

# Spirit Baptism:

## A Completed Historical Event

An Exposition and Defense of the Historic Baptist View of Spirit Baptism

by

Thomas D. Ross

- I. Introduction
- II. Statement of views
  - A. Post-conversion special power (PCP)
  - B. Contemporaneous with regeneration and an action that places one in the universal body of Christ—universal church dispensationalism (UCD)
  - C. Completed historical event—the historic Baptist view
- III. Proof for the validity of the historic Baptist view
  - A. Spirit baptism in the Old Testament
  - B. Spirit baptism in the Gospels
  - C. Spirit baptism in Acts
  - D. Spirit baptism: The alleged reference in 1 Corinthians 12:13
    - a.) Is the body of Christ the visible congregation or a universal, invisible church?
    - b.) Does Christ baptize with the Spirit, or does the Holy Spirit baptize?
    - c.) Was Spirit baptism a completed historical phenomenon at the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, or is it a event that takes place regularly throughout the entire dispensation of grace?
    - d.) The Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:13
    - e.) A Summary of the Conclusion of the Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:13
    - f.) Support from Commentators for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a Reference to the Church Ordinances
  - E. Historic Baptist support for a first century fulfillment of Spirit baptism and for interpreting 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to the church ordinances
  - F. Spirit Baptism: Other Alleged References in the Epistles: Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21<sup>1</sup>
- IV. Conclusion
- V. Appendix: Excerpts from the sermons “The First Pentecost” and “The Church, The Habitat of the Holy Spirit” by B. H. Carroll.
- VI. Bibliography
- VII. Endnotes

## I. Introduction

Spirit baptism is an important Biblical doctrine. Wrong views of the event do not only constitute Pneumatological error but lead to various other errors in systematic theology, such as false ecclesiology (developing, e. g., from a wrong view of 1 Corinthians 12:13). Furthermore, incorrect views of the baptism of the Holy Ghost lead to confusion in the intensely practical matter of sanctification. Entire religious movements, such as Pentecostalism, have arisen in large part from unbiblical views of Spirit baptism. Thus, one's ability to glorify God, and to love Him with the heart, soul, and mind, is strengthened by a correct comprehension of Spirit baptism, and weakened by erroneous views of it.

## II. Statement of views

Many conflicting views of Spirit baptism compete for adherents in the modern religious milieu. One prominent view, which will be referenced below as the *post-conversion special power* (PCP) view, affirms that the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which it avers continues to take place today, occurs after the point of conversion in the life of some, but not all, Christians. The baptism is said to bestow a variety of special benefits or powers. The adumbration of these benefits or powers varies greatly based on the theological paradigm of specific PCP advocates.<sup>ii</sup> In contrast, what this composition will term the *universal-church dispensational* (UCD) view holds<sup>iii</sup> that at the moment of faith and regeneration, the Holy Spirit baptizes a believer into the universal, invisible church—the body of Christ.<sup>iv</sup> The UCD and PCP views<sup>v</sup> agree that Spirit baptism continues to take place today, but the UCD position, contrary to the PCP, affirms that all believers have been Spirit-baptized, and maintains that Spirit baptism is not intrinsically connected with any visible signs or special powers.

A third view, which will be termed the *historic Baptist* view,<sup>vi</sup> affirms that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a phenomenon restricted to the first century and connected with the sending of the Holy Spirit by Christ on the day of Pentecost as recorded in the book of Acts. This position, contrary to both the UCD and PCP doctrines, denies that anyone receives Spirit baptism today, although it affirms that the Holy Spirit indwells all believers immediately at the point of faith and regeneration (Romans 8:9, 14; Galatians 4:5-6). In agreement with the PCP position but against the UCD view, the historic Baptist position affirms that the Bible teaches that Spirit baptism took place after regeneration. In agreement with some PCP advocates, the historic Baptist position

connects Spirit baptism with miracles, signs, and wonders. Furthermore, while advocates of the historic Baptist position agree that Scripture contains dispensational distinctions,<sup>vii</sup> their ecclesiology, against the UCD doctrine and the generality of PCP advocates,<sup>viii</sup> denies that the doctrine of a universal, invisible church is Scriptural, affirming instead that the word *church* pertains solely to the local, visible assembly.<sup>ix</sup> Since the doctrine of a universal, invisible church, developed especially by Augustine of Hippo in his battles against the Anabaptist Donatists and assumed within the Protestant movement by the Magisterial Reformers, is the position of almost all non-Baptist, Protestant religious denominations, this third view is held nearly exclusively by Baptists. Thus, it is properly termed *Baptist*. Furthermore, since many modern Baptists, especially those who have abandoned the militant separatism of the New Testament (NT), are influenced more by the broad spectrum of Protestant evangelicalism than by classical Baptist systematics, and have consequently abandoned much historic Baptist doctrine and practice, including its position on Spirit baptism, in favor of UCD or PCP positions, this third position is properly termed *historic* among Baptists because of its historical dominance in past centuries, despite its decline among many today that claim the Baptist name.<sup>x</sup>

