

**Articles and Sermons :: John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown**

**John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/21 10:00 AM**

Pastor John MacArthur has announced a "strange fire" conference to be held this October, claiming that part of the charismatic movement "offers to God unacceptable worship, distorted worship. It blasphemes the Holy Spirit. It attributes to the Holy Spirit even the work of Satan."

If these charges are true, this means that many leaders in the charismatic movement have committed the unpardonable sin and are therefore hell-bound. If these charges are not true, Pastor MacArthur has seriously overstepped his bounds and misused the Word of God.

And it is only fair to ask whether Pastor MacArthur, in his rightful zeal to correct excesses or errors in the charismatic movement—what he calls "strange fire"—is also guilty of rejecting the true fire. Does he embrace the glorious things that the Holy Spirit is doing worldwide, resulting in the salvation of tens of millions of souls, or does he write them off as the result of emotionalism and deception?

Before addressing these very weighty questions, let me express my deep appreciation for Pastor MacArthur. He has been in high-profile ministry for decades without a hint of a sexual or monetary scandal. He has been an unashamed witness for Jesus before the world; he has preached the cross and the blood; he has renounced cheap grace and emphasized the importance of the lordship of the Son of God; and he has been a devoted student of the Scriptures.

In all these ways, if we had more leaders like John MacArthur, the church and the world would be in much better shape.

At the same time, he has made sweeping, critical statements, often throwing out the baby with the bathwater, not only rejecting the dangerous excesses and extremes in the charismatic movement but also labeling some genuine works of the Spirit as "charismatic chaos."

The fact is that there has never been a true outpouring of the Spirit that has not been controversial, be it in the ministry of Jesus, at Pentecost in Acts 2 or throughout church history, right up to our day. Yet all too often, sincere leaders like Pastor MacArthur have failed to discern what God was doing in the midst of the human emotion and response.

One church historian pointed out that during the Great Awakening in 18th-century America, the biggest difference between Jonathan Edwards, the preeminent leader of the awakening, and Charles Chauncey, the foremost critic of the awakening, was that Edwards focused on the wheat while Chauncey focused on the chaff. Has Pastor MacArthur been guilty of doing the same thing when it comes to the charismatic movement?

Without a doubt, there are horrific things being done in the name of Jesus and the Spirit, often on Christian TV for the whole world to see—and this stuff is downright shameful, bringing reproach to the reputation of the Lord. Along with other charismatic leaders, I have renounced these things for decades. But is it the responsibility of every charismatic-Pentecostal pastor and leader to renounce these things all the time?

Pastor MacArthur has called on his Pentecostal brothers and sisters to stand up and speak out against these abuses, joining him at his upcoming conference; but if a pastor is shepherding his flock and feeding them God's Word and his people are not guilty of these abuses or watching these TV preachers, why is it his responsibility to address these errors? Does Pastor MacArthur feel the responsibility to monitor the preaching of tens of thousands of non-charismatic pastors across the country and publicly renounce their errors? Why, then, must Pentecostal and charismatic pastors renounce extremes in their movement to somehow prove their orthodoxy?

And which is worse? To preach a carnal prosperity message or to give people false assurance that, once they are saved, no matter how they live, no matter what they do, even if they renounce Jesus, they are still saved? Which message will result in more people being misled and finding themselves in hell?

Pastor MacArthur rightly renounces the carnal prosperity message, yet many non-charismatics who follow him embrace an extremely dangerous version of the "once saved, always saved" doctrine. Why the double standard here?

Again, I am not for a moment excusing doctrinal errors, emotional manipulation, financial greed or other spiritual abuses often perpetuated in the name of the Spirit, but it is absolutely outrageous that Pastor MacArthur claims, "The charismatic movement is largely the reason the church is in the mess it is today. In virtually every area where church life is unbiblical, you can attribute it to the charismatic movement. In virtually every area—bad theology, superficial worship, ego, prosperity gospel, personality elevation. All of that comes out of the charismatic movement."

And he is quite wrong when he states, "Its theology is bad. It is unbiblical. It is bad. It is aberrant. It is destructive to people because it promises what it can't deliver, and then God gets blamed when it doesn't come. It is a very destructive movement."

