where water relates to natural child birth or any where in the bible has water being spoken of as natural child birth or anything close to it.

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 19:30**

Logic I am only looking at that one passage and reconciling what I read.  
To me if I apply your reasoning then we have 3 births 1 natural 2 through baptism 3 rebirth  
You will notice no reference to baptism in the dialog with nicodemus.  
This in my opinion is a convenient place to insert water baptism which in no way is being referred to  
You and I are not the first to examine these two possibilities. Theologians differ on this matter.  
I don't know if I 'proved my theory'...as you say...but I would say it is equally possible to cast doubt on the other view since it doesn't fit the dialog.  
So since neither of us really knows for now I choose to say born of the womb=natural birth  
Make sense?  
.....David

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/17 20:09**

We must also look at Jesus' words to Nicodemus, and what Jesus was holding Nicodemus accountable for.

Jesus asks him-

John 3:10 Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?

Now what "things" would Christ be speaking of? Where in OT was there a similar idea presented that Nicodemus should have known?

Perhaps here-

Ezekiel 36:25 Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.

Ezekiel 36:26 A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.

Ezekiel 36:27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.

Here we see both water and spirit spoken of in regards to the new birth, or regeneration. This is the promise of the new covenant is it not?

**Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2007/10/17 21:12**

Quote:  
-----Here we see both water and spirit spoken of in regards to the new birth, or regeneration. This is the promise of the new covenant is it not?  
-----

Yes, I think you are on the right track here with this reference to Ezekiel. I believe that Jesus' words in John 3:5 about being born of water and spirit have nothing to do with literal H<sub>2</sub>O. It's not about water or baptism. Salvation cannot be accomplished by a bath. The water He was speaking of was symbolic, it was from the Old Testament picture of purification. Nicodemus would have understood that reference. The Ezekiel 36 passage brings together the ideas of water and spirit, it is the OT promise of regeneration.

The Holy Spirit places the believer into the body of Christ and purifies the believer by the water of the word...

*that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word,*  
(Eph 5:26)

*Already you are clean because of the word that I have spoken to you.*  
(Joh 15:3)

Paul refers to the "washing of regeneration" and "renewing by the Holy Spirit" in Titus 3:5, echoing Jesus' words in John 3:5. Jesus was telling Nicodemus that he needed to be spiritually purified and spiritually reborn. The whole point in speaking to Nicodemus this way was to show him that law and rituals-including baptism-cannot give eternal life. Baptismal regeneration is unscriptural.

In Christ,

Ron

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 21:14**

roaringlamb,i dont see how nicodemas could possibly have connected those 3 scriptures to what Jesus was saying. They were not dialogging on baptism. they were specifically discussing birth. The weight is definately on the side of natural birth. besides if the baptism theory is taken to its logical conclusion it appears to me we have 3 births.

....David

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 21:26**

InTheLight, In that case the born=baptism theory still doesnt fit because not only would nicodemas have to connect Jesus words to baptism even more far fetched he would have to connect baptism with birth. Its almost like a picture is being presented that any good jew would automatically connect the dots of this obvious baptism=born of water theory when even us being enlightened would not say "you need to be born of water" I have never heard of this And yet you think nicodemas would have automatically thought this? This just doesnt seem possible

...David

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/17 21:55**

Quote:  
-----They were not dialogging on baptism.  
-----

Those verses in Ezekiel have nothing to do with baptism, but rather the cleansing effect of a regenerated heart.

If not these verses, then where in the OT would Christ be drawing from, and wondering what Nicodemus did not understand.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 22:10**

Quote:  
-----psalm1 wrote:  
Logic I am only looking at that one passage and reconciling what I read.  
To me If I apply your reasoning then we have 3 births 1 natural 2through baptism 3rebirth  
You will notice no reference to baptism in the dialog with nicodemus.  
This in my opinion is a convenient place to insert water baptism which in no way is being referred to  
You and I are not the first to examine these two possibilities. Theologians differ on this matter.  
I dont know if I 'proved my theory'...as you say...but I would say it is equally possible to cast doubt on the other view since it doesnt fit the dialog.  
So since neither of us really knows for now I choose to say born of the womb=natural birth  
Make sense?  
-----

Baptism is not a birth, it is a representation of salvation, in that it is a change of life; from death to life(Romans 6:4, Colos 2:12, 1 Peter 3:21).

Therefore, 1)the first birth at conception, 2) second at acceptance of the Work that Christ did, or the moment of Salvation; born from death to life.

**The baptism is not that which is born of the flesh is flesh**

The word "water" is used in Eph 5:26 & Titus 3:5.  
Baptism was practiced by the Jews in receiving a Gentile as a proselyte. In this baptism, the proselyte promised in the most solemn manner to renounce idolatry, to take the God of Israel for his God, and to have his life conformed to the precepts of the Divine law.



Jesus tells Nicodemus, that the Jew himself cannot be admitted into the kingdom of the God unless he, first, strip himself of his Judaism by baptism of water(as the christian is baptized strip himself of his wordlyness), and put off his carnal and put on a spiritual state.

This is the basic conversation:

**John 3:4-5** Nicodemus said to Him, "How can a man be born again after he is already old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb to be born of the flesh again?"

:5 Jesus answered him, "I am telling you a truth, a "natural" person cannot enter the kingdom of God, you must first, strip yourself of his old life with the symbol baptism of water and also by the Holy Spirit.

:6 Because whoever is born from human parents(flesh) is a still a natural man, whoever is born from the Holy Spirit is a spiritual man.

:7 So, do not be surprised that I have said to you, "You must be born from above."

Jesus is not putting born of water as being born of flesh. That would be contrary to what HE is saying in context of verse 6; one cannot enter into the kingdom of God Except a man be born of a woman? and the spirit.

Furthermore, it would be rather ridiculous to say that one needs to be born physicaly to do anything, for that is like, duh!

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/17 22:21**

Quote:

-----psalm1 wrote:

InTheLight, In that case the born=baptism theory still doesnt fit because not only would nicodemus have to connect Jesus words to baptism even more far fetched he would have to connect baptism with birth.

-----  
If you would understand what baptism is:

**Rom 6:3-5** Know you not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

:4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that just as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

:5 For if we have been united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:

Baptism is a **representation** of death, therefore, the coming up out of the water is life(a new birth).

Baptism is a representation of the actual event of salvation.

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 22:23**

roaringlamb, it was a rhetoracle question.He was saying even though you are a master you know not the things of the spirit.

read vs 12

also when you read vs7 and8 we see that 'these things' are referring to the new birth not new births plural.

the more I look at this the more and more it looks like born of the flesh can only mean 'from the womb'

....David

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 22:26**

logic ...nobody connects resurrection with birth.

If you connect baptism to birth then you have 2 births

Born again and baptism are 2 different things

....David

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/17 22:45**

Logic, Ok what I am seeing here is you place most of the weight of this dialog with nicodemus on the "water" part of the sentence, whereas an english teacher would put the emphasis on the born of the spirit part.

Through process of elimination we can rule out baptism.

Jesus reference to water is a direct answer to nicodemus question 'mothers womb'

....David

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/10/17 23:19**

Quote:

-----the more I look at this the more and more it looks like born of the flesh can only mean 'from the womb'

Yes, I agree, and it seems that what Jesus is getting at is the need of regeneration to understand the things He was teaching.

Later Christ would say, "that which is flesh is flesh", or in other words, "it will always remain flesh until there is a new birth of the Spirit.

Jesus word in vs 12, 13 also show what Paul speaks of in 1 Corinthians 2-

1Co 2:7 **But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory:**

1Co 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

1Co 2:9 But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

1Co 2:10 But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.

1Co 2:11 For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

1Co 2:12 Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

1Co 2:13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1Co 2:14 **But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.**

The water and the spirit are cleansing of the heart, and imparting of Spiritual life into the heart. Thus it is made a new heart that seeks Christ, and seeks to obey Him.

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/18 11:55**

Acts 8:36 And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain WATER: and the eunuch said, See, HERE IS WATER; what doth hinder me to be BAPTIZED? 37 And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. 38 And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the WATER, both Philip and the eunuch; and he BAPTIZED him. 39 And when they were come up out of THE WATER, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.

Verse 37-Why did Philip say "If thou BELIEVEST with all thine heart thou mayest"- because he knew the words of his Christ

Mark 16:16 He that BELIEVETH AND IS BAPTIZED shall be saved;

In scripture, for New Testament saints the word baptism refers to water & Spirit.

Acts 8:36 "...see here is WATER, what doth hinder me to be BAPTIZED?" (clearly talking about water baptism)

Or you can see this totally clear in:

Matt 3:11 I indeed BAPTIZE you WITH WATER unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall BAPTIZE you WITH THE HOLY GHOST, and WITH FIRE:

John is stating how he baptized people in water, and then he goes on to say how Jesus will baptize people with the Holy Ghost and with Fire.

Also, the same is true for the word water sometimes:

John 4:14 But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

When Christ uses "water" here, he is referring to the Spirit. (He uses water to reference the Spirit because water is a pure substance)

Thus in scripture we see that people are to be "baptized" :

1. IN water
2. IN the Spirit
3. IN Fire

The word "baptism" means literally SUBMERSION, IMMERSION. If you look up the word baptism in Greek it will you both references to water and Spirit-thus Christ's exact words in John 3:5

(<http://bible1.crosswalk.com/Lexicons/Greek/grk.cgi?number908&versionkjv>) Definition of Baptism

To say that the word baptism only refers to Spirit baptism is inaccurate and unscriptural.

People who do not believe in baptismal regeneration simply do not understand what they are saying neither the words of Christ in John 3:5

Matt 3:7 But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to FLEE FROM THE WRATH TO COME.

What was John's baptism? Of/In water unto repentance.

But the Bible clearly states, that in John's day-they were saved by being baptized (in water) by John confessing their sins.

Matt 3:6 And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. ( Why did they confess their sins to John while being baptized?)

Also: Mark 1:4 John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the BAPTISM (in water) of repentance FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.

If John in his day, preached baptism (referring to water) of repentance FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS-but almost every one on this site refuses to believe that even now, water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ is FOR the remission of sins even as the Holy Word of God says in Acts 2:38.

Mark 1:4 John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. That is the same thing Christ told his disciples in :

Luke 24:47 And that repentance and remission of sins should be PREACHED in his name among all nations, BEGINNING at Jerusalem. (Notice Repentance and remission of sins are TWO different things)

This first time Luke 24:47 was ever fulfilled was Acts 2:32-38 32 This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. 33 Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy G

host, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. 34 For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, 35 Until I make thy foes thy footstool. 36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. 37 Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? 38 Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins,

How did John preach repentance and remission of sins: Luke 3:3 And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;

Again, if John preached the baptism of repentance FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS-meaning John water baptized unto repentance for the remission of sins-then why do people on this site refuse to believe that water baptism in the name of Jesus Christ is FOR the remission of sins when the verse plainly says this:

Acts 2:38 Then Peter said unto them Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ **FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS**

When Peter said Repent and be baptized-He is talking about water baptism. Notice he says "**IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST**"

Remove the words " the name" and read the verse in that manner:

Acts 2:38 "...and be baptized IN JESUS CHRIST, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost..."