While the prominence of the UCD and PCP doctrines throughout the gamut of denominational affiliations within evangelicalism and fundamentalism leads to large amounts of interaction between their advocates, as manifested in books, journal articles, and other studies comparing the merits of the two, the modern restriction of the historic Baptist doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Ghost to the most conservative elements within the Baptist movement has led to most advocates of the PCP and UCD doctrines ignoring it, often because of ignorance of its existence. This abandonment is unfortunate, since, as the remainder of this composition will demonstrate, the historic Baptist view, not the PCP or UCD doctrine, is taught in the Bible.

### III. Proof for the Historical View

#### A. Spirit Baptism in the Old Testament

When the Lord Jesus baptized the church with the Spirit on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2, Peter, in Acts 2:16-21, proved the legitimacy of the events of the day by quoting Joel 2:28-32:

28 And it shall come to pass afterward, *that* I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: 29 And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. 30 And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. 31 The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come. 32 And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever shall call on the

name of the LORD shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call.<sup>xi</sup>

This text sets forth the Old Testament prediction of Spirit baptism. Its exegesis consequently provides important insights for the understanding of Spirit baptism in its New Testament fulfillment.

One notes that the Old Testament prediction of Spirit baptism was not connected with regeneration, but with those who were already converted (and were thus the Lord's "servants and handmaids" before the Spirit was poured out upon them). Spirit baptism, Joel predicted, would be connected with miraculous powers, signs, and wonders (2:28-30). The reference<sup>xii</sup> to Joel 2:28ff. in Acts 2 did not bring salvation and forgiveness to the 120 members of the pre-Pentecost church who received the baptism with the Spirit (Acts 1:15; 2:1) but brought, as promised, "power" (Acts 1:8; *dunamis*, δύναμις). An analysis of *dunamis* in Acts demonstrates that it is always connected with Divinely-bestowed miraculous power.<sup>xiii</sup> Consistent with this use of *dunamis*, in Joel 2:28 supernatural prophecy, dreams, and visions are the fruits of the prediction "I will pour out my spirit." The recipients of Spirit baptism in Acts two received supernatural powers to speak in tongues and do other miracles, and Peter employs the quote from Joel in Acts 2:15-21 to justify the Spirit-produced speaking in unlearned foreign languages (2:6-11) that had amazed and enthralled the onlooking unconverted Jewish crowds (2:14-16). Joel did not predict a Spirit baptism that was temporally simultaneous with the invisible inward works of regeneration, conversion, and justification, but a post-justification bestowal of power to do visible signs and wonders on those within God's institutional covenant community. Acts 2 therefore records a bestowal of such miraculous power by means of Spirit baptism on those who were already saved and baptized church members.

Furthermore, Joel did not predict that the Spirit would be regularly outpoured upon individuals who, day by day, year by year, came to faith in the Messiah and were converted; he predicted a massive, one-time outpouring<sup>xiv</sup> of the Spirit upon the generality of the covenant community. This does not suit the UCD insistence that Spirit baptism takes place at the point of individual regeneration for all believers for the duration of the church age. Nor does the PCP belief that Spirit baptism continues to occur as individuals experience special post-conversion crises throughout the church age find support in Joel 2:28-32. The text is, however, entirely consistent with the historic Baptist position that Spirit baptism was a first century gift from Christ to the corporate church, a completed event fulfilled in the first century as recorded in the book of Acts.