In reality, more people have been saved—wonderfully saved—as a result of the Pentecostal-charismatic movement worldwide than through any other movement in church history (to the tune of perhaps a half-billion souls), as documented recently in Allan Heaton Anderson's *To the Ends of the Earth: Pentecostalism and the Transformation of World Christianity*. And professor Craig Keener has provided overwhelming testimony to the reality of God's miraculous power worldwide today (see his brilliant two-volume study *Miracles*).

Tragically, rather than recognizing the outpouring of the Spirit worldwide—God's true fire, falling in abundance in many nations—and focusing on the spiritual deadness that exists in many Spirit-denying churches, Pastor MacArthur has chosen to focus on aberrations and extremes in the charismatic movement, even making the extremely dangerous claims that charismatics are blaspheming the Spirit and attributing "to the Holy Spirit even the work of Satan."

To be perfectly clear, I am not for a second claiming that Pastor MacArthur is blaspheming the Spirit (God forbid!), but in the New Testament, blasphemy of the Spirit is knowingly attributing the works of the Spirit to Satan (Mark 3:23-30), and I am far more concerned about denying the true fire than I am about putting out every aberrant charismatic brush fire.

Let God's holy fire fall!

from: <http://www.charismanews.com/opinion/in-the-line-of-fire/39944-john-macarthur-strange-fire-and-blasphemy-of-the-spirit>

**Re: John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown - posted by narrowpath, on: 2013/6/21 1**

This is a very good article. I have read McArthur's book *Charismatic Excess* and it grieved me a lot. He did not correct their errors but damned the whole movement. There are other teachers that do a much better job on correcting these errors and teach the right application of spiritual gifts.

It is very dangerous to unsettle Christians who know the gift of the spirit and prevent them from using it.

Everything that God gives is essential and necessary for the church.

I cannot imagine that anyone who knows the baptism of the spirit came to the conclusions McArthur draws.

**Re: , on: 2013/6/21 19:12**

Good article. My problem with the article is the tying together of the Charismatic movement and the Pentecostal movement. For lack of a better description, and if pushed, I would say that I am a "classic pentecostalist." This was also how a bunch of brothers we met from Poland described themselves. And so to me, a classic pentecostalist is someone who believes in the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the sign gifts that go along with it, but who stand upon the word of the Lord therefore would reject all that which is not found in the Scriptures, prosperity gospel, word of faith, Florida revival's where there was roaring like lions and so called holy laughter and so on.

So what does that mean? It means that you would upset the Charismatics and McArthur. On the one side you have people who claim to be Baptized in the Holy Spirit but who fall for every wind of doctrine and pay little attention to the Word of God, and on the other hand, people, often times very proficient in the Word, but who deny the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the sign gifts, cessationists for the most part and proponents of once saved always saved. The whole truth does

not lie in either of these camps. I appreciate what McArthur is speaking about when it comes to worship, but can I worship along side someone who would deny the power thereof?

Anti-Christ means "anti-replaced" and "Christ-the anointed one." So, anti Christ, at its most basic, is a replacement anointing that passes itself off as God. This is what McArthur is talking about, but if you do not believe in the power of the Holy Spirit as described in the Bible, can you ultimately be better off than the charismatics? .....bro Frank

**Re: , on: 2013/6/21 19:25**

1 Thes. 5:19-22

Do not quench the Spirit. Do not despise prophetic utterances. But examine everything carefully. Hold fast to that which is good. Abstain from every form of evil.

I believe the above verses provide the best balance. Personally I respect John MacArthur's ministry. But do not agree with his views of cessationism. At least, I think he still holds that position.

Bearmaster.

**Re: John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2013/6/21**

"Tragically, rather than recognizing the outpouring of the Spirit worldwide—God's true fire, falling in abundance in many nations—and focusing on the spiritual deadness that exists in many Spirit-denying churches, Pastor MacArthur has chosen to focus on aberrations and extremes in the charismatic movement, even making the extremely dangerous claim that charismatics are blaspheming the Spirit and attributing "to the Holy Spirit even the work of Satan."