This again are the very sentiments of Jesus Christ in John 3:5 Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God

This is the very thing Peter preached on the Day of Pentecost when the Jews said " What shall we do"

You cannot separate water and Spirit baptism-they go hand in hand in Christ Jesus-this is the full meaning of Romans 6: 1-12 and Eph 4:5

1 John 5: Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?

6 This is he that came by WATER and BLOOD, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. 7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, THE SPIRIT, and THE WATER, AND THE BLOOD: and these three AGREE IN ONE.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/18 15:50**

Quote:

-----  
psalm1 wrote:

Logic, Ok what I am seeing here is you place most of the weight of this dialog with nicodemus on the "water" part of the sentence, whereas an english teacher would put the emphasis on the born of the spirit part.

Through process of elimination we can rule out baptism.

Jesus reference to water is a direct answer to nicodemus question 'mothers womb'

....David  
-----

Yes, water is a direct answer to nicodemus question, but water is never referred to as child birth. Let scripture interpret its self.

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 16:01**

how many verses are required to form a doctrine? is 3 the magic number? 5? 10?

How many times in scripture is "Word" defined as God? there are thousands of instances of "word". How many of those say that it means "God"?

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 16:01**

Blazed, let me ask you: must you speak in tongues to be saved?

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/18 16:02**

Logic,hi, I would in a heartbeat agree with you 100%. But i see the objections to the water baptism interpretation.

Maaby we can just respectfully disagree?

I dont know that it necessarily matters.

....David

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 16:04**

IMHO, "and" is the most important word in the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus. Not "water" not "Spirit" not "flesh".

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/18 16:18**

Quote:

-----  
BeYeDoers wrote:

Blazed, let me ask you: must you speak in tongues to be saved?  
-----

To answer your question:

You must have the Holy Ghost to be saved-and when receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost one does speak with/in ot her tongues as the Spirit of God gives utterance.

\*Speaking in other tongues is not a gift-it is the Holy Ghost himself who is the gift

Acts 2:38 Then Peter said Repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive **GIFT OF THE HOLY GHOST**

One must have the GIFT of the Holy Ghost (to be born of the Spirit John 3:5)) to be saved.

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 16:23**

yes or no would be fine, thanks.

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/18 16:31**

Yes, a person must have the Holy Ghost in order to be saved. And as Jesus said, when anyone is born of the Spirit you will hear the "SOUND" thereof

John 3:8 The wind bloweth where it listeth, AND THOU HEARST THE SOUND THEREOF, but canst not let whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: SO IS EVERY ONE THAT IS BORN OF THE SPIRIT.

And on the day of Pentecost: Acts 2:2 And suddenly there came a SOUND FROM HEAVEN as of a rushing mighty wind, and it FILLED ALL THE HOUSE WHERE THEY WERE SITTING.3 And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire that sat upon EACH OF THEM.4 And they were ALL FILLED WITH HOLY GHOST, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 16:51**

Thanks, and I believe this is the point where we delve into something more serious. Do you belong to a United Pentecostal or United Apostolic church? Earlier in the thread you said that the "name" of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit was Jesus. It is not. Jesus is the name of the man (incarnation) whom Mary gave birth to. NOWHERE in scripture is there anything remotely close to the Father or the Spirit being called "Jesus". Father, Son, and Holy Spirit all concurrently exist as one God but three distinctions. The Father was in heaven, Jesus was on earth, and the Holy Spirit descended on Him as the Father spoke. Oneness churches believe in the ancient heresy of Sabellianism, and have added baptism in water and tongues to their list of requirements for justification. God's word says repentance, and faith APART from any works.

The two predominant heresies regarding the nature Christ at the time of the early fathers and still today are: Sabellianism and Arianism. The early fathers clearly taught against both (Which makes sense considering neither are what Jesus or His Word teaches). I would suggest you do some studying on the doctrines of the Hypostatic Union and Communicatio Idiomatum.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/18 16:56**

Quote:

-----BeYeDoers wrote:

how many verses are required to form a doctrine? is 3 the magic number? 5? 10?

How many times in scripture is "Word" defined as God? there are thousands of instances of "word". How many of those say that it means "God"?

Use the "word" according to context of its given meaning.

Use "water" according to context of its given meaning.

"Water" is never given the meaning as child birth.

Do you know how to use hermeneutics and/or exegesis?

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 21:00**

water means water and we must hesitate to read symbolism into its meaning unless scripture is clearly pointing that way. Not that it isn't symbolic, but we can't start with that assumption and then interpret the verse. This is exegesis and a basic hermeneutic. So water is water. Now, where or from what is that water? Here are some possibilities:

1. baptism
2. rain
3. bathwater
4. rivers, lakes, etc.
5. natural birth and human bodily fluid

these are all (there may be more) literal "contexts" of the word water in scripture. So which one is used here, or is it a separate one not used somewhere else? I ask this in reference to my question earlier, "how many verses does it take to build a doctrine?" The answer is "one" as long as it is in line with the rest of God's revelation. Eg. there are 2 verses in the Bible that use "Word" as a proper name in reference to God and Jesus. That's it. 2. So must we read those verses to say "word just means what God says, not a name for the preIncarnate Jesus b/c every other use of the word means that which is written or spoken." This is what the Arians do to deny the deity of Christ. But we now that a word must be understood in light of its context, so Word is the name of the eternal Son b/c that is how John uses it.

So, just because water is used in baptism x number of times and symbolically for Spirit y number of times and rain z number of times, that doesn't mean those apply here.

Here is the way I read this passage (I am open to correction and discussion, though). Nicodemus did not understand the "AGAIN" part of Jesus' statement, so he thinks he has to re-enter his mother's womb. Jesus clarifies by giving a short discourse on Spiritual birth (the AGAIN part) contrasted with Nicodemus' original understanding of re-entering the womb. In this explanation, He says you must be born of water AND Spirit. He is drawing a contrast throughout His explanation so t

hat Nicodemus wouldn't be confused. His use of "water" parallels born, womb, flesh. His use of "Spirit" parallels again, Spirit, and wind. I might be totally wrong, but it is a very straightforward interpretation, and in no way contradicts the rest of scripture. And, it is purely EXEGETICAL. Reading baptism into it is EISEGETICAL. Could it mean baptism? sure. But it seems awfully forced in this context.

I know you are going to ask where in scripture does water refer to natural birth and the human body, so:

John 19:34  
1 John 5:6,8

Again, I'm not dogmatic about this interpretation, so let's discuss :-)

However, I am dogmatic about baptism being necessary in order to be saved b/c it adds to Christ's work on the cross, not to mention NOT TAUGHT in scripture. Yes, there are 3 verses that APPEAR to say that on the surface, but proper exegesis and hermeneutics prove otherwise. Baptism is our response to salvation, not a prerequisite of it.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/18 21:08**

Quote:  
-----And, it is purely EXEGETICAL. Reading baptism into it is EISEGETICAL. Could it mean baptism? sure. But it seems awfully forced in this context.  
-----

Well spoken friend... spiritual blessings in Christ Jesus

- Jim

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/18 22:30**

Quote:  
-----BeYeDoers wrote:  
Here is the way I read this passage (I am open to correction and discussion, though). Nicodemus did not understand the "AGAIN" part of Jesus' statement, so he thinks he has to re-enter his mother's womb. Jesus clarifies by giving a short discourse on Spiritual birth (the AGAIN part) contrasted with Nicodemus' original understanding of re-entering the womb. In this explanation, He says you must be born of water AND Spirit. He is drawing a contrast throughout His explanation so that Nicodemus wouldn't be confused. His use of "water" parallels born, womb, flesh. His use of "Spirit" parallels again, Spirit, and wind. I might be totally wrong, but it is a very straightforward interpretation, and in no way contradicts the rest of scripture. And, it is purely EXEGETICAL. Reading baptism into it is EISEGETICAL. Could it mean baptism? sure. But it seems awfully forced in this context.  
-----

It goes like this:

**:3** Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

**:4** How does one start his life over again. Can a man throw every thing he has known or learned away and start from scratch when he is old?

**:5** unless one is buried by baptism into death in the likeness of baptism:(Rom 6:4) and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

**:6** That which is done of the flesh is flesh by only starting over with ones own effort; and that which is done of the Spirit is spirit.

Nicodemus is not stupid, He wouldn't ask about literally being born as a baby again, or going back into the womb as an adult. He isn't even being sarcastic.

Jesus is saying that he must loose his "religion" and take on a totally new concept.

He is a Teacher of Israel, Nicodemus knows that Jesus is talking about starting over from scratch with what one has learned and knows.

Nicodemus knew that baptism of water means that when a man was baptised, he becomes a proselyte to the Jewish religion; and, in this baptism, he promised in the most solemn manner to renounce idolatry, to take the God of Israel for his God, and to have his life conformed to the precepts of the Divine law.

Nicodemus also knew what John the baptizer was doing and what his baptism meant.

It means to renounce all he knew in his Judaism, to take the Jesus as the Messiah for his God, and to have his life conformed to what Jesus was teaching.

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/18 22:55**

Wow. ok. sure. I can see that. I don't think that's what Jesus is saying...too much inference and speculation. But I can't necessarily argue b/c it is completely in line with the rest of scripture. At least from what I gather, you are saying that the new birth, the circumcision of the heart, the cleansing of our hearts by faith is what is necessary for salvation. Baptism in water is the "picture" of this, just like circumcision of the flesh.

But you are not saying that the physical act of baptism fulfills some sort of prerequisite to justification, correct? Because you seem to keep agreeing with Blazed, who DOES believe that.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 12:01**

Quote:  
-----BeYeDoers wrote:  
Wow. ok. sure. I can see that. I don't think that's what Jesus is saying...too much inference and speculation. But I can't necessarily argue b/c it is completely in line with the rest of scripture. At least from what I gather, you are saying that the new birth, the circumcision of the heart, the cleansing of our hearts by faith is what is necessary for salvation. Baptism in water is the "picture" of this, just like circumcision of the flesh.

But you are not saying that the physical act of baptism fulfills some sort of prerequisite to justification, correct? Because you seem to keep agreeing with Blazed, who DOES believe that.

**AMEN!**

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 13:43**

Quote:  
-----  
BeYeDoers wrote:  
Wow. ok. sure. I can see that. I don't think that's what Jesus is saying...too much inference and speculation. But I can't necessarily argue b/c it is completely in line with the rest of scripture. At least from what I gather, you are saying that the new birth, the circumcision of the heart, the cleansing of our hearts by faith is what is necessary for salvation. Baptism in water is the "picture" of this, just like circumcision of the flesh.

But you are not saying that the physical act of baptism fulfills some sort of prerequisite to justification, correct? Because you seem to keep agreeing with Blazed, who DOES believe that.

Not simply the act of baptism in water-but the act of baptism in water **IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS**

\*Acts 2:38 & Acts 4:12

It is the name of Jesus attached to the baptismal candidate that makes this such a supernatural process of operation by God adhering to God through Christ's commandment given to the Apostles in the Great Commission



**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/19 13:51**

I think the horse is dead...

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 14:03**

Quote:

-----BlazedbyGod wrote:

Not simply the act of baptism in water-but the act of baptism in water **IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS**

\*Acts 2:38 & Acts 4:12

It is the name of Jesus attached to the baptismal candidate that makes this such a supernatural process of operation by God adhering to God through Christ's commandment given to the Apostles in the Great Commission

-----  
The exact wording does not matter, it is not what one says, but the intent of the baptism that counts.

**Col 3:17** And whatsoever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father by him.

Otherwise, you must say, "the name of the Lord Jesus" with every thing you do.

Anyway, God knows that one is being baptised in HIS name for the purpose of remission of sins without saying those particular words.