The only other two texts that connect the Spirit (*ruach*, רֹּחַ) and the verb rendered *pour out* (*shafach*, שָׁפַח) in Joel 2:28-29 are Ezekiel 39:29 and Zechariah 12:10. Both

texts refer to events that pertain to the eschatological future for Israel (as, indeed, does Joel 2:28-32 in its ultimate fulfillment). Neither passage contains an “all flesh” expansion,<sup>xv</sup> as Joel 2:28 does, that reasonably incorporates Gentiles. Furthermore, neither Ezekiel 39:29 nor Zechariah 12:10 is referenced in the New Testament as being fulfilled in or relating to Spirit baptism, nor does anything in the New Testament indicate that the latter passages pertain to events in the church age. Isaiah 44:3, which employs a different verb for *pour* (*yatsaq*, יָצַק) than Joel 2:28-29, is also a promise to Israel (44:1) which relates to the Millennium, not to the NT church. It has no necessary connection with the doctrine of Christian Spirit baptism as explicated in Acts 2 and Joel 2. Other Old Testament texts likewise speak of special works of the Holy Spirit (Isaiah 32:15; 34:16; etc.), but these are all also references to His blessings upon Israel, not the church. While a general analysis of the work of the Holy Spirit in the Old Testament is a valuable and important task,<sup>xvi</sup> it goes beyond the bounds of the current study, in which Old Testament passages are relevant only as they pertain to the New Testament phenomenon of Spirit baptism. Consequently, while advocates of Reformed covenant theology can and regularly do, consistently with their theological system and spiritualization of Old Testament prophecy, employ texts that pertain to Israel as if they had to do with the NT church,<sup>xvii</sup> believers who hold to a literal, dispensational hermeneutic, and who consequently recognize the Biblical distinction between Israel and the church, ought not so to do.

The Old Testament, as evidenced in an examination of the passage (Joel 2:28-32) Peter quoted in Acts two to explain the baptism of the Holy Ghost, supports the historic Baptist view of the doctrine, rather than the UCD or PCP position. Spirit baptism was predicted as a post-conversion gift for the collective body of God’s covenant community, not an event simultaneous or synonymous with regeneration. It would not apply the invisible grace of justification to the legal standing of sinners but bestow power to perform visible miracles to saints. It was not a personal, individual event that would occur regularly and gradually as individuals came to the Redeemer in repentance, but a one-time corporate gift for those already part of the people of God. The promise of Spirit baptism was fulfilled for the church on the Day of Pentecost, in those who had already been converted and immersed upon profession of faith.

## B. Spirit Baptism in the Gospels

The only references in the gospels to Spirit baptism<sup>xviii</sup> are found in Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; and John 1:33. All of these are upon the lips of John the

Baptist. John, the first Baptist preacher, prepared the way for the Lord Jesus by preaching the gospel and immersing people who had been saved, preparing people for Christ's coming and His gathering of the church during His earthly ministry.<sup>xix</sup> John's baptism is that practiced by Christ's church and perpetuated from the first century until today<sup>xx</sup> by true Baptist churches; his baptism was not some other sort of non-Christian baptism.<sup>xxi</sup> When "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins[,] [then] there went out unto him all the land of Judaea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins" (Mark 1:4-5). The Baptist preached to those he immersed that "there cometh one mightier than I after me, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose. I indeed have baptized you with water: but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost" (Mark 1:7-8). John thus identified the recipients of Spirit baptism with believers who had received his immersion in water. Spirit baptism was not received only by the apostles, but was for the church as an institution, the entire body of immersed believers. John's identification was in line with Old Testament predictions, which affirmed that men and women, old and young, would receive Spirit baptism (Joel 2:28-29). The context of Matthew 3:11<sup>xxii</sup> and Luke 3:16<sup>xxiii</sup> likewise identify those who believe the gospel and are immersed with the recipients of Spirit baptism. When the Baptist, as recorded in John 1:19-33, specifically speaks to unbelieving and unbaptized individuals, to unconverted "priests and Levites . . . of the Pharisees," he does not say that they will be baptized with the Holy Ghost.

While one who believes that the baptism with fire of Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16 refers to the damnation of the unconverted in hell<sup>xxiv</sup>—a position that appears initially plausible because of the connection of the word "fire" in Matthew 3:11 to that in 3:12<sup>xxv</sup>—can still agree with the conclusions made above concerning the connection between Spirit baptism and the church, the position that baptism with fire is synonymous with Spirit baptism deserves serious consideration and should be considered correct for a number of reasons. First, the reader of the gospels could very easily conclude that they were synonymous. One who simply reads "I indeed baptize you with water . . . but . . . he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire" (Matthew 3:11; *Ego men baptidzo humas en hudati . . . de . . . autos humas baptisei en Pneumati Hagio kai puri, ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι . . . δὲ . . . αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ*; cf. Luke 3:16) could very easily think that the same "you," the "you" that receives water baptism, also receives both the Spirit and fire. Baptism *Pneumati Hagio kai puri* would reasonably be viewed as being received by the same individuals at the same time, as both "Spirit" and "fire" follow a single *en* in connection with the single