My question is this: How can someone that rejects the true fire of God consider themselves an authority on what he says is "strange fire"?

Mike

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/6/21 21:49**

Quote:  
-----My question is this: How can someone that rejects the true fire of God consider themselves an authority on what he says is "strange fire"?  
-----

There are 2 extremes perhaps being posed. One being everything is essentially strange fire and the spiritual gifts have ceased. The other is the desire to see all the spiritual gifts in operation that no discernment is shown.

May we be those pressing forward in the Spirit for all the spiritual riches in Christ Jesus and have also the Spirit of discernment to compare all things with the revelation of God's Holy Word and example in the saints before us.

True Christianity never worked unless baptized in and fully controlled by the Spirit of the living God.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2013/6/21 21:59**

Narrow path, Frank, Bear, Mike, Greg,

Amen brethren, I am in agreement with you all!

**Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2013/6/22 0:51**

appolus(Frank) wrote:

Quote:  
----- And so to me, a classic pentecostalist is someone who believes in the Baptism of the Holy Spirit and the sign gifts that go along with it, but who stand upon the word of the Lord therefore would reject all that which is not found in the Scriptures, prosperity gospel, word of faith, Florida revival's where there was roaring like lions and so called holy laughter and so on.  
-----

Amen. While I highly respect and admire Michael Brown and much of his teaching and preaching, I believe he has been known to lack discernment in the area of counterfeit manifestations and has wrongly justified some things he shouldn't have in his Brownsville meetings.

I think of men like Leonard Ravenhill and Paul Washer, men who have such a love for God and His truth and true revival, and try to avoid deception, while believing in the sign gifts of the Spirit.

Sometimes we can get so endeared with our denominational ties that we lose focus. The main thing should be seeking after God in all His fullness in spirit and in truth; they must go together (spirit and truth) or else we will be deceived like so many these days. Let us seek the real thing brothers, let us not settle for some cheap imitation or counterfeit. May God help us all in these last days.

**Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2013/6/22 5:51**

"There are 2 extremes perhaps being posed. One being everything is essentially strange fire and the spiritual gifts have ceased. The other is the desire to see all the spiritual gifts in operation that no discernment is shown.

May we be those pressing forward in the Spirit for all the spiritual riches in Christ Jesus and have also the Spirit of discernment to compare all things with the revelation of God's Holy Word and example in the saints before us.

True Christianity never worked unless baptized in and fully controlled by the Spirit of the living God."

Amen Brother!

Having been very much a part of the Charismatic Movement and the move of God in Pensacola at Brownsville AOG, I have been a witness to both the true fire of God being poured out which resulted in many people getting saved, backsliders coming home, and the presence of God being manifested, but I have also seen the excesses and strange fire, and men moving out in the flesh and calling it the Spirit. Men like Michael Brown, Steve Hill, and John Kilpatrick did exercise true discernment, but they were not trying to put out every trace of wild fire that broke out, but they really wanted to see true change and transformation within the Body of Christ, and the gospel of the Kingdom of God being preached, which means both repentance and outpouring of the Spirit being spread throughout the world.

Mike

**Re: , on: 2013/6/22 8:02**

But God's servants such as Michael Brown may have grown out of some of the immaturity as seen in the charismatic movement. My understanding is Michael Brown is theologically trained. Yet he writes and teaches with a dependence upon the Holy Spirit. I might add Michael Brown is one of the ones crying out against the false teaching of hyper grace.

Bearmaster.

Re: , on: 2013/6/22 8:17

I did some googling on Dr. Michael L. Brown. As far as I can discern his academic credentials are credible. Yes. He has made some goofs as pertains to Brownsville. But then John MacArthur carries credible academic credentials. And he denies the sign gifts. At least the sign gifts working in this day.

Academic credentials are good. But remember the apostles themselves were "uneducated and untrained men". Yet these men had been with Jesus. Good question to ask if any servant of God. Are they with Jesus.

My thoughts.

Bearmaster.