**Act 8:38** And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.

Does not say that Philip baptized him "IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS", it just says that he baptized him.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/19 14:07**

Quote:

-----I think the horse is dead...  
-----

Beuase it hasn't undergone the proper religous ceremony to revive it yet...

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 14:12**

Quote:

-----jimied2sin wrote:

Quote:

-----I think the horse is dead...  
-----

Beuase it hasn't undergone the proper religous ceremony to revive it yet...  
-----

Maybe some one wants to keep it for the glue.

Or the hooves for some yummy jello. :-P

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 14:14**

Quote:

"Act 8:38 And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.

Does not say that Philip baptized him "IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS", it just says that he baptized him.

This is because it already told what name Philip baptized in.

Acts 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.

Also if you scroll down 4 verses, you will see:

Acts 8:16 For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)

The name of Jesus is the only name that can remit sin. As long as it is the name of Jesus that is called, whether it be " Lord Jesus", or "Jesus Christ" or simply " Jesus" -it is JESUS that matters.

When Paul asked Jesus who he was: This was the Lord's reply:

Acts 9:5 And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said: I AM JESUS..."

\*Matt 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins. (Doesn't say Lord Jesus, Christ Jesus, just JESUS)

This was and has been the same principle all over the New Testament.

Water baptism is to be done in the name of Jesus-just like praying.

"And whatsoever ye ask in MY NAME.."

Well, what is his name?

\*I was not signifying that the " remission of sins" part must be said, I was signifying the name of Jesus in some form MUST be said.

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/19 14:15**

You see, one of the things I don't understand about this forum, is that people come in and argue about issues that theologians have been arguing about for 2000 years and expect to come to a conclusion, or some resolution... but really all it does is further the divisions between us.

If 2000 years hasn't resolved an issue of doctrine, a couple days of forum posts isn't going to do it.

Let's learn to agree about the things that we can agree on and disagree about the things that we disagree on, and continue to be brothers in Christ.

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 14:19**

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/19 14:40**

Blazed, what are you on fire for God about?

You know, I'm pretty heavily involved in the missions community and nothing gets me more stoked than to meet someone who is on fire for the Lord.

Honestly, someone who spends their whole life bickering about doctrinal issues to me is very irritating! Especially one so contentious as baptism. (and I'm a Baptist!)

Oswald Chambers wrote in the Utmost passage yesterday 'The test of my love for Jesus is the practical one, all the rest is sentimental jargon.'

Is your fire for Jesus just sentimental jargon?!

If you love Jesus, instead of cutting up his sheep, how about feeding them. How about some edifying conversation. You don't think this is arguing, but go and look at the tone of your posts for the last several days.

Your 'fire' isn't doing anything except burning other Christian brothers.

True fire from the Lord manifests itself in a life of compassion, mercy, sacrifice and grace. If I'm wrong about you, please tell me... but if you want to claim 'fire' or being 'blazed by God' show me some fruit!

William Booth wrote a song called 'send the fire!' William Booth lived in aflame every day, and his life was manifest in compassion towards the poor and zeal for God among the heathens. People who are genuinely on fire for the Lord seek out those on fire, irregardless of doctrinal or denominational backgrounds... your fire seems to be man-made, because you're so forcefully proclaiming your denominational and doctrinal superiority.

My 2 cents.

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/19 14:42**

one more post

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 14:58**

Quote:

-----BlazedbyGod wrote:

\*I was not signifying that the " remission of sins" part must be said, I was signifying the name of Jesus in some form MUST be said.

Why must it be **said**.

Some times I end prayer with only "amen" but it is **done** in His name.

I would re-phrase your quote to one small change of a word, "I was not signifying that the " remission of sins" part must be said, I was signifying the name of Jesus in some form MUST be **done**."

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 15:07**

"Honestly, someone who spends their whole life bickering about doctrinal issues to me is very irritating! Especially one so contentious as baptism. (and I'm a Baptist!)"

It seems to me that you are upset about my love and passion for the NAME OF JESUS (not just simply baptism).

My fire for the Lord, is a holy zeal according to KNOWLEDGE.

"Your 'fire' isn't doing anything except burning other Christian brothers."

Who have I burned-or are you just prejudging me, even as you did early by saying " I am bickering"

"People who are genuinely on fire for the Lord seek out those on fire, irregardless of doctrinal or denominational backgrounds... your fire seems to be man-made, because you're so forcefully proclaiming your denominational and doctrinal superiority."

Tell me one time did I lift up any denomination or my denomination as you say. Or did I simply proclaim the name of Jesus Christ? Who have I forced to do anything or believe what I know is truth?

In this very post I have been called:

- 1 hereitcal
- 2.to be bickering
- 3.of man-made fire
4. and to be forcefully proclaiming denominatl teaching (yet I have never spoken of any denomination)

Yet, I have not done any of these to no one in this post.

I guess if I was to equate, I would find there is no love for me from the people who have posted in this particular thread. Yet I am the one accused of all....

:-)

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/19 15:16**

Glory Hallelujah! Like I said before it is good to hear from a apostolic brother speaking the truth. Finally I hear someone talking in my language. I once said the same thing. This is awesome. Yes the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the gift of salvation, it is the spirit of Christ himself who is eternal life. To everyone born of the spirit there is a sound, there is a wind and this sound, this wind just happens to produce an utterance in us in which the spirit of God enables once he takes residence. Speaking in tongues is not a gift. Many Holy Spirit believers speak in tongues without the gift of diverse tongues b/c the gift of diverse tongues is used primarily in the public setting and it is not a "you and God conversation" like one would use in prayer or worship but it is a "God speaking through you to convey a message to the church or to an unsaved person" conversation.

Keep on speaking the truth Blaze. I love the truth!

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/19 15:22**

My frustration stems from the fact that despite your claim to be zealous about Jesus, your comments over the past several days show that you're just another ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet\\_troll](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_troll)) internet troll.

I'm tired of people on this forum (and you're only the most recent of many) who join only to start trouble. Your comments over the past several days haven't been edifying and haven't added at all to the community.

The point of this forum is not bickering over minor points of scripture, but instead encouraging those who are genuinely seeking a deeper relationship with Jesus. If you want to argue doctrine there will be people here on this forum willing to walk that path with you, but I'm simply tired and voicing my frustration.

I have been pretty harsh, but I've given you the opportunity to show some fruit, and you answered back with the same sarcasm and proud tone that has defined your other posts until this moment.

Trust me when I say this, you're not the only person on this forum 'blazed for God,' but when you act like you are, you betray ignorance to all those around you. You have to realize that this forum represents many different denominations and hundreds of different doctrinal views... the second you start ranting about one doctrinal view over all others you are basically telling the rest of the forum that they're going to hell.

We are all brothers and sisters in Christ here, we all proclaim the same Jesus (hopefully) and we all desire to see revival. Please tone down your rhetoric and start contributing something to edify the other brothers and sisters.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/19 15:30**

I don't see why we have to argue over these things. It is most evident that scriptural baptism is administered in the name of Jesus. You laid out the scriptures plainly. Even more why 2000 yrs when the bible is pretty clear concerning the name of Jesus baptism. The bible is pretty clear concerning the holy spirit baptism and the evidences and the signs of it coming. I don't get it. I grew up Apostolic but I tested what I was taught to see if it was true and it was. Constantly I am aiming at refining my understanding on these issues and get a clear understanding of it. I don't know what will get us into unity on these subjects. Maybe intense persecution

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 15:31

Quote:

Logic wrote:

Quote:

-----BlazedbyGod wrote:

\*I was not signifying that the " remission of sins" part must be said, I was signifying the name of Jesus in some form MUST be said.

Why must it be **said**.

Some times I end prayer with only "amen" but it is **done** in His name.

I would re-phrase your quote to one small change of a word, "I was not signifying that the " remission of sins" part must be said, I was signifying the name of Jesus in some form MUST be **done**."

Because to say something, is still to have DONE something.

Also: Col 3:17 And whatsoever you do IN WORD OR DEED, DO ALL in the name of the Lord Jesus,...

The very first part of this verse declares that you can DO( or have done) IN WORD(by saying, by speaking)

How did Christ declare it was done? By SAYING " IT IS FINISHED

How does that mountain get moved out of the way?

"whosoever shall SAY to this mountain, BE thou removed.."

Mark 9:38 38 And John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name,

How do we cast out devils?

Acts 16:16-24

16 And it came to pass, as we went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination F32 met us, which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying: 17 The same followed Paul and us, and cried, saying, These men are the servants of the most high God, which shew unto us the way of salvation. 18 And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and **SAID** to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.

Matt 17:9 And as they came down from the mountain, Jesus CHARGED them,) **SAYING** , Tell the vision to no man, until the Son of man be risen again from the dead

How did Jesus "CHARGE" them? by SAYING...

How does a general give a command for a soldier TO DO something? By saying, by VERBALLY SAYING/TELLING HIM WHAT TO DO.

You can DO something....by SAYING something.And this is how it is supposed to be.....DONE. (even as I just SAID that). Thus even in scripture referring to water baptism, a charge give to us by Christ through his apostles....that is how we are to baptize and be baptized.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 15:41

n/a

Re:, on: 2007/10/19 15:54

Dear Blazed

At first, I was very interested in the question that started this thread, and getting quite excited in exploring afresh what John says in the Gospel and first Epistle.

It should have turned into a very useful discussion.

But I almost gave up completely when you started posting.

Not because of the content of what you say, but because of your manner of saying it, and the impression you give that you are trying to hijack the thread and lead the discussion along the lines of your particular doctrinal stance ("denominational" or not is beside the point).

You are entitled to your interpretation of Scripture, but please stop trying to impose it on everyone else, as if you had a monopoly on Truth.

*No-one* has a monopoly on Truth, except God Himself.

Maybe you really are as loving and as on fire as you claim, but, if so, why do your posts give the opposite impression?

Perhaps you are simply unused to forum discussions and don't realise that you are putting yourself in a bad light, rather than convincing others that your interpretation of Scripture is true. (Unless they already believe the same, of course, and need no convincing).

Proclaim what you understand of Truth if you want, (though you need to accept that others may disagree, and have a *right* to disagree), but please don't batter your brethren with your beliefs and accuse them of starting it when they react.

in Him

Jeannette

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 16:05

Re:, on: 2007/10/19 16:06

Quote:

iansmith wrote:

My frustration stems from the fact that despite your claim to be zealous about Jesus, your comments over the past several days show that you're just another ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet\\_troll](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet_troll)) internet troll.

I'm tired of people on this forum (and you're only the most recent of many) who join only to start trouble. Your comments over the past several days haven't been edifying and haven't added at all to the community.

The point of this forum is not bickering over minor points of scripture, but instead encouraging those who are genuinely seeking a deeper relationship with Jesus. If you want to argue doctrine there will be people here on this forum willing to walk that path with you, but I'm simply tired and voicing my frustration.

I have been pretty harsh, but I've given you the opportunity to show some fruit, and you answered back with the same sarcasm and proud tone that has defined your other posts until this moment.

Trust me when I say this, you're not the only person on this forum 'blazed for God,' but when you act like you are, you betray ignorance to all those around you. You have to realize that this forum represents many different denominations and hundreds of different doctrinal views... the second you start

ranting about one doctrinal view over all others you are basically telling the rest of the forum that they're going to hell.

We are all brothers and sisters in Christ here, we all proclaim the same Jesus (hopefully) and we all desire to see revival. Please tone down your rhetoric and start contributing something to edify the other brothers and sisters.