verb “baptize.”<sup>xxvi</sup> Furthermore, the *men/de* clause confirms the association of the several instances of “you” in the verse. Second, Acts 1:5 refers back to Luke 3:16. Why would not the entire action of the verse, the “Holy Spirit and fire” baptism, happen at the same time? Third, in Acts 2:3-4, the baptism with the Spirit and the appearance of “fire” on the heads of those Spirit-baptized happens at the same moment. Would not Theophilus, reading Luke-Acts, recall Luke 3:16 and think that this was the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire? Fourth, the gospel accounts in Mark 1:8 and John 1:33 both record only baptism with the Spirit; fire is not mentioned. This fact suggests that there is one baptism with the Spirit and fire, since neither Mark nor John believed the reader needed to hear about fire baptism as a distinct event; simply mentioning Spirit baptism covered both “Spirit and fire.”<sup>xxvii</sup> Fifth, in Acts, only a record of Spirit baptism as a fulfillment of John’s preaching is recalled from the gospels (Acts 1:5; Luke 3:16) and recorded (Acts 2), suggesting that baptism with the Spirit and fire was a single event predicted by John. Sixth, the parallel between Spirit baptism’s validation of the church and the coming of the *shekinah* on the Old Testament tabernacle and temple<sup>xxviii</sup> supports the unity of the two baptisms. Seventh, while one who believes baptism with fire is eternal torment affirms that one either receives Spirit baptism or fire baptism, the disciples in Acts never told anyone that, since they did not receive Spirit baptism, they were going to get fire baptism. Eighth, while Spirit baptism was a one-time event, the lost who die are cast into hell moment by moment, day by day, so the baptism with fire would seem not to be a one-time event, but something daily repeated, indeed, something that is occurring continually worldwide. Parallelism between the two would then be minimal. One who wished to extenuate this difficulty might argue that the baptism with fire refers to the postmillennial future after the Great White Throne judgment, when all the lost in Hades are cast into the lake of fire (Revelation 20:11-15). In that case, while all the lost, throughout the entire Old Testament and into the Millennium, get cast into the lake of fire and thus allegedly receive fire baptism, only the tiny fraction of church age saints connected with the events in Acts receive Spirit baptism, thus making the two baptisms most discontinuous. John the Baptist also did not prophesy that all the lost would receive the baptism of fire—at the very least, people in the Old Testament dispensation are not referred to in his preaching. Were fire baptism the eternal torment of all the lost of all ages, its fulfillment would be strikingly different than its prediction. Ninth, no passage states that the eternal state of the lost is a fulfillment of the baptism of fire—the conclusion is an implication drawn from what are not foolproof premises. Tenth, the allusion to Malachi’s prediction concerning John the Baptist, which undergirds Matthew 3:11-12, refers to two different types of fire, a sanctifying fire that separates some among

the people of God to a special purpose (Malachi 3:1-3; cf. Isaiah 1:25; Zechariah 13:9) and a different kind of fire associated with the damnation of the wicked (Malachi 4:1). A fulfillment of Malachi that mentions a baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire that sets apart the church for a specific purpose and an unquenchable fire that the wicked will receive in the eschaton is entirely consistent with the Old Testament. Therefore, the Old Testament background eliminates the initially plausible conclusion that the baptism of fire of 3:11 must necessarily be the fiery eternal damnation mentioned in 3:12. Last, maintaining that fire baptism is synonymous with Spirit baptism, on the historic Baptist view elucidated below, makes both Spirit and fire baptism, like literal immersion in water, ecclesiological, not soteriological events. Christ gathered His church from those who had received the baptism of John, and it is the same church that received the baptism with the Spirit in Acts 2. John made “ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Luke 1:17) by bringing them to salvation and then baptizing them, so that they could be part of the congregation Christ was gathering (John 3:29), which the Savior later authenticated by baptizing His assembly with His Spirit. For one to affirm that fire baptism is damnation in hell is to move this latter baptism from the realm of ecclesiology to that of soteriology and eschatology. As literal baptism is not a means of receiving salvation, so no metaphorical reference to baptism in the New Testament is ever clearly soteriological. The cumulative weight of the reasons above lead to the conclusion that, while the position that the baptism with fire is the eternal damnation of the lost appears initially plausible, the position that the baptism with the Spirit and fire is a single event received by the church in Acts 2 is clearly preferable.