Re: John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown, on: 2013/6/22 11:02

oh no.

why? why? why?

of all the ever darkening news I read, that just keeps getting darker and darker, more evil, cold and fell. I think this, right here, is probably the worst thing I've read.

what is John MacArthur doing? When you have a prominent evangelical leader firing a full cannon broadside at a part of the Body in times like this....we are surely headed for some very dark times, and I pose this question...is John MacArthur REALLY doing the Work of God?....and honoring the Blood of the Lamb?

this is just the worst news IMAGINABLE.

Some one brought up Len Ravenhill....well fyi, Michael Brown sat at the feet of Len as a student AND brother AND friend...as far as Michael Brown being head theologian for the Brownsville AoG, and then president of the "Brownsville School of Revival:....did anyone know WHY Michael left that post?...because from what I read, he didn't want to be AoG ordained, and they drew a line in the sand, and said, you HAVE to be "AoG credentialed"....reasons?...I don't know.

I know this, Michael Brown has been a mentor to me from afar, and encouraged me, because he too, is a fellow Hebrew in the flesh, and when he speaks and teaches about Messiah, Crucified, Resurrected....these teachings resonate with me, they feel very familiar, and God bless Michael for having the sand to call John MacArthur out on this dreadfully injurious verbiage...it borders on ecclesiastical "suicide"....could it be, and i'm not trying to be cute or cheeky..but could it be some form of Alzheimer's on MacArthur's part?

you know brethren, personally, we've had huge breakthroughs in my family, and this morning I awoke with such Joy and Shalom Peace, Grace, Wholeness and Love, the Kind only God the Holy Spirit can engender....and I would NEVER TELL any of them, about this TERRIBLE WITNESS....they will NEVER hear about this article or MacArthur's new onus, if I can help it...they need "milk" right now! not 'sour grapes' or 'bitumen'!

why doesn't MacArthur speak out against the roman "church"?...and I don't wish ANY offense against dear beloved brothers here, who were freed from that bondage, but if wants to fire fusillades of cannon fire, there's a target. Rome is cuddling up with the UN and the EU. i'm well aware elements of the AoG have cuddled up to American imperial and military aspirants...ohhhhh.

i'm just going to stuff my gullet with microwaved taquitos and try and fall back asleep, and maybe pretend this never happened...at the very least, i'll just restart the day, recognizing that God is God. Master of the Universe, He has all this nonsense well in hand, and is perfectly Able to make things right....amen.

**Re: John MacArthur - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/6/22 11:16**

This is very common language for the reformed and calvinist camps, One does not need to be very well read in Luther and Calvin to realize how often they called anyone whom differed from them theology as blasphemers,

Thankfully we no longer have the consistory condemning with persecution all whom differ with their theology and mandating us to attend their sermons weekly and mandating us to recitation by memory the pater and credo and other recited prayers and confessions.

**Re: John MacArthur, Strange Fire and Blasphemy of the Spirit - Michael Brown, on: 2013/6/22 12:21**

Quote:  
-----If these charges are true, this means that many leaders in the charismatic movement have committed the unpardonable sin and are therefore hell-bound. If these charges are not true, Pastor MacArthur has seriously overstepped his bounds and misused the Word of God.  
-----

Could it be the other way round? The unpardonable sin is attributing to Satan that which is of the Holy Spirit? Matthew 12:31-32.

Of course if we are speaking of blaspheming the Holy Spirit, the context in which we have the one single example of this has nothing to do with offering "strange fire" but rather accusing the Lord Himself of labouring in the power of Satan. Yet the Lord clearly said in His earthly ministry I told you, and you do not believe; the works that I do in My Father's name, these testify of Me" John 10:25

Offering strange fire was an issue of worship and not whether the gifts of the Holy Spirit or Satan were evident in the sons of Aron. Leviticus 10:1, Numbers 3:4, Number 26:61

If Satan casts out Satan, he is divided against himself; how then will his kingdom stand? "If I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? For this reason they will be your judges. "But if I cast out demons by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. "Or how can anyone enter the strong man's house and carry off his property, unless he first binds the strong man? And then he will plunder his house. Matthew 12:26-29

The singular relevance of the work of the Lord Jesus is that before He worked any works, the Father first bound the strong man. Why must this be so? Because unless you first bind the strong man you cannot carry off his property. This is the meaning of the passage above and demonstrates the unusualness of the reality of casting out demons. How can you cast out demons and not bind the one who lords it over them in the first instance? If we ourselves had witnessed this reality in the clear way in which Jesus laboured, we too would have to guard our mouths. Otherwise we would find ourselves in the place of the Pharisees, who working in the mind of Satan blasphemed the Holy Spirit and therein rejected God's will for their lives.