-----  
Amen Bro Ian

You and I have had the odd disagreement too, as have many others. But there are ways of disagreeing, and ways of discussing disagreements and differences in doctrinal stance. One can disagree strongly, and put forward a point very forcefully and still remain gracious, and accepting of someone who doesn't see things that way.

That is all anyone has said against you, Bro Blazed, that you haven't been doing that so far, and this is creating problems for the whole thread.

Which is a pity

in Christ

Jeannette

**Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2007/10/19 16:13**

**Re:, on: 2007/10/19 16:17**

Quote:  
-----I don't see why we have to argue over these things. It is most evident that scriptural baptism is administered in the name of Jesus. You laid out the scriptures plainly  
-----

Here is another example of someone using underhanded debating skills. It might as well say

Quote:  
-----There's no reason to argue over this because it is so clear and anyone who doesn't agree with me is wrong and doesn't understand scripture.  
-----

No thanks friend - not buying. I'll stick with the powerful salvation that comes from the renewal of the Holy Spirit even if the believer has been \*gasp\* baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit.

I fear for believers whose religious passion resembles that of the pharisees more than that of Christ. For thousands of years men have followed close scriptural details and have argued over how to best keep these details... Jesus came to destroy this type of religion, and the men who spent their time arguing over these type of details did not even recognize the Christ to whom they pointed.

In His name - Jim

Re:, on: 2007/10/19 16:18

and before anyone says it....

**Doctrine is important,**  
but it can also be deceptive.

The kingdom of God is in power and not in word. The pharisees had the words and argued over them down to a "t"...

In Christ - Jim

Re: Can we get back on track?, on: 2007/10/19 17:03

Let's look at the original discussion point again.

The question was if John 3:5-6 is talking of "water" as meaning childbirth.

John 3:6 - the original reference *Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be **born of water and of the Spirit**, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*

*:6 That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.*

I'm beginning to think that water here does indeed refer to baptism. Not because there's any mystical power in the water itself, but because baptism is a step of obedience to the Lord, a public declaration of faith, from which there's no going back. I've heard that in Muslim countries a convert to Christ may be comparatively safe as long as he doesn't get baptised. But if he takes the public step of baptism his life is in danger from then on.

So it is a step of utter commitment to Christ. And the Kingdom of God has no room for half-hearted or lukewarm converts.

\*\*\*\*\*

Some of the following scriptures have already been mentioned. This is just an attempt to put things together in order to get a clearer picture - at least in my own mind.

One of the main themes of John's writings is that Jesus, although He was one with God from eternity, became a man.

John 1:1 **In the beginning was the Word**, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God...

John 1:14

And **the Word was made flesh**, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

1John 1:

1 **That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life;**

2 (For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)

3 **That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.**

Jesus wasn't just a heavenly Being that temporarily took on human form, as angels sometimes do, He really did become human!

And even His death proved it:

John 19:34-35

34 **But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water.**

35 **And he that saw it bare record, and his record is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe.**



John obviously sees this as very significant. For one thing it proved that Jesus was indeed dead - the blood in His body was already clotting, the thick clots separating from the watery blood plasma.

It also proved His humanity – as the Resurrection proved His divinity –

Or maybe John saw more even than this?

In 1John he uses this truth of “the Word become flesh” as a “diagnostic test” for heresy –

1John 4:2-3

2 *Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that **Jesus Christ is come in the flesh** is of God:*

3 *And every spirit that confesseth not that **Jesus Christ is come in the flesh** is not of God:*

And in chapter 5 water and blood is spoken of again –

1John 5:6

*This is he that came **by water and blood**, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but **by water and blood**. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.*

Does water refer to childbirth here? There is certainly both “water” and blood during that process. If so, it is again emphasising that Jesus became fully human and was born just as we are.

Or does it refer to baptism? If baptism, it states plainly that baptism in itself isn’t enough.

Or does it link with John 19, which may be the key to the whole thing, that when He died for our sin, water and blood came forth from His side.

And this in turn links with the bringing forth of Eve from Adam’s side – for Jesus is spoken of as the second Adam – and the bringing forth of the covenant with Abraham, when the Lord put him into a deep sleep (Genesis 15), as He did Adam. Because Abraham was the ancestor of the holy “Seed” of God, Jesus.

Who will receive the Church, His bride, from the Father

(Revelation 21:2) *And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.)*

as Adam received Eve.

WOW!!!! This is awesome! I’m not quite sure where this is leading but it just makes me want to fall down and worship the Lord

One last scripture – John 1:12 *...But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:*

13 *Which were born, **not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh**, nor of the will of man, but of God.*

The new birth has nothing to do with man’s efforts, (in the same way that Adam didn’t do anything to produce Eve, or Abraham to cut the covenant with the Lord in Genesis 15). Water isn’t mentioned here, which may be significant, only flesh and blood.

in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/10/19 17:31

Quote:

-----  
Everett wrote:

I don't see why we have to argue over these things. It is most evident that scriptural baptism is administered in the name of Jesus. You laid out the scriptures plainly. Even more why 2000 yrs when the bible is pretty clear concerning the name of Jesus baptism. The bible is pretty clear concerning the holy spirit baptism and the evidences and the signs of it coming. I don't get it. I grew up Apostolic but I tested what I was taught to see if it was true and it was. Constantly I am aiming at refining my understanding on these issues and get a clear understanding of it. I don't know what will get us into unity on these subjects. Maybe intense persecution

-----  
Hi Bro. Everett

You asked "I don't know what will get us into unity on these subjects"

But true unity is spiritual not complete agreement over doctrine - especially the finer points of interpretation.

As John said, there is a *spirit* of truth and a *spirit* of error:

1Jo 4:6 We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.

Of course, a spirit of error will eventually manifest itself in false doctrine, but false doctrine isn't the root of the error.

And if we indeed have the Holy Spirit of Truth He will lead us into all Truth. Which doesn't, as you seem to think, mean 100% correct, dotting i's and crossing t's doctrinal truth.

***Don't you understand that Truth is a Person - Jesus Himself?***

And who can say that they understand that Person 100%?

Or even understand 100% what the Bible says about that Person?

We should agree on the basic facts, but beyond that it's always a matter of interpretation.

That is why I cannot agree that it is "most evident that scriptural baptism is administered in the name of Jesus...the bible is pretty clear concerning the name of Jesus baptism. The bible is pretty clear concerning the holy spirit baptism and the evidences and the signs of it coming."

The Bible is by no means clear on those points, it depends on how you interpret it.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/19 18:59

I thank you for your response but isn't all truth and the truth (jesus christ) two different things?

All we need to know is the foundations of the Apostolic Doctrine and we have lost them. The bible clearly shows us the foundations of the Apostolic Doctrine. We can know 100% as far as how to be saved, who is our savior, who is Jesus, the holy spirit baptism, water baptism and etc. It is not hard.

Are you saying that we can't know whether to baptize in Jesus name or in the name of the father, the son and the holy spirit? The Bible clearly shows us this matter.

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/19 19:28

If you are indeed talking to me, cause I cant tell if you are responding to someone else, what do you suppose me to do to edify you? Just shut my mouth.

Should I edify you by telling you a lie or the truth? Do you think I am actually lying to you and on the day of judgment i will have to face God for what i have said. I know in whom I believe and the words I have spoken to you are the truth. Blaze went over so many scriptures to back it up before i ever came on this forum. You didn't even need my input, blaze alone was enough but I wanted to share with everyone the truth in clarity.

Jesus would not say Except every man be born into this world and born of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God. Of course everyone to be born will be born of the flesh, why add the except like its not gonna happen. Not every body to day is being baptized and not everyone today is being born of the spirit.

The trinity is unscriptural b/c three persons cannot be in one person. God is one person, one infinite being who manifested himself in the flesh as Jesus Christ our Lord. You cannot have three "me's" in "me". The spirit soul and body are parts of a person not persons within a person. The fullness of the Godhead was in Jesus bodily. He spoke like he was outside time and space, speaking on behalf of the Godhead (the father, the son and the holy spirit).

There is only one scripture that says to baptize in the name of the father, the son and the holy spirit but did anyone be baptized in the name of the father, the son and the holy spirit. No but in the name of Jesus Christ. Do I offend you by just speaking the plain word. Its all in Acts. Why would this offend you?

If none of this is worked out and talked out then we still will remain divided but we'll be silently divided, secretly harboring things in our hearts and someday it will come out.

I agree with you and the other guy ian, we must strive for loving Jesus and looking past our differences but I cannot let myself be baptized wrong if i know the truth, thats where the division comes because how can two walk together accept they agree. We must agree! The early disciples followed wholeheartedly after the apostles doctrine. They agreed, they were of one mind, one heart.

You want edification but what is edification seen as now a days? the prosperity Gospel. Should I tell someone they are saved when they are not. Should I tell someone good things all the times so that he will be in a comfort zone? We should no doubt seek to edify but Paul told timothy to tell those others that are preaching false doctrine to stop. Edification and contending for the apostolic faith are two totally different things.

I have seen that through these talks you have been given revelation on some things. You see if we can do these discussion in a loving manner and have a receptive heart where can we go wrong. We both must not stop until we are completely assured about the truth of this matter without causing another brother to stumble or to fall, without hurting one another and without operating in the flesh.

God Bless

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/19 23:09

Quote:

-----Everett wrote:

The trinity is unscriptural b/c three persons cannot be in one person. God is one person, one infinite being who manifested himself in the flesh as Jesus Christ our Lord. You cannot have three "me's" in "me". The spirit soul and body are parts of a person not persons within a person. The fullness of the Godhead was in Jesus bodily. He spoke like he was outside time and space, speaking on behalf of the Godhead (the father, the son and the holy spirit).

-----  
What is the Godhead, if there is no trinity?

I say It is scriptural!

**MAT 3:16-17** As soon as **Jesus** was baptized, he went up out of the water. At that moment heaven was opened, and he saw **the Spirit of God** descending like a dove and lighting on him. And **a voice from heaven said, "This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased."**

**2 Corinthians 13:14** May the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be

e with you all.

**1 Peter 1:1-2** To God's elect, . . . who have been chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctifying work of the Spirit, for obedience to Jesus Christ and sprinkling by his blood.

**1 JOHN 5:7** For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/19 23:34**

everett, I have discussed the trinity with j. witnesses. They deny the deity of the son.

Now this is a new one on me. You deny the existence of the father and Holy spirit?

Have you read in genesis where it says let us create man in our image?

Or in heb. 'but of the son he says thy throne o God is for ever and ever?'

Who was Jesus looking up to when he prayed to the father?

When Stephen was stoned Jesus was standing beside the father.

Go to the bookstore and purchase a book concerning this religion you are in.

They have deceived you!

...David

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/20 2:21**

Let us not be deceived: this thread is not simply about dunking a person in water. It is not a "small point of doctrine." This is about the nature of Christ and His work on the cross. There is nothing "apostolic" about the doctrines being presented here under that name. It is one of the oldest heresies in the book: Sabellianism. And the UPC/UAC has added to that justification by baptism and tongues. Grace alone through faith is not enough.

To the "apostolic" brethren out there: I love you. PLEASE read the whole council of God and not just the verses that fit the proof-texting you have been taught. All of the arguments you have used on this thread to promote your doctrine can easily be found on the UPC website. It used to be on the homepage under something like "60 reasons the Trinity is false". But they conveniently ignore the scriptures that plainly contradict their teaching, not to mention the wealth of Ante-Nicene father writings (in context) that prove a consistent line of teaching the Trinity from the revelation of scripture.