The translation of the Authorized Version that Christ “shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 3:11, etc.) is superior in its particular context to a rendering of *Baptisei en Pneumati Hagio*, βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, as “he shall baptize you *in* the Holy Ghost.” A comparison of the gospel texts on Spirit baptism indicate that both the simple dative and the dative with *en* specify the same category of usage in the text. For example, in Luke 3:16 the dative *hudati* (ὑδατι) parallels *en Pneumati Hagio kai puri*, ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. Acts 1:5 likewise parallels John’s baptism *hudati* with baptism *en Pneumati Hagio*. Note also the simple dative *puri* (πυρί) in Matthew 3:12 and Luke 3:17. The simple datives are best taken as examples of a “dative of means/instrument [by, by means of, with] . . . [where] the dative substantive is used to indicate the means or instrument by which the verbal action is accomplished. This is a very common use of the dative, embracing as it does one of the root ideas of the dative case (viz., instrumentality) . . . before the noun in the dative, [one should] supply the words *by means of*, or simply *with*.”<sup>xxxix</sup> While the instrumental dative is very common,

there is a great “scarcity of . . . usage [for the] . . . locative of place without a preposition . . . [so that the grammarian] Blass indeed remarks that the ‘local dative’ does not occur in the N. T.”<sup>xxx</sup> If there are few simple datives representing a dative or locative of place in New Testament Greek, or perhaps none at all, but the instrumental idea for the dative form without a preposition is very common, then the presumption that the baptisms in Matthew 3 and the parallel passages are “with” water, “with” the Holy Ghost, and “with” fire, rather than “in” these three, is very strong. Similarly, *en Pneumati* constitutes a use of *en* with the dative indicating instrument or means.<sup>xxxii</sup> Thus, in Spirit baptism “Christ is the agent . . . and the Holy Spirit is the means . . . that the Lord uses to baptize . . . *Pneumati Hagio* clearly indicates means in Mark 1:8 (as in several other passages dealing with Spirit-baptism).”<sup>xxxiii</sup> Furthermore, *en pneumati* regularly possesses the sense of means or instrumentality in the LXX; the locative idea of sphere is significantly less common.<sup>xxxiii</sup> Indeed, the locative sense is not clearly present in any passage in the Greek Old Testament where *en pneumati* refers to the Holy Spirit.<sup>xxxiv</sup> The related *en puri* (cf. Matthew 3:11, *baptisei en Pneumati Hagio kai puri*, βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί) also very frequently possesses the sense of instrumentality or means in the LXX.<sup>xxxv</sup> However, such metaphorical language for Spirit baptism does not exclude any locative sense in Spirit baptism, nor does Christ’s pouring out the Holy Ghost from heaven, which resulted in Spirit baptism, exclude the Spirit’s “fill[ing] all the house where [the 120 in the church] were sitting” (Acts 2:2) and thus immersing the church in His overwhelmingly powerful presence.<sup>xxxvi</sup> Nevertheless, syntax and context demonstrate that the rendering of the Authorized Version and of English Bibles back to Tyndale<sup>xxxvii</sup> is correct in affirming that Christ performs Holy Ghost baptism *with* the Spirit.

Luke 11:13, although not employing the words “Spirit baptism,” likewise refers to the once-for-all coming of the Spirit recorded in Acts 2; no reference to any post-regeneration crisis, along the lines of the PCP position, are in view. Luke-Acts indicates that Christ personally had spoken to the disciples about Spirit baptism while on earth (Acts 1:4), but Luke 11:13 constitutes the only previous reference in Luke’s inspired record to which Acts 1:4 can refer. During Christ’s earthly ministry and before Pentecost, as recorded in the gospels, the potential existed for the Spirit to be asked for, to come for a particular purpose as He did in the Old Testament, and then to leave (cf. Judges 3:10; 6:34; 11:29). Before Pentecost, the Spirit was promised (Luke 11:13; John 14-16), temporarily given so that in the period of Christ’s bodily absence, but before the permanent arrival of the Spirit in Acts 2, a member of the Godhead would be with the church (John 20:22; cf. 16:7; 14:16-18),<sup>xxxviii</sup> and prayed for in the period between the

promise of His permanent coming and its fulfillment (Acts 1:14). Finally, the Holy Ghost permanently came to indwell the saints when Spirit baptism took place in Acts 2.<sup>xxxix</sup> No record exists in Acts of any post-Pentecost prayers along the lines of Luke 11:13 for the benefit of those who already possessed the indwelling Spirit, since the onset of His permanent abode in the saints made the dispensationally transitional action of praying for Him no longer necessary or appropriate.