The problem for John MacArthur may be simply that he hasn't seen this working of the Holy Spirit in a convincing way. Perhaps what he has witnessed has been to great a show, not so much to do with casting out demons but offering to God the sorceries of the flesh and the natural man, as true worship, and then pressing others to walk in them as of the Lord. If we then add, that these same men are being influenced by demonic agencies, we would simply confuse the matter. No doubt this addition, if it is proven to be the underlying motive of Mr MacArthur's accusations, will bring in confusion. Reality however will in the end prove itself openly and Mr MacArthur will make his own case in October.

Anyway I think he has a valid point. Offering strange fire has more to do with worship and service to God than it has to do with spiritual gifts. When Jesus said to the pharisees "if I by Beelzebub cast out demons, by whom do your sons cast them out? For this reason they will be your judges", the Lord is of course speaking about the disciples who on this very point were amazed and excited that even the demons were subject to the name of Christ when they were initially sent out (Mark 6:7, Luke 10:17). This is long before Pentecost so we would have to ask by what power were the disciples able to cast out demons? It is of course by the power of the Spirit working in Christ Himself and by His name to those whom He sends. It is by John at the river Jordan that this power of God is come into visibility, not by tongues of men, angels or fire, but by "a voice crying aloud in the wilderness" and the witness of the Father from heaven. Spiritual power is become Pentecost but its authority is the Father working in Christ Jesus. This is something which Mr MacArthur understands very well.

If we want to comprehend by which point Satan was again loosed to his evil we have to look no further than the supper table of the Lord. He entered in full sight of the Lord into one of His apostles and therein pressed him to do that which no man could do without his power. It is one thing to talk, as Judas no doubt did talk a great deal when conspiring to betray the Lord for money, with the chief priest and his ambassadors, it is another thing to press into it in the sight of the Lord. Or else why did Judas suddenly come to such an overwhelming regret and take his own life? The Pharisees on the other hand pressed Jesus continuously with the mind of Satan not his power, and as a result they themselves alone are said to have committed the unpardonable sin of blaspheming the Holy Spirit because they did it in their own power. If we want to see what a pharisee and Satan look like working together after he is loosed in power, we need look no further than the trial of the Lord when a roman governor asked "do you not want me to release unto you your king?" and they cried "away with Him, we have no other king than Caesar". We need a little wisdom brethren and less imagination.

I rather think Mr MacArthur is better informed than we believe him to be. If we by reason of his secessionist position, imagine that he is ignorant of spiritual realities then we are become his judge and in that fools.

It is almost always the case that when we want to make controversial that which is in truth a sober reality, we will set a snare for our feet and fall right into the trap ourselves.

<http://blog.ichabod.eu/sorcerers/>

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2013/6/22 14:35**

Quote-

I rather think Mr MacArthur is better informed than we believe him to be. If we by reason of his secessionist position, imagine that he is ignorant of spiritual realities then we are become his judge and in that fools

-Quote Andrew

Andrew, who has stated what you have supposed. Nobody has stated that he wasn't informed on spiritual things. The problem is that a cessationist is lacking in the fullness of the Holy Spirit in operation is his life by his own admission.

cessationist -someone who believes that certain works of the Holy Spirit have ceased

— noun

a temporary or complete stopping; discontinuance: a cessation of the Holy Spirits working

Acts 18:24-26

Ministry of Apollos

Now a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man had been instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, he spoke and taught accurately the things of the Lord, though he knew only the baptism of John. So he began to speak boldly in the synagogue. When Aquila and Priscilla heard him, they took him aside and explained to him the way of God more accurately.