Please do not take this as an insult: You have been taught how to argue, but not reason. You have been brought up to exegete, not exegete.

I plead with you: re-examine the scriptures and let them interpret you.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 12:56**

All I know for sure with the upmost confidence is that the word trinity is not found in the bible and the explanation for the word trinity is not either. This "trinity" or Godhead is described otherwise. There is a Father, there is a Son (Word), There is a Holy Spirit but they are all ONE. ALL ONE. ALL ONE AND THE SAME BEING, PERSON. GOD is so much greater than us. HE can appear in so many forms at the same time. Right now he could be audibly speaking in Russia and at the same time audibly speaking in China. Right now he could be physically present in the U.S and at the same time physically present in Australia. His ways are so much higher than our ways. The trinity has God separated like he can't be one person and operate in totally different realms like the south polar vs the north polar. We know for sure that The Father is God and the Holy Spirit is the spirit of God so therefore God but the mystery lies in Jesus. Jesus is God too although he is man at the same time (this brings us back to the polar opposites, this enigma, this paradox) and if he is God then he can say I am the everlasting Father the Prince of Peace. He can say I and the Father will come and take our abode in you. For goodness sake he even said before Abraham was, I AM. Jesus is the fullness of the Godhead bodily. So if you want to know the name of the Father, The Son and the Holy Spirit, you can find it in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

No, I am not a part of the UPC. I am not a part of an organization but I am part of an organism, a living body that gets its information from the Head who is Christ the Lord. No early teaching or doctrine from an organization has deceived me because I always go back study the word for myself from a unbiased point of view and I find such things as these as true.

You can't ever convince me to believe that the trinity is God originated and God inspired when the history tells us that the catholic church made it up and in the bible it is nowhere to be found not just in the word but in the meaning. Never has the bible said that in God is three persons. God is one person, one infinite being that is everywhere at the same time doing

ng things in multiple places so that it looks like he is more than one but the bible stresses the fact so much that he is still ONE besides the way it may look like such as the Son standing beside the right hand of God or the Father speaking to the Son while the Holy Spirit is descending on him. God can do so much more than that.

You gotta understand the difference between names and positions, titles and offices or roles. Jesus was more than the "Son". Before he came to the earth he was the Word and that made him one with God for the Word is God. When he came to the earth he was the Word made flesh which made him the only begotten of the Father. After his resurrection he was Lord of both the dead and the living. After his ascension he was giving the highest place over all things. Soon after on the day of Pentecost the holy spirit was poured out but the 120 didn't just receive the "third person of the trinity" but they receive the "second and the first person of the trinity" if I may talk in your language. You see these are all mysteries. Not only does one receive the holy spirit but one receives the spirit of Christ and the spirit of the Father which is the spirit of God b/c they are one. The trinity separates God and limits him as in a box like a person may say "this is the third person of the trinity working" no this is God working who isn't divided into third or second persons but there are different roles that he fulfills that are tied to a name like Jehovah Rapha and etc. If you want to use numbers on God to be correct you can't call him three persons in the Godhead. Why not 24 persons in one Godhead b/c he is so much bigger than that. It is safer to just say there is one God who is infinite and every where at the same time through his spirit and he has manifested himself to the world through his dear Son Jesus Christ who is also God because of his number of days which has no beginning or ending, he has no earthly father, he never sinned and every man has sinned, no one is perfect but God. There is unity in this.

I hope we can have these talks and learn from each other b/c every time I may listen to you I make sure what I believe is the truth and vice versa for you. If we were alone on an island how could our faith and beliefs be tested.

I don't know who you are but I love you anyway. God Bless.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 13:51**

You Said:

"There is nothing "apostolic" about the doctrines being presented here under that name. It is one of the oldest heresies in the book: Sabellianism. And the UPC/UAC has added to that justification by baptism and tongues. Grace alone through faith is not enough."

My Response:

I have no idea what Sabellianism is but what I do know is the Mystery of Godliness which is "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Jesus Christ was God, we all know and believe that I hope. He was God before his human manifestation as the Word and he is God and Man even after his death, burial and resurrection as the Lord of both the dead and the living. He is the one that will judge everyone. The Father has giving the judgment over to the son but the son said that I will not condemn you but the words I have spoken to you which my Father gave me to speak will on that day declare you innocent or guilty. If Jesus is God then he can rightly say "I am the everlasting Father, the prince of peace, the mighty God". He even said that he was before Abraham's time as the great I AM. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him..." How are we complete in him? We are complete in him because he is the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. I already showed you how he is the Father and everyone knows he is the Son but what about the Holy Spirit. Before he was the Word made flesh which is the Son he was the Word and the Word was no doubt God. After Jesus' ministry on earth the glory he had with the Father before the world began was restored. It was like he went back to being the Word before his descending to the earth but this time he still has his body yet it is glorified never to die as God is imperishable, incorruptible. Why? Because he is our brother and he had to share in our likeness and he is the first fruits of the resurrection body. We are in him and one day shall be like him as to his resurrection, glorified body. You see this is all a mystery in which Paul talked about.

They say that the trinity is a mystery but Paul says otherwise that Jesus is a MYSTERY b/c he is the FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY in which all the treasures and knowledge of God are found in Him. GREAT IS THE MYSTERY OF GODLINESS!

Jesus is the highest revelation of who God is. It is not enough to say that the name of God is Jehovah this and Jehovah that. The bible in the old testament said that God's name was the Lord, Jealous, Holy and so on but in the New Testame

nt in which the Law and the Prophets is fulfilled through the coming of the Messiah God is given a new name and this new name transcends and supersedes the old ones. His new name is Jesus (I am not talking about the new name in revelations). Jesus walks on water as it states in the old testament that God can do. Jesus calms the seas as it states in the old testament that God can do. Jesus is baptizing with the Holy Spirit and fire as states from John the greatest of all the old testament prophets would do and it even says something in Malachi about how Jesus would be like a refining fire and a launders soap. Jesus is likened to Moses, to Adam, to the works of the prophets, to the high priest, to the sacrifices.... I mean he is everything important in the bible! Jesus said that the Law and the prophets point to him! Now that we have the highest revelation of who God is are you trying to go back to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit obsolete and incomplete explanation of the Godhead when the Godhead is found in Jesus?

Think about it Jesus fulfills so many roles and titles of God all in his one person. He was with God before the world began, when there was nothing nowhere. He created the world and the universe. We later found out what the image and likeness of God is and what it looks like through Jesus whom God made as the blueprint of the image and likeness of God. He spoke the words of God as to the prophets and holy men and women of God through out the ages. He was involved in judgments that God poured out on the nations. He was the redeemer and savior of the world by taking on himself the likeness of man and dying as a blameless sacrifice. He was the holy and righteous servant and branch of God. He was the one seen as in the Song of Solomon. He was the one seen in Isaiah's vision and Ezekiel's vision. I MEAN JESUS IS AWESOME. PAUL KNOWS WHAT HE MEANS WHEN HE SAID THE FULLNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY IS IN JESUS. HE IS THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH AS HE WAS THE HUSBAND OF THE ISRAELITES. HE IS THE HUSBAND OF THE CHURCH IN WHICH WE ARE THE BRIDE. JESUS BRINGS ALL THE OLD TESTAMENT TOGETHER AND TIES IT INTO HIS MINISTRY ON EARTH AND DURING THE CHURCH AGE! WE ARE SEEN AS PRIESTS AND (KINGS) OF GOD THAT CAN ENTER THE HOLY PLACE AND OFFER UP INCENSE AND EAT OF THE BREAD OF GOD ONLY BECAUSE OF JESUS.

I MEAN WHAT MORE CAN I SAY. ALL THESE THINGS ARE SCRIPTURAL. PAUL WOULD TESTIFY BY SAYING AMEN FOR I AM ONLY REPEATING WHAT HE SAID.

I HOPE WE ALL CAN COME TO AN AGREEMENT ON THESE THINGS. IF THE TRINITY WERE TRUE THEN I WOULD HAVE ALREADY CHANGED MY BELIEFS. I LOVE THE TRUTH AND WHATEVER THE TRUTH IS REVEALED IN THE BIBLE I BELIEVE. THERE ARE TEACHINGS OUT THERE THAT ARE VERY ALLURING AND SEEM TO BE TRUE BUT I KNOW DEEP DOWN IT IS NOT. HALF TRUTHS ARE NOT TRUTHS. WE HAVE A LOT OF HALF TRUTHS TODAY.

ALTHOUGH I DON'T KNOW YOU I'M SURE YOU LOVE JESUS VERY MUCH AND I LOVE YOU ALSO.

I PRAY THAT THIS IS EDIFYING AND UPLIFTING TO YOUR SPIRIT.

GOD BLESS

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/20 14:59**

I doubt if there is anybody in the s.i. fellowship that will agree with this doctrine of no trinity.

In fact anybody that espouses to this error will meet stiff opposition in 99% of christian circles.

You would have to hijack the leadership of s.i. to have much further voice.

this is no small thing. And this is non negotiable for me.

You are not weighing your doctrine ....you are instructive.

Not me....My battles are too hard won to let some doctrine of men disenfranchise me!!!

That is some kind of sloppy jaloppy jibberish!!

...David

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/20 17:12**

You may not be familiar with the term Sabellianism, but that is what you are presenting to us.

Arians and modalists alike use the argument (sic) "the word trinity is not found in the Bible so therefore it can't be true". That is horrible reasoning. The word "bacon bits" isn't in the Bible either, but I'm pretty sure they exist. The question is not whether the word is in scripture, but whether it is taught in scripture.

If the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one person, then who spoke to the whom that was landed on by whom at the Son's baptism? If they were one "person" then at this point in time that person was split into 1/3 each. If you say this was just God being "omnipresent" (another word not found in scripture, and yet true), then you deny the nature of the incarnation of Christ and Jesus could not be our representative as "man".

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all called "God" in scripture, all have God's attributes, and yet are spoken of independently with different offices and subordinations while all exist and operate simultaneously. God refers to himself as "Us" several times in scripture. The clearest picture of one God in three persons is found in Gen. 18. Get a KJV and read it, paying particular attention to the "Thou/Thee/Thy" vs. "Ye/You/Your" in the conversation between Abraham and his one God Jehovah in three persons.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/10/20 18:12**

Quote:

-----Everett wrote:

Jesus Christ was God, we all know and believe that I hope. He was God before his human manifestation as the Word and he is God and Man even after his death, burial and resurrection as the Lord of both the dead and the living. He is the one that will judge everyone. The Father has giving the judgment over to the son but the son said that I will not condemn you but the words I have spoken to you which my Father gave me to speak will on that day declare you innocent or guilty. If Jesus is God then he can rightly say "I am the everlasting Father, the prince of peace, the mighty God".

Who was Jesus praying to all through HIS ministry?

Surrly, He didn't departed into a mountain to talk to Himself(Mat 14:23, Mar 6:46, Luk 6:12).

Who was He talking to when He cried, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"

**Re:, on: 2007/10/20 18:47**

Quote:

----- Everett said

Â...You can't ever convince me to believe that the trinity is God originated and God inspired when the history tells us that the catholic church made it upÂ...

Â...I HOPE WE ALL CAN COME TO AN AGREEMENT ON THESE THINGS. IF THE TRINITY WERE TRUE THEN I WOULD HAVE ALREADY CHANGED MY BELIEFS. I LOVE THE TRUTH AND WHATEVER THE TRUTH IS REVEALED IN THE BIBLE I BELIEVEÂ...