Indeed, since Christ Himself prayed for the Spirit to come to permanently indwell the saints (John 14:16-17), the Father has certainly heard His Son's prayer as Mediator and, in light of the fact of Luke 11:13, has given the Spirit to the saints. The Spirit was "the promise of the Father" (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4), which Christ received from Him when He asked (Acts 2:33), and which the Father consequently gave to the saints for Christ's sake at Pentecost. If, before the Spirit permanently indwelt believers, the Father gave the Holy Ghost to those who asked for Him, how much more would He give the Spirit permanently to the saints when the Son asked for Him on their behalf? To affirm that one must still ask for the Spirit today, based on a misunderstanding of Luke 11:13, actually denies the efficacy of the prayers of that blessed Savior and Mediator who said, "thou [Father] hearest me always" (John 11:42), for He has already asked for and received the Spirit and given Him to His own.

Thus, Luke 11:13 refers to the receipt of the Spirit Himself<sup>xl</sup> by those who, in the time period when Christ spoke those words, asked for Him.<sup>xli</sup> No reference to greater ability to exercise spiritual gifts, or any other ministries or blessings from the Holy Ghost which will abide throughout the age of grace, is indicated by the verse. Christ promised that the Father would give, not blessings by the Spirit, or gifts from the Spirit, but, in response to urgent and continued prayer as recorded in Acts 1:14 (cf. Acts 8:15),<sup>xlii</sup> would "give the Holy Spirit" Himself. Luke 11:13 contrasts human parents, who repeatedly give good gifts to their children,<sup>xliii</sup> with God the Father, who, in Spirit baptism (as a one-time, yet future event in Luke 11:13),<sup>xliiv</sup> would give the Person of the Holy Spirit.<sup>xliv</sup> While, at the time of the Lord's discourse in Luke 11, parents were providing good gifts to their children, the Father's permanent giving of the Holy Spirit had not yet taken place, and it would not occur until the record of Spirit baptism in Acts, when Christ, having asked the Father for the Holy Ghost, gave the indwelling Spirit to His people.

As an examination of the grammar of Luke 11:13 itself supports a reference to Spirit baptism and the initial receipt of the Spirit, so the fulfillment of the verse in Acts also demonstrates that the Father's gift of the Holy Spirit is not a repeated event, but the one-time action of the initial receipt of the Spirit, first by Spirit baptism during the transitional period in Acts, and then in regeneration throughout the dispensation of grace.

One-time, non-continuous action, expressed by the Greek aorist, is the consistent language of Acts (Acts 5:32; 15:8) and the rest of the Bible (Romans 5:5; 2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5; 1 Thessalonians 4:8; 2 Timothy 1:7; 1 John 3:24)<sup>xlvi</sup> for the giving of the Spirit. Only in 1 John 4:13 is God's gift of the Spirit to an individual not expressed with the aorist; in that verse the perfect tense indicates that the Spirit was given in the past at a moment in time, and continues to dwell within His saints. There are no instances in the New Testament where continuing action tenses are employed for a particular individual's being given the Holy Ghost.<sup>xlvii</sup> In striking contrast, spiritual gifts from the Holy Ghost are expressed consistently with continuing action tenses.<sup>xlviii</sup> The recorded Scriptural fulfillment of the prayers indicated in Luke 11:13 demonstrates that, as the Lord intended, the saints prayed in the book of Acts for the coming of the Spirit (Acts 1:14; 8:15), and their prayers were answered in Spirit baptism (Acts 2:33; cf. Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4). Just as no Spirit-indwelt person in Acts ever prays that he would receive the Spirit, as mentioned in Luke 11:13, so the prayer specified in the verse is not appropriate for the universally Spirit-indwelt Christians (Romans 8:9) of today.<sup>xlix</sup> Those who are already indwelt by the Holy Ghost have no need to ask for Him whom they already have.<sup>1</sup>