Now Andrew how can he truly be able to accurately discern on the operation of the Holy Spirit when he by his own admission has not experienced nor will except certain works of the Holy Spirit as being for our day. That which is perfect has not come yet and we still only know in part as the Holy Spirit reveals to us. Now if one thinks that he is complete in his experience but has not experienced what multitudes of others have experienced how can he truly know what is of God and what is not.

Now if you truly don't want people to end up as fools to believe that McArthur is complete in his experience and that he is well qualified to explain to us the way of the Holy Spirit more perfectly than I don't see your argument.

Blessings...from brother rbanks

**Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2013/6/22 14:55**

There is a great little book written by John Sherrill entitled THEY SPEAK WITH OTHER TONGUES.

John Sherrill is, along with his wife Elizabeth, the co-author of many well-known Christian biographies and auto-biographies -- including THE CROSS AND THE SWITCHBLADE with David Wilkerson, GOD'S SMUGGLER with Brother Andrew and THE HIDING PLACE with Corrie ten Boom.

At the time that he wrote the book, Mr. Sherrill was a somewhat skeptical yet open-minded magazine reporter researching the Pentecostal, Charismatic and "Jesus" movements. His research was extensive. He did a great job of detailing the history of the Pentecostal movement and even notes the differences between "classical pentecostals" and "charismatics" (although I think that the definitions may have changed or become blurred over time).

The book provides some interesting accounts of the modern Pentecostal movement including historic anecdotes from Topeka, Kansas, Azusa Street and other revivals. Sherrill was also able to gather input from David Wilkerson, Catherine Marshall and even others. More importantly, it is written mostly as an autobiography by the author as he developed his own perspective from Scripture, history, the experiences of others and, finally, his own experiences.

I recommend this book. It is an easy, quick read and can provide some valuable insight into the issue from "the outside looking in." Even though the book is old (originally published in 1964 although it may have been updated), it is one of my favorite books on the subject. I do appreciate the warnings about "wild fire" or "strange fire" from men like John MacArthur or even Dave Hunt though I am convinced of the place and use of spiritual gifts today.

<http://www.elizabethsherrill.com/they-speak-with-other-tongues-book-desc.html>

[http://www.amazon.com/They-Speak-Other-Tongues-Sherrill/dp/0800793595/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1371925780&sr=8-1&keywords=they+speak+with+other+tongues](http://www.amazon.com/They-Speak-Other-Tongues-Sherrill/dp/0800793595/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1371925780&sr=8-1&keywords=they+speak+with+other+tongues)

**Re: , on: 2013/6/22 16:37**

Quote:  
-----Now Andrew how can he truly be able to accurately discern on the operation of the Holy Spirit when he by his own admission has not experienced nor will except certain works of the Holy Spirit as being for our day. That which is perfect has not come yet and we still only know in part as the Holy Spirit reveals to us. Now if one thinks that he is complete in his experience but has not experienced what multitudes of others have experienced how can he truly know what is of God and what is not.

Now if you truly don't want people to end up as fools to believe that MacArthur is complete in his experience and that he is well qualified to explain to us the way of the Holy Spirit more perfectly than I don't see your argument. rbanks  
-----

I agree that conventional wisdom would assert that one who rejects the ecstatic gifts would seem to be lacking in an ability to judge these things in those who have received them by faith. Conventional wisdom is of no use however. Apart from the possibility of not really comprehending Mr MacArthur's deep concern in this instance, it is the new life which is the instrument of discernment for all believers. We ought not to confuse the discerning of spirits with spiritual discernment. Unless a man is actively cooperating with unclean spirits a man cannot be discerned, by a gift of the discerning of spirits, therefore such a gift is not necessary to comprehend spiritual deception. Such a man can only be comprehended by ordinary and reasonable means (Doctrines & Conduct). Although any believer could in an instant be convicted by the Holy Spirit whether to go to the right or the left, this is not the same as discernment. True prophetic discernment is not conviction, but knowing in the spirit and speaking it with the mouth as though you did in fact understand the thing spoken off. Neither is spiritual discernment the same as rejecting something with the mind, it is a reasonable maturity to effect or add greater substance to conviction, by faith. Three ways to obey, one spirit and one life in Christ.