Hi Everett

I appreciate what you have written recently, and it has given food for thought Â– especially your comment about God's nature being beyond our understanding (words to that effect). You do have a point, although I disagree with your conclusion, (because the same could equally be said about the concept of the Trinity).

Just a couple of comments for now on the above quotes, from two different postsÂ...

This is a poor illustration but the best I can think of at the moment:

There is a man I often see around town. I know some things about him, such as: he's married with two children, works in a bank, drives a red car, has a brown and white dog, and lives on the High Street. However, I don't know his name.

If I later hear someone calling him "Mr Smith". Does that make any difference to the other facts about him? Does that mean that maybe he isn't married, doesn't work in the bank etc?

The earliest believers knew certain things about Jesus, about His fulfillment of the Old Testament Scriptures, about His relationship with the Father and about the Holy Spirit. They wrote down something of what they knew and understood, and remembered.

Much later theologians tried to explain one aspect of what they early Christians wrote about  $\hat{A}$ – one aspect of the nature of God. This was given a name  $\hat{A}$ – The Trinity.

*Of course* the expression,  $\hat{A}$ “The Trinity $\hat{A}$ ” is not found in the Bible! It $\hat{A}$ s a technical term coined later, (whether by the Catholic Church, or whoever, makes no difference).

Many other theological terms aren $\hat{A}$ t found in the Bible either, but that doesn $\hat{A}$ t disprove what the terms stand for. You are confusing a mere  $\hat{A}$ “label $\hat{A}$ ” for the truth it stands for (doctrine is an attempt to explain Truth) .

However, the **concept** is found all over the Bible. It is less obvious of course in the Old Testament, where the absolute oneness of God had to be stressed because of the ever-present danger of idolatry, but, even there, there are many hints . For example, in the *shema*,  $\hat{A}$ “Hear O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord $\hat{A}$ ”. Literally in the original it is,  $\hat{A}$ “ $\hat{A}$ ...the Lord your God $\hat{A}$  is one Lord $\hat{A}$ ”.

One of my favourite references (partly because it $\hat{A}$ s obscure and difficult to explain away) is Isaiah 48:16

Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I : and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me.

It must be Jesus talking, but how can God send Himself? How can the Spirit send Jesus if the Spirit and the Father are both Jesus?!

You said:

Quote:  
----- IF THE TRINITY WERE TRUE THEN I WOULD HAVE ALREADY CHANGED MY BELIEFS. I LOVE THE TRUTH AND WHATEVER THE TRUTH IS REVEALED IN THE BIBLE I BELIEVE  
-----

Yet in the first quote you said:

Quote:  
----- $\hat{A}$ ... You can't ever convince me to believe that the trinity is God originated $\hat{A}$ ...  
-----

I $\hat{A}$ m sure you are passionately sincere and believe every word you say, but, if you really love the Truth and are open to Truth, you should be able to examine the Bible with an open mind. You should have the courage to at least search the Scriptures like the Bereans did at Paul $\hat{A}$ s preaching, to see if others $\hat{A}$ ’ interpretations might after all have some truth in them, rather than saying  $\hat{A}$ “you can $\hat{A}$ t ever convince me $\hat{A}$ ... $\hat{A}$ ”.

Shouldn $\hat{A}$ t you?

In Him

Jeannette

(PS, apparently it $\hat{A}$ s considered rude to put things in block capitals too much, or use huge font sizes  $\hat{A}$ – as if you are shouting. I wouldn $\hat{A}$ t have known if someone hadn $\hat{A}$ t told me, so this isn $\hat{A}$ t a criticism)



Re:, on: 2007/10/20 18:49

Quote:

-----  
BeYeDoers wrote:

You may not be familiar with the term Sabellianism, but that is what you are presenting to us.

Arians and modalists alike use the argument (sic) "the word trinity is not found in the Bible so therefore it can't be true". That is horrible reasoning. The word "bacon bits" isn't in the Bible either, but I'm pretty sure they exist. The question is not whether the word is in scripture, but whether it is taught in scripture.

If the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one person, then who spoke to the whom that was landed on by whom at the Son's baptism? If they were one "person" then at this point in time that person was split into 1/3 each. If you say this was just God being "omnipresent" (another word not found in scripture, and yet true), then you deny the nature of the incarnation of Christ and Jesus could not be our representative as "man".

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are all called "God" in scripture, all have God's attributes, and yet are spoken of independently with different offices and subordinations while all exist and operate simultaneously. God refers to himself as "Us" several times in scripture. The clearest picture of one God in three persons is found in Gen. 18. Get a KJV and read it, paying particular attention to the "Thou/Thee/Thy" vs. "Ye/You/Your" in the conversation between Abraham and his one God Jehovah in three persons.

-----  
That's in a nutshell what I was trying to say in the last posting (which must have taken at least an hour to compose!

Thank you!

Jeannette

Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 19:23

Imagine Jesus saying to himself "Since I am God I don't need to pray and if I do pray who I am I going to pray to since I am God himself indeed in the flesh" After that Jesus would fly up to heaven, send thunder bolts, come back and walk on water, feed a million people, cure all diseases and say it is done forget the cross when I can speak things into existence, I speak salvation to those who follow me. This would be absolutely crazy. Jesus was God but he was the son of God, he called himself more the son of man. He didn't have a high mind thinking I am God this is great like the movie Evan Almighty which was blasphemy. He had to know his position as the Son who submitted to his Father in everything. Likewise we today are called sons of God and we have to submit to the father and pray to him. Jesus was an example for us to follow. In the flesh, his state of humiliation he couldn't take on the role of the everlasting father at that moment but after his glorification, the glory that he had before the world began was restored, he could be called the everlasting father just as he is called today the Lord of both the dead and the living.

In Jesus' humanity he prayed to the Father who heard him. You got to understand that Jesus Christ was the word manifest in flesh. God died for the world through his son. The Son, the Son had a earthly BODY, earthly ears, mouth, toes, feet, mind, will, emotion (soul). The son had a earthly mother, the son had earthly friends. The son ate food and drank and had a digestive system on earth. The Son had a voice, a tongue, a vocal cord and lungs. He could speak. Just because God was in Jesus and Jesus was God doesn't mean that no one was in heaven. the Father was in heaven while the son was on earth doing his will but Jesus also says that "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." This is another mystery, a enigma because it doesn't make sense, a paradox because it is contradictory. Thank God for the preservation of this verse in the kjv b/c in the NASV IT DOES NOT SAY THAT!

Do you get what I am saying here. As a human Jesus had to pray that way because in the office of God the Father he has no body. God as a spirit alone doesn't pray to no one. Since Jesus is God why does he have to pray. He has to pray like he is doing today, interceding for us at the right hand of God because of his office and his position as the only begotten of the Father which is the word made flesh and in this word made flesh you see a great high priest, you see a king, you see God, you see the fullness of the godhead, you see a sacrifice, you see a perfect life, you see the type of righteous Job, you see the the last Adam, the second man, you see the love of God, you see the jealousy of God and his zeal for his temple and his people and his commandments and his word.

I said it once and I'll say it again to let you know what way I am answering your question. Jesus is the Son and he had to stick to that position and office. he had to operate in it and not go outside those parameters. Not praying to the father because he was the everlasting father or because he was God would be going outside or violating his office rules and boundaries. As a Son he had to submit to the Father who was his Father since HE WAS BORN OF GOD WASNT HE? THERE WAS NO EARTHLY SEED INVOLVED IN THE CONCEPTION. THEREFORE HE WAS RIGHTLY GOD'S SON WH

Y NOT PRAY TO HIM AS A SON. After the last enemy death is destroyed the Son will subject himself to the father and hand the kingdom over to him so that God will be all and all.

Does this answer your question?

**Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/10/20 20:49**

Everett, now you have me confused :- ( When you STATE what you believe, it sounds like Oneness theology (you say you agree with Blazed, and he is presenting classic Oneness). You STATE that the Trinity is wrong and Father, Son, Holy Spirit are the same person w/o distinction. But when you EXPLAIN what you believe, it sounds very much like you are presenting Trinitarianism.

One response though: You say that trinitarians "divide" God into three. We do not. There is 1 God, manifested as 3 "persons". The Father is God but is NOT the Son/Word who is God but is NOT the Holy Spirit who is God. God is not "made up" of three, but is "One as three". A Tri-unity.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 20:50**

I have no idea, this is crazy. It is a mystery that I cant explain.

I said you cant ever convince me not because I was going to believe what I wanted to believe but because from what I have researched and studied the trinity originated from the catholic church and was used in catholic baptism but the apostles never mentioned the trinity word or the meaning as to three "persons" in the Godhead. I understand three like it says these three are one but persons make it seem like you are saying three gods cause a person is a being like I am one person not three persons. There would be three everett's who would have to have different personalities or else they would be clones and God doesn't make clones. Jesus Christ wasnt a clone of God he was God. Adam wasn't a clone either he was made IN the image of God. Jesus WAS THE image and LIKENESS of God.

I have no idea what to say to this: "Hear O Israel the Lord your Gods is one Lord" which you said is the original passage because to our thinking that doesn't make sense. I mean "God you just said that you are one at the same time saying th at you are many". It seems so contradictory but there is always an answer to these things for God cannot lie.

The Son came out of the Father from his mouth, he spoke the word and the seed which is the word was sent and the seed was received into the womb and the seed conceived by the overshadowing of the holy spirit and the seed germinated and eventually God's Son was born. Like wise our father's send a seed and it is placed in a womb and the seed become s a child and the child came from the union of the Father and the Mother, so the child is technically part of their parents body, the child is their parents own flesh and blood, we bear the image and likeness of our natural father. We are like them and of them. We are their offspring. We take on the name of our Father so did Christ. Compare the operations of the natural father and his son with our heavenly father and his dear son.

If there is three person in heaven and they are all God who are we to worship. Are we going to for a century worship God the Father then for another century worship the Son and then the Holy Spirit? I see it as this: God is a spirit that is without length, width, depth or height for he is everlasting. He is every where at the same time. How can God be visible except he reveal himself, except he manifest himself. Everyone I believe who has seen God has seen the son in different measures b/c the son is the word made flesh, made visible and the word is God, the word made flesh is the image and likeness of God, the word explains God, the word shows God. God is invisible so how can we see him except the help of his word. I don't believe there will be two or three persons in heaven b/c who will we worship? God is a spirit who is every where, who can we corporately worship in heaven except his Son. Read this scripture it will blow your mind:

I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession;

That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:

Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;

Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see : to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.

Thank You for your comment. I will definitely go back and study the scriptures from a open mind and see if what ever body is saying is indeed true for I love the truth and if the truth be this then I will get on your side but if the truth be the other I will remain but i don't think it is possible because this thing is too hard to explain.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 20:54**

Where did I sound or how do I sound like I was presenting Trinitarianism?

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/20 21:19**

"No one has seen the Father except the one who is from God (jesus); only he has seen the Father."

"No one has ever seen God, but God the One and Only (jesus), who is at the Father's side, has made him known." This verse is a big enigma. Jesus is at the father side while he is on earth. The question is who is the father? Look below.

"Philip said, "Lord, show us the Father and that will be enough for us."

Jesus answered: "Don't you know me, Philip, even after I have been among you such a long time? Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father. How can you say, 'Show us the Father'? 10Don't you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words I say to you are not just my own. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work."