### C. Spirit baptism in Acts

The first chapter of Acts evidences that the predictions by John the Baptist that the Messiah would baptize with the Holy Ghost were fulfilled on the day of Pentecost as recorded in Acts chapter two. Referencing these predictions, the risen Christ appeared to His disciples, "to whom . . . he shewed himself alive after his passion . . . being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with *them*, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, *saiith he*, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1:3-5). Spirit baptism, which would take place "not many days"<sup>li</sup> after Christ's ascension at the conclusion of the forty-day period when the Lord appeared to His church after His resurrection, was "the promise of the Father." While the Apostle John records an extensive discourse by Christ concerning the coming of the Comforter in the act of Spirit baptism (John 14-16; cf. 7:37-39), only Luke 11:13, in the Gospel written by Luke, records speech by Christ about Spirit baptism before His death, while Luke 24:49 records Christ's post-resurrection back to the promise of Luke 11:13<sup>lii</sup> that the Father would give the Holy Spirit. The "promise of the Father" mentioned in Acts 1:4 is the "promise of my Father" of Luke 24:49, the Holy Spirit, who would bring

the church “power from on high” (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8) to assist in her witnessing work (John 15:26-27; Acts 1:8) when He was sent by the ascended Christ as One to take His place on earth. When the church received the baptism of the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, she received the “power” spoken of in Acts 1:8; no individually received second blessing at a post-conversion crisis, along the lines of the PCP doctrine, is envisaged in Acts 1:8. Indeed, since Acts 1:8 employs the word *dunamis*, the verse is most likely a reference, not to the universal power that the Spirit gives to His saints in the church age in gospel preaching and Christian living, but to the miraculous power to perform signs and wonders that accompanied the Pentecostal outpouring of Acts 2 (cf. *dunamis* as “miracles” in 2:22).<sup>liii</sup> Acts chapter one thus affirms that the promised baptism of the Holy Ghost predicted by John and the Lord Jesus in the gospels would take place in Acts chapter two.

In Acts two, on the day of Pentecost, the ascended Christ sent the Comforter from heaven and baptized the church<sup>liv</sup> with the Holy Spirit. The corporate nature of this baptism is emphasized, among other indicators, through the consistent use of plural word forms (2:1-4, 6-7, 11, 13-15, 17-18, 32, etc.) and the mention that the Spirit, under the figure of wind, “filled all the house” where the 120 were (Acts 2:2), and gave every member of the church tongues of fire and miraculous tongues (2:3-4).<sup>lv</sup> The church, unified (v. 1, 41-47) and blessed by Christ, is emphasized at the beginning and end of the chapter (2:1, 47).<sup>lvi</sup> The arrival of the glory of God and the special presence of Jehovah, shown here by the permanent entrance of the Spirit into the church in the baptism “with the Holy Ghost and with fire” (Luke 3:16), parallels the coming of the fiery *shekinah* glory (Exodus 24:17) upon the tabernacle (Exodus 40:34-38; Leviticus 9:24), and upon Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 8:10-11; 2 Chronicles 5:13-14; 7:1-3),<sup>lvii</sup> even as His glory will come into the future Millennial temple (Ezekiel 43:2-5; 44:4). Spirit baptism validated the church as God’s institution for *latreia*—that is, holy service and worship—as the glory of God validated the tabernacle and Solomon’s temple.<sup>lviii</sup> And, as the coming of the *shekinah* on the institution for worship in the Old Testament was a one-time act with continuing results of the abiding presence of Jehovah, so Spirit baptism was a one-time act with the abiding result of the presence of the Triune God in the church.

The 120 members of the pre-Pentecost church (Acts 1:15), upon being baptized with the Spirit, received miraculous power to speak in tongues, prophesy,<sup>lix</sup> and do other signs and wonders (2:4, 17-19, 43). In accordance with the division of the book of Acts in 1:8 into Spirit-blessed witness in “Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth,” the Spirit, who came upon and validated the church to Jews in Acts 2, performed similar works in Acts 8 with Samaritans, in Acts 10 to Gentiles within the compass of the Promised Land (10:24) who were connected to

Judaism,<sup>lx</sup> and in Acts 19 to Gentiles outside of the Land with no previous connection to Judaism, representing the “uttermost parts of the earth.” As the baptism with the Spirit brought visible miraculous evidence, particularly the ability to speak in tongues, “which [those present could] see and hear” (Acts 2:33), so in Acts 8, Philip, who had already received the Spirit, did “miracles and signs” (Acts 8:13). Thus, the receipt of the Holy Ghost was again accompanied with visible evidence such as tongues speaking, which could be seen and heard (Acts 2:33), for “Simon *saw* that . . . the Holy Ghost was given” (Acts 8:18).<sup>lxi</sup> In Acts 10, “they of the circumcision which believed were astonished . . . because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God” (Acts 10:45-46).<sup>lxii</sup> The coming of the Spirit here was very obviously attended with miraculous ability to speak in unlearned foreign languages. Finally, when “the Holy Ghost came on them [who had just previously believed and been saved];<sup>lxiii</sup> . . . they spake with tongues, and prophesied” (Acts 19:6). The signs and wonders of Acts 2 accredited the church to the Jews, who require a sign (1 Corinthians 1:22), as the Lord’s new institution of service, replacing the Jerusalem temple (Matthew 23:38). Likewise, the miracles of Acts 8, 10, and 19, in each of which Jews were present, demonstrated that the Lord did indeed want Samaritans and Gentiles incorporated into His newly authenticated church. With the events of Acts 19, the progression of Acts 1:8 was complete—the miraculous coming of the Spirit as the inauguration of permanent Spirit-indwelling for the church and all saints in the age of grace had commenced. In each instance, Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, a particular group—Jews, Samaritans, Gentiles in the Promised Land with a connection to Judaism, and finally all other Gentiles—received the Spirit. In each instance, miraculous ability to speak in tongues and other external supernatural manifestations were evident. With the events of Acts 19, the dispensational transition of the coming of the Spirit was complete.