Similarly one who rejects something in his thinking does not necessarily lack it in his spirit. Who knows what gifts of the Holy Spirit Mr MacArthur has? I take it that Mr MacArthur will show his full meaning when the time comes and from that we will know what the substance of his presentation and call to enquiry is. Therefore to assert that because Mr MacArthur rejects the gifts of the Holy Spirit does not mean that he cannot comprehend in a renewed mind of Christ that other men offer strange fire, is to presume that his opposition is solely on the basis of rejecting the gifts of the Holy Spirit, be it tongues or any other gift. As a matter of reality I go a great deal further than Mr MacArthur. I would speak a great deal more

re plainly than he does and have done many times. To claim that he lacks the ability to know that "something is wrong" with certain brethren does not make him a fool (lacking wisdom) but may simply reflect the reality of affairs. Increasing numbers of brethren are becoming sorcerers and have given up their own discernment due to an insensitive conscience, and the doctrines of demons increasingly become the basis for continuing on. Difficult things to say because it makes the "sayer" seem guilty of attributing to Satan the things of the Holy Spirit if we have believed the object of concern. It is especially true if the "sayer" believes in the first instance that tongues for example is essentially demonic. The problem is that tongues can be demonic they can also be sorceric as of a man of intentional effect.

As to whether anyone has said anything about Mr MacArthur as reflecting my comments we can all read for ourselves no doubt.

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2013/6/22 17:19**

Andrew,

On another thought maybe this will be good for McArthur and others also because it could cause him to experience of the Holy Spirit in a way that he hasn't before.

This could be one of his greatest challenges, and God could enlighten him on some things lacking in his understanding and also help others who are lacking in discernment. I do believe that McArthur has a measure of the Holy Spirit and a depth of the "Word" to be able to discern the many errors that many have fallen into.

Hopefully he want bash the true things he doesn't understand but use caution in the exercise of true spiritual discernment showing from scripture, which he has a great knowledge of, the false and deceptive spirits that too many have been so gullibly duped in the accepting of doctrines of demons.

Blessings..from brother rbanks

**Re: , on: 2013/6/22 17:36**

Quote:  
-----On another thought maybe this will be good for McArthur and others also because it could cause him to experience of the Holy Spirit in a way that he hasn't before. rbanks  
-----

Yes that would be wonderful. I had the same thought as well. Amen.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/6/22 18:32**

one of the best sermons I saw of John MacArthur was preached at Greg Laurie's church, he is basically a Pentecostal, he and most of the church received him well, and he preached to them as brethren exhorting them but fully, I don't know if any one has seen that sermon but it was worth watching

A big mistake that Pentecostals and Charismatics make is thinking we are more spiritual than others who have not received certain gifts, most of us tongue talkers would not come close to the John Weasleys, Witfields, Edwards, Branheard who never spoke in tongues or prophesied in the fresh scent of speaking and thus says the Lord

Paul did imply with a question that not everyone spoke in tongues or prophesied, unless one experiences those gifts it remains very hard to expect especially if one is taught that they have ceased

What is evident is noticed is that many Pentecostals and Charismatics don't expect prophecies that are given saying that the old testament prophecy was different, and new testament prophecy means to exhort and preach the word, so they are partial secessionists in that sense, I read an article of Zac Poonan that suggested this

and many secessionists believe God still heals and performs miracles according to His will. They just don't believe that a person wields the power to heal or perform miracles, I personally see the sound Pentecostal Charismatic and the sound secessionist as being on the same spiritual ground

blessings

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/6/22 18:54**

just found this quote from greg laurie about john mac

John MacArthur, one of the greatest preachers alive, is always willing to speak his mind about what the Scripture teaches. I have many of his volumes in my library and am honored to count him as a friend.

In addition, John was one of the featured speakers at our recent Preach the Word Conference.

He recently posted an article on the topic of the frank discussion of sex in the pulpit and more that caused quite a stir. This article was brought to my attention, and I was asked my position on what he said.

My response was that I am in complete agreement with it. In fact, I wrote a similar blog post on the topic about six weeks ago.