The Father is God. God is Jesus. God in his divine nature dwells in inapproachable light and has never been seen until Jesus the image and likeness of God made him known and showed us the Father who no one has seen or heard except Jesus.

"I have testimony weightier than that of John. For the very work that the Father has given me to finish, and which I am doing, testifies that the Father has sent me. 37And the Father who sent me has himself testified concerning me. You have never heard his voice nor seen his form, 38nor does his word dwell in you, for you do not believe the one he sent.

This is all mind boggling. God is awesome. I don't know what more to say but keep on striving for the truth, don't settle for old bread, stale bread but seek fresh manna from heaven. Keep on searching the scriptures diligently to gain a greater understanding of God but I think we will both come to the state like Paul when he said: Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God!

How unsearchable his judgments, and his paths beyond tracing out!"Who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has seen his counselor?"

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/21 9:04**

now we can clearly see the need to make water = baptism in john 3:5 even though it is forced into the text.

Its not that we are trying to be scripturally accurate.

we are fickle and need our doctrine protected by scripüre.

We have no choice but to "fix" the great comission becuase our doctrine dictates Jesus only.

Now we got to "fix" the trinity by disqualifying those that believe the bible.

This is a typical tactic to make your 'oponent' look stupid

Kinda reminds me of the post trib. debate.

The trinity can't be traced to the catholic church as its origin

Why are mens eyes blinded to the truth?.

Maybe reason isnt enough to interpret Gods word.

You can intellectually argue with everet but he needs more than convincing intellectually.

Any time I mess with the God head I must be willing to accept what goes with it.

...David

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/21 11:37**

Show me one scripture where anyone in the bible is baptized in the names Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit or by using the phrase "in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit". You see I can't say that nobody was baptized in the NAME OF the father, the son and the holy spirit because the NAME of the father, the son, and the holy spirit is THE LORD JESUS CHRIST but nobody in the bible is baptized in that formula (the name of the father, the son and the holy spirit) because it is obsolete and the Name of Jesus supersedes it because Jesus is the Fullness of the Godhead (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) bodily. It was Jesus that died for our sins and therefore our sins are washed away by his blood through baptism in his name. There is no harm if we do all things in the name of Jesus whether by word or deed as the Apostle Paul says b/c if we lift up the name of Jesus the Son then we are lifting up his Father too for they are the same. The office of the Holy Spirit doesn't ask for worship b/c the Holy Spirit's mission is to speak of the Son and always do things pertaining to Him. The Father is not lifted out b/c if we so adore the Son for what he has done we will likewise adore the Father for they are the same thing. You may hear me saying thank you Jesus and then saying thank you father. You might hear me praying to the Father and then asking Jesus for help. The Name of Jesus is the bottom line. You can't go more deeper into that name because that name is an earthly name. You may say that I am the father of the family or the son but what is your name. You can go deeper in the titles Father, Son and Holy Spirit and the name Jehovah Rapha b/c they all point to Jesus right? Every father or son has a name and the name of Jesus just happens to fulfill the name of The Father, The Son and The Holy Spirit. The Name of Jesus just happens to fulfill the name Immanuel and the name Prince of Peace or mighty God. You see, you can't go any deeper into the name of Jesus b/c Jesus is the fulfillment of the law and the prophets all that is written in the old testament will be found in Jesus and his Church who are one and the same body through union by the spirit.

Please really, do an unbiased and open mind research on the origin of the trinity. Where it came from and where it started and even before Christianity there is and are a trinity of gods that are and were used in the pagan religions such as the Egyptian trinity: Osiris, Isis and Seth. The Roman trinity: Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva and there is even a Wicca trinity: Maiden, Mother, and Crone. Now that we are not bound by strict rules and a law that says that we can't read anything else but the bible or a law that says that we can't hear anything from the bible except from the priest's mouth let's go and do some research b/c history can reveal itself what is truth but we must use the guidance of the Holy Spirit to know the fact from the myth.

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/10/21 12:53**

Everett, Brother ...

Think this has been about beaten into the ground, it's becoming cyclical. Please do a search of the site on this matter, there has been quite a deal of past discussion.

**Re: - posted by mizpeh, on: 2007/10/21 20:49**

Logic,

I agree with you that born of the water is water baptism. Since Jesus said 'you must be born again', I wonder if you would consider anyone who has not been baptized as being saved?

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/21 21:04**

Okay, I will, in fact I am right at this moment researching this subject but if there has been already past discussions and it hasn't been solved then it is useless to continue to try.

Sorry, I guess it is more beneficial from now on to devote myself to praying for our eyes to be opened to the assurance of the truth and that this spiritual stronghold, this wall and bulwark would be torn down so that we can walk together in unity without having to come back to the "Oneness" and "Trinity" controversy.

God Bless you all on SI. Keep on serving and loving Jesus to the end. "Saints don't stop praying for the Lord is nigh, he will hear your cry. For the Lord has promised and his word is true. Saints don't stop praying, he'll answer you."

"Dear God please send us a genuine Holy Ghost Revival in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen. "

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/21 21:28**

If one were to go solely upon the scripture that says "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" and not regard the other scripture that says "he that endures to the end shall be saved" is not rightly dividing the word of truth because it is possible for one to believe and be baptized but not endure to the end.

So all I can say is that such a one in this case needs to compare scripture with scripture and ask God to give him understanding on them so that he'll know what it really means to be saved.

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/21 21:53**

Earlier on when brother Everett mentioned that he was glad to see another Apostolic Brother on the forum I needed to check something.

For those unfamiliar with the term 'Apostolic' as used by these brothers, it doesn't refer to the Apostles in the NT or the Apostolic Succession claimed by Catholics, Orthodox, Lutherans, Anglicans and Methodists.

It refers in one sense to a Pentecostal *Denomination* that traces its roots back to the Welsh Revival of 1904. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apostolic\\_Church](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apostolic_Church)) There is a good article on wikipedia about the Apostolic Church.

Based on the conversation so far I figured BlazedbyGod as a member of a Apostolic Denominational fellowship, and a search for his nickname on Google will show that he has fellowshipped with an Apostolic Church.

The most controversial teachings of the Apostolic Denomination are their stance on Baptism and Tongues. They claim that a person isn't saved if they haven't been Baptized by Immersion and if they haven't manifested the Holy Spirit through tongues.

Now, based on what I gather, Everett on the other hand is part of an entirely different "movement" that refers to themselves as Apostolic. He is part of the Oneness Apostolic *movement* of Pentecostals that trace their roots back to the Azusa Street Revival of 1906.

The most controversial teachings by the Oneness Pentecostals is their stance on the trinity, ie. there isn't one. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oneness\\_Pentecostal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oneness_Pentecostal)) Wikipedia article on Oneness Pentecostalism here. There is also a good wikipedia entrance about the ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oneness\\_vs\\_Trinity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oneness_vs_Trinity)) difference between the trinity and oneness doctrines here.

The only thing I should interject is that both of these groups who call themselves Apostolic Brethren teach doctrine which is outside of orthodoxy within most mainline denominations, as well as most pentecostal churches.

And in retrospect, BlazedbyGod could be part of the latter group when considering his emphasis on 'Jesus' name' which is usually associated with Oneness Pentecostals.

It should also be mentioned that Even Roberts, the revivalist at the forefront of the Welsh Revival preached the trinity in the orthodox sense, and did not preach at any length about tongues or particular baptismal preferences. So despite the claim of a connection with the Welsh Revival, the modern Apostolic Denomination have strayed widely from their forefathers.

Also, while both groups have developed out of Revivals in the early 1900's and share many similarities in their doctrines on manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and both claim the title Apostolic, they are in fact entirely different groups within Pentecostalism. One being a Denomination within Pentecostalism and the other being a doctrinal movement within Pentecostalism.

I guess it could be possible to be part of the Apostolic denomination and also part of the Oneness movement... which may be the case for Blazed, I guess we'll have to see how he responds.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/10/22 1:58**

Gal 3:27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

Rom 6:3 Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?

Who baptized us into Christ, Christ in us?

1Cr 12:13 For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Who baptized us into One Body?

Jhn 14:16 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;

Who sent the Holy Spirit who is baptized into us forever? Who is in us forever by the prayer of Jesus Christ?

John 14:16-17 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.

"dwelleth": Strong's says; Strong's Greek Dictionary

3306. meno

Search for G3306 in KJVSL

menw meno men'-o

a primary verb; to stay (in a given place, state, relation or expectancy):--abide, continue, dwell, endure, be present, remain, stand, tarry (for), X thine own.

"Abide": Same word. menw meno men'-o

"with": Strong's Greek Dictionary

3844. para

Search for G3844 in KJVSL

para para par-ah'

a primary preposition; properly, near; i.e. (with genitive case) from beside (literally or figuratively), (with dative case) at (or in) the vicinity of (objectively or subjectively), (with accusative case) to the proximity with (local (especially beyond or opposed to) or causal (on account of)

"In" en: a primary preposition denoting (fixed) position (in place, time or state), and (by implication) instrumentality (medially or constructively), i.e. a relation of rest.

See the difference of "with" from "in".

there is a difference in the baptism of John and the old testament and the baptism of Christ, God and the Holy Spirit. All in the new testament is In, en:

Strong's Greek Dictionary

1722. en

Search for G1722 in KJVSL

en en en

a primary preposition denoting (fixed) position (in place, time or state), and (by implication) instrumentality (medially or constructively), i.e. a relation of rest.

Baptized into Who By Who? The Father The Son and The Holy Spirit, in the name of Jesus Christ.

Christ liveth "IN" me: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/22 10:23**

You were way too confident in that assertion Brother. I was not referring to anything except the Apostolic Doctrine in which the early apostles taught and I call those who hold to the Apostolic Doctrine "Apostolic". Those who baptize in the titles Father, Son and the Holy Spirit are actually making themselves a part of the Roman Catholic Church. That is what they did back then. Anyone that wasn't baptized in the titles Father, Son and The Holy Spirit were killed and those that submitted became a part of the Roman Catholic Church which dominated the world at that time with the sword and deception. The Romans had their own trinity, so did the Egyptians, so did the Babylonians and so does Wicca. The catholics made this picture that had God with three faces and below it a triangle showing how the son is not the father, the father is not the holy spirit but they are all God and that picture was strikingly similar to the picture of the Hindu goddess that has many arms and three faces. The Trinity doctrine is from pagan beliefs and the intellectual ideas of wise men. I am Apostolic as to my beliefs. Not all Pentecostals believe in no woman pastors. Apostolic predominately doesn't allow woman pastors or ordain homosexual leaders. Assemblies of God allows woman pastors. The Apostolic Doctrine doesn't. I am pentecostal as to my belief in the holy spirit baptism and the speaking in tongues that follows. I am holiness as to my belief in without holiness no one will see the Lord. I am baptist as to my belief in immersion in water and not sprinkling and pouring. And so and so forth. You get my point. So pretty much you can call me a simple Bible Believing Christian. If I were to call myself something that relates to doctrinal controversies I would only be stirring up strife or causing contention and then that would divide like it says in 1 Corinthians. It shouldn't divide if I call myself a follower of Christ or a Saint or a Christian b/c all of us can agree we are followers of Christ, Saints, and Christians but when it comes to catholics, methodists, pentecostals, baptists and apostolics we can't always agree on everything which will not promote real unity which is of one mind and one heart.

