

Ok, here is my theory which seems to be somewhat contravened by Hombre's note--He said:

Quote:

As I have mentioned earlier, my GF goes to a non-denominational church. They do not preach divine healing specifically. They haven't heard a small percentage of what we have. Yet healings and deliverances occur there sporadically. The latest is about an unsaved fellow, who was quite the druggie, sharing needles and the like. He was diagnosed with AIDS. He came in several Sundays ago, and asked for prayer for salvation. They also laid their hands on him, and he said he felt something go through his body. The next Sunday, he witnessed that he had been back to the doctor, and that upon examination, he was told that he no longer had AIDS...and that perhaps the blood tests had been mixed up previously.

Yes...all very logical.

...anyway....there is more to the healing issue than gritting ones teeth, and the continued healing manifestations of those who know practically nothing theologically (can you say Peter?) demonstrate that.

For the past few days I've been considering the lack of signs and wonders in our modern-day churches.

My premise can be summed up in the observation that there is very little supernatural in our churches, which is in direct contrast to what we see in the early church.

After thinking about this, I had concluded that God would be working against Himself by working supernaturally in a church that didn't line itself up with the Bible, particularly the New Testament pattern.

Sure, you see "some" supernatural taking place, but it is usually through individuals who are not associated with any particular church. My thinking is that God still moves on behalf of His people, those who exercise faith in His promises, by healing and provision, because He promises to take care of His children in this manner. We don't (usually) see Him moving on behalf of a group of people (say-- a church) because in doing so He would be "confirming" those things that the church stands for, and to my mind, He isn't going to lend His stamp of approval unless that church, as a whole, was following after His established pattern.

I'm leaving out, for the sake of discussion, those churches where the supernatural seems to be more or less present, yet who are blatantly not following after the biblical pattern. These churches

(in my opinion) who do not pattern themselves after biblical principles, yet experience the supernatural gifts, are suspect in my view, because I know that there are two sources of the supernatural. The Bible talks about false signs and wonders, especially present in the end-times, that will be used by Satan and his followers to deceive.

For God to make a distinction between His own supernatural workings and the workings of Satan, He (to my mind) would not move supernaturally in an environment where His own Word was not being followed. Signs were given to "confirm the Word", so when the Word isn't being preached and signs are manifest, I am automatically suspicious.

This is not to say that God does not heal and deliver on the basis of an individual's faith, but I don't think He does it if it will lend credence to a particular church. At least that is the theory.

Thoughts anyone?

William