**Re: , on: 2013/6/22 20:14**

My question to John MacArthur, whom I respect, and other cessationists would be.....if the sign gifts of the Spirit have ceased after the first century.....then how do you explain the ongoing activity of the Holy Spirit in the 1040 window? Moslems are coming to Christ in great numbers by dreams and visions of Jesus. And this cannot be written off as an activity of Satan because many of these Moslem background believers who have come to Christ will be persecuted and some will be martyred.

There are also credible healings that are taking place in the 1040. I remember hearing a Pakistani pastor say some doctors in Pakistan will tell their patients go to the Christians they can heal you. I cannot. These are Moslem doctors trained at some of the finest medical schools in the world.

If the sign gifts have disappeared in the first century. Then the 1040 church has not gotten the word.

Bearnaster.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/6/22 22:50**

I found this as I expected ,,,,from a sermon of john mac showing that he does believe that god still heals ;;;

tho I myself believe in the sign gifts ,,,,I more so believe that god heals through the prayer of his normal faith filled saints apart from the gift of healing ,,and that would easily explain all these healings IF they are real healing

john mac says here

Somebody asked me recently if we get a lot of people here coming out of healing churches? I say, "Yes, we get the people who go and don't get healed, no question about it." What a tragic thing; multitudes go away shattered, disconsolate, feeling either they have failed God or God has failed them. Now let me say this, people are going to say, "Well, are you saying God doesn't heal?" No, I'm not saying that, if God wants to heal, He can heal. That's completely, obviously within His power, and if it's in his purpose He can heal. He may heal as a result of prayer. He may heal through simple processes, through medical assistance, or he may heal in a way that we can't explain medically. God may speed up the recovery mechanism and restore a person to health in a way that medicine can't even explain. Sometimes He may overrule a medical prognosis and allow someone to recover from a normally debilitating disease.

Healings like that may come, He may do them; He may do them in response to prayer, He may do them just because He wants to do them. But the gift of healing, and the ability to heal, and special anointings for healing, and healings that can be claimed and therefore realized, and all the typical faith healing technique billed on the idea that God wants every

ody well all the time, has no Biblical sanction whatsoever in the post-apostolic era.

**Re: - posted by skopos\_theou, on: 2013/6/22 23:36**

It's fascinating to see how teachers who claim to be so strong on hermeneutics violate those principles when they want to defend their biased opinion. There are many tactics that MacArthur uses that violate the principles he himself professes but I'll just touch on two:

(1) In regard to the 1 Cor. 14:4 he comments on Paul's statement "he that speaketh in an tongue edifieth himself". Would anyone reading that verse in the context of that chapter and anywhere else the word "edify" is used interpret that to mean "puffs up" himself. I quote MacArthur: "The first verse they assume 'speaking in an unknown tongue' builds someone up, when in fact, Paul was saying it in a negative sense. It puffs your ego, or it, at best (if you do it in private) would be nefit you, which would be selfish and contrary to any proper use of spiritual gifts." I'm not going to waste anyone's time by elaborating further on such a biased interpretation of the word edify.

(2) Regarding cessation of spiritual gifts, MacArthur uses the same bias against the supernatural that he criticizes the evolutionists of that base their worldview on "naturalism" (a presupposition that rules out the supernatural). The fact is, the only scripture that truly implies how long the spiritual gifts would be in operation is 1 Cor. 1:7 where Paul writes: "So that you come behind in no gift, waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." How long are spiritual gifts to be utilized by the church? Until the second coming of Jesus.

John Gil's commentary affirms this when he writes: " So that ye come behind in no gift,.... Ordinary or extraordinary; a detail of the gifts which were bestowed on them is made in 1 Corinthians 12:8; by which it appears that they were not inferior in gifts to any of the churches waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ who will appear a second time, come in great glory, will raise the dead, and judge both quick and dead; when gifts will cease and be of no more use, and when they must all be accounted for; and therefore, till that time comes, should be diligently made use of, and improved to the interest and service of Christ."

When does John Gil say the Scripture teaches gifts of the Spirit will cease? When Jesus returns. These were not the biased words of a charismatic or pentecostal. Gil was far from that. But he had the integrity to state what this scripture plainly taught and we should heed his words that we will give an account for how we use these gifts which are operative until Christ returns.

Baruch Ha-Shem!