I am a bible believing Christian, a follower of Christ and his word. I adhere to the doctrines of the early Apostles and Prophets as they indeed helped build the foundation of the church with Christ Jesus as the corner stone. Jesus said to his disciples that if they listen to me they will listen to you. The whole bible is the word of God not just Jesus' words but to understand the word made flesh we must understand the written word also which is the same thing.

We will someday get to the unity of the faith though false teachings of false apostles and false prophets/imposters have led the church into very dark times in the past now we are slowly coming back to the full truth for the bible says it and the stature of the mature man demands it.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/22 10:43**

Can you elaborate more on this topic b/c i was contemplating this a few days ago and it has stuck in my mind yet without any release.

"there is a difference in the baptism of John and the old testament and the baptism of Christ, God and the Holy Spirit. All in the new testament is In, en:"

I also noticed how in Hebrews it says the prophets of old had the spirit of Christ in them. Not only did they have the spirit in them and not just upon them but it was also the spirit of Christ in them who (Christ) wasn't even born yet as to his humanity. i had thought that the old testament saints didnt have the holy spirit in them but Zacharias, Elizabeth and John the baptist (filled with the holy ghost from womb) were filled with the holy ghost. What is the difference between our receiving the holy spirit and theirs? Is their a different measure? Is it that in Christ we have the fullness b/c Christ is the completion of the Law and the Prophets? Is it b/c of the sequence of events like the grace eternal, law temporary aspect? animal skins for man to Abraham - grace (Eternal). Moses to John the baptist - Law (temporary). Christ and his Church - grace (eternal). Is it b/c of how we were saved after Christ's finished work on the Cross and the old testament saints looked at that in the future and were saved but both of us had to either look forward or backward this took faith and both of us had to apply that faith.

Do you have an answer on what the difference is between the old testament saints and us new testament saints concerning the holy spirit and it filling and abiding?

**Re: - posted by psalm1, on: 2007/10/22 11:08**

everet, how do you recocile the references in the word concerning the thre sepatate porsons of the Godhead.

The Holy Sririt.....He

The Father....He

Jesus....He

They are clearly 3 persons

This is solid ground and an acurate starting place

You seem to start from a different 'location'

When a simple bible study PROVES this 'no trinity' concept false.

....David

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/22 15:36**

By the moderator I was told to tone this whole discussion down and from an brother I was given a wise rebuke so I have modified this post for the sake of peace but I believe the truth is already evident. Why do you need me or Blaze or anyone else to explain to you what you already know? It is more than folly to continue these posts after 8 to 9 pages. Paul summed it all up in one page. This is totally pitiful! Many a times we know the answer to things but just don't want to accept it. It is sad how the simple words of Jesus get turned into long pages of arguments between men and not long hours of inquiring before God. Brothers and Sisters in Christ let us seek God concerning this matter and the first person that comes back in an argumentative and derisive manner will have not succeeded the test. Rather let us agree! Let us agree! For goodness sake let us agree just once!

**Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/10/22 17:16**

Generally when a Mod tells you to tone down, you don't post an even longer explanation. I just want to make sure that anyone who is reading this forum gets both sides. The side that you have been stating in your prior posts is not biblically orthodox (at least in any church I have attended). There are a lot of things in theology that I don't understand, so I'm not stating that you are wrong in your beliefs, but whenever there is something controversial, both sides should be stated to give the reader the benefit to make the choice between them.

Only the Holy Spirit can confirm the truth in someone's heart, there is plenty of theology that is man centered, and plenty of well meaning teaching that takes the focus off of biblical truth... who owns truth? Only Jesus can really tell us what is true.

The moderators have the hard task of making sure that people who are preaching what is contrary to the truth are kept from sowing seeds of false teachings... the fact that the moderators haven't told you to stop talking outright is a positive thing. I hope you understand that no one is trying to tell you to stop talking, but you need to have more wisdom and discernment in your conversation. But you should also understand that when a Mod talks with you in private (as they have with me in the past) that it is a sign that you are dangerously close to the edge of that grey area when they have to start making choices on whether or not the things that you're saying have a positive effect on the forum or a negative one.

Generally when I've recieved a warning from a moderator I take a few days, or a couple of weeks away from the site, get my head together, pray about what I have said and try to see the side of whoever it was that I was argueing with... and in several cases I have been persuaded that I was in the wrong. I am not infalible, and I am not an expert on all things theological, and I am not an even tempered person, but God has given me enough sense to take a step back once and a while and try to gain better understanding, and he has blessed me with that understanding on occasion.

This forum can be a great blessing spiritually if you let it... many people come to this forum with their own adgendas, politically, emotionally or doctrinally motivated. If you have an agenda of your own, this place cannot be a blessing. This is n



ot a soap box, this is not a pulpit, it is a fellowship... and being in fellowship with others means you need to learn how to listen to other people as well as when to be silent. Being in fellowship with others, being in relationships is tough... unfortunately a lot of people who come to forums like this are failures in fellowship (not all mind you, there are plenty of wonderful loving people on here) and this may not be the best place for someone... it can make someone even more bitter or frustrated in the long run. If someone comes to a forum like this to vent, they may just be sewing seeds of bitterness that will take years to dig out the roots in repentance.

So as much as this forum can be a blessing, it is also a dangerous place as well -Satan would seek to use anything, no matter how good, to corrupt the children of God.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/22 17:34**

Thank you Ian, for this very gracious and sensitive comment.

I wonder if there should be a rule made about posting very long posts, or very frequently, in any one thread? :-P

Bro. Everett, I was hoping to really study your responses to try and understand where you are coming from, but have totally given up because of being half drowned in the mass of words you produce!

I mean, I would like to get to know you better as an individual, not merely your views: ...what makes you tick, why you have posted as you have, how you got to the point of believing what the majority of Christians see as heresy, what sort of person you are...etc

Blessings

Jeannette

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/22 18:30**

Yeah, I thought about that, but I thought he had meant to tone it done in the manner of speech and conversation not in length but certainly toning it done in length will inevitably tone done the speech and conversation.

Thank You Iansmith for your wise rebuke and instruction.

"I pray that God will help us to abound in the love of God and live so much for you that the devil will be completely exposed in this area and sphere that he has been operating in so that we can be free to completely walk together. Oh, God give us the insight and wisdom concerning how to communicate things you reveal to us and when to say, how to say it and when to refrain from saying it. Help us to guard our mouths. This is probably a big problem on forums when the mouth is given full vent to say as you will via the keyboard. Dear Jesus help us to ever be in your will. Amen"

May God's grace be with you Iansmith. I love you as a brother.

**Re: - posted by Iansmith (), on: 2007/10/22 18:45**

You were doing really well until the cynicism kicked in...

Quote:  
-----If I can I will be taking my post down for the sake of peace for it seems like no one wants to find out the truth on this matter why waste time posting things up that God has revealed to me and others through his word rather let us sit back and give ourselves to compromising out of the fear of man for some pagan doctrine that even unsaved me know is false.  
-----

Your last comment, stated in sarcasm of course appears to the untrained eye as an attack on the rest of the forum users... it may appear that 'no one wants to find out the truth' and that we're all self satisfied with our theology... but could it be... and don't take this wrong... but others, including myself have been trying to help you see that there is a mote in your own eye.

It takes a skillful word craft to write in what appears to be humility and then couch some sharp proud comments. Pride is the fundamental root of many of the sins on this forum, including my own, it takes an extra degree of humility to admit that one has typed several pages of comments in pride, or spiritual pride.

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/22 18:59**

I thank you for your striving with me brother. You are my mirror. You see things I am unable to see. I guess that is why we need each other. Imagine if we didn't have each other, there will be no one to tame us and to wisely, kindly instruct us. From your perspective, I can't see, so I need your eyes and you have given me your eyes on this matter. Thank You. I am humbled to see you admit your own pride as well as mine. I didn't know that I was being cynical. I thought I was using sarcasm that even God and Paul use in the bible as a different route to indirectly express their thoughts and to get their point across. I'm glad that you are here to respond so I can modify my previous post for the sake of my brothers in the Lord. Truly all I want is the best for them. I hope for us to someday come to agreement on these things without compromising the truth.

God Bless you IanSmith

**Re:, on: 2007/10/22 20:16**

I understand and sympathize with your dilemma here Everett.

At least you do believe in the Deity of Christ.

Also respect your desire to comply with other poster's requests over points on posting. That takes humility and I admire that in folks.

Could I just ask you to read just the first and last posts on this one thread?

([http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id7346&forum36&9](http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id7346&forum36&9)) Who is Jesus?

Please, I really do understand your desire to Glorify The Logos, but if you would just read those two posts, would you come back and give me your opinion?

Thank you - truly.

**Re: - posted by mizpeh, on: 2007/10/22 20:26**

Everett,

The Holy Spirit was given to a select few of OT saints, mainly those the prophets and the anointed priest. Moses wished all of God's people were filled with the Spirit and prophesied. Some people say the OT saints were temporarily filled with the Spirit but if that is so, why did David ask God not to take away his Spirit from him after his sin with Bathsheba and the murder of her husband was revealed?

The OT was also a different covenant in which a person could be saved by keeping the law. In the new covenant all believers are to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit like the first disciples did on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2...a fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel.

Everett, if you're interested, there are Oneness Pentecostal/Apostolic forums you can join and discuss the scriptures with those who believe as you do. I tried to pm you with this but I'm not allowed for some reason, maybe because I'm new here. If you interested let me know.

**Re:, on: 2007/10/22 20:52**

Maybe that would be the easier way for you who are of the JesusOnly persuasion to go where they agree with you all, rather than try to convince us against the Tri-Unity of God - but won't you at the least read those two posts and give our Scripture references a chance?

The other point - to say that one is not born-again, unless he has already received the Baptism in the Holy Spirit or even water baptism, would send many to Hell that died before they had the chance - like the thief on the cross.

Thank you for the effort to strive peaceably though.

**Re: - posted by mizpeh, on: 2007/10/22 21:46**

He Reigns,

I will read the two posts in the link you posted to Everett.

I've been in long discussions with Trinitarians on CARM for over a year. The two Oneness sites I go to have intelligent, articulate Trinitarians who discuss their beliefs there as well.

BTW, "Jesus Only" is a misrepresentation of what I believe unless you are saying that Oneness folks only baptize in the name of Jesus Christ then you would be correct.

**Re: - posted by Lkid, on: 2007/10/23 0:52**

looking back at the original question if i may, what do you guys make of 1 Peter 3:18-22.

For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit;

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;

Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.

The like figure whereunto 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:

Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

I used to think John 3 spoke strictly of natural birth when speaking of water. I still think that is ok to look at it that way. However I see now also the application it has of the washing of the water making us clean as someone has mentioned here earlier. The quote from Ezekiel is great. Ties together the water and the Spirit. Awesome! As is seen in 1 Peter we are not saved by or through water baptism as it is only an outward representation of an inward change. God observes the heart, that's what He is concerned with. Everything else, including baptism, is an outpouring from within. My God doesn't wait to save His lost children until they've jumped through some hoops after confessing that Jesus is Lord and believing that God raised Him from the dead. The neat thing in the bible is that some people are water baptized and then receive the Spirit, some receive the Spirit and then are water baptized, and some there is no mention of baptism. Amazing, God allows us all out of the water with His diversity yet the same Spirit

What do you guys and girls make of 1 Peter 3

**Re: - posted by Everett (), on: 2007/10/23 9:48**

I will read the posts that I was asked to. I never said what you have stated I said. I am suppose to be taking a break from the forum but I will read what you are talking about and not talk unless i am asked a question for now I am praying for the Lord's direction in these previous matters. God Bless