The Spirit’s being *poured out* or *shed forth* (Acts 2:17, 18, 33), employing the Greek verb *ekkeo* (ἐκκέω), is employed in Acts 2 in connection with Spirit baptism.<sup>lxiv</sup> This one-time event<sup>lxv</sup> where the Father, at the Son’s request, poured out the Holy Ghost in accordance with the prediction of Joel 2:28-32, is employed in Luke-Acts only for the unrepeatable event of Pentecost. This NT use of *ekkeo* is consistent with the facts that the Hebrew verb *shafach* (שָׁפַח), employed in Joel 2 and discussed above, “does not mean a gradual pouring as required, but rather a sudden, massive spillage,” that the LXX employs *ekkeo* to render *shafach* in the three passages where the latter verb is connected with the outpouring of the Spirit (Joel 2:28-29; Zechariah 12:10; Ezekiel 39:29), and that the Greek verb is not employed in the Greek Old Testament in connection with Spirit outpouring in any other passage. No other text in Luke-Acts connects the work of the

Spirit with *ekkeo*,<sup>lxvi</sup> although the closely related but distinct verb *ekkunno* (ἐκχύννω)<sup>lxvii</sup> is employed in Acts 10:45 for the closely related but distinct miraculous work of the Spirit on the Gentiles in Acts 10. When “the Holy Ghost . . . [was] shed forth” or poured out, visible miracles, “which ye now see and hear,” were connected with the event (Acts 2:33). Thus, the outpouring of the Spirit was for those already converted and already church members, it took place once for the entire church age in Acts chapter two, and it was accompanied with signs and wonders. For the Spirit to be outpoured again, He would have to leave the earth, which He will not do for the entire dispensation of grace. However, after He is removed at the Rapture, He will be outpoured again on Israel in the Tribulation in the ultimate fulfillment of Joel chapter two.

In contrast to the once-for-all outpouring of the Spirit on the church for the entirety of the dispensation of grace in Acts 2, when the Spirit’s validation of Samaritans<sup>lxviii</sup> and Gentiles as fit members of the NT church in Acts 8 and 10 is in view, the Spirit is said to *fall upon* (ἐπιπίπτω) them after their conversion (Acts 8:16; 10:44; 11:15). Christ baptized the church with the Spirit directly and immediately in Acts 2, and the benefits of this one-time event were transmitted mediately through the apostles to Samaritans and Gentiles in Acts 8, 10, and 19, explaining the connection of the miraculous fruits of Spirit baptism in connection with the laying on of apostolic hands. The uniqueness of Acts 2, as the actual and unrepeatably act of Spirit baptism, is supported by the appearances of tongues of fire on each member of the pre-Pentecost church (2:2-3), a miracle not repeated in the coming of the Spirit on the groups in Acts 8, 10, and 19. The Spirit fell upon the Samaritans subsequent to both faith and baptism in Acts 8, and the Greek construction employed for the Spirit’s falling upon men in 8:16 suggests that the falling took place at one point in time, with abiding results.<sup>lxix</sup> Furthermore, no text in Acts or elsewhere in the New Testament portrays the Spirit as repeatedly falling upon anyone.<sup>lxx</sup> One would have expected the Spirit to fall upon the Gentiles in Acts 10 after their faith and baptism as well, but Peter and his Jewish brethren would never have accepted the immersion of Gentiles had the Spirit not come on them first; as it was, they “were astonished” that the Spirit had fallen upon the Gentiles (10:45) but recognized the fact as proof that God wanted them added to the church by immersion, which they consequently performed (10:47-48)—although even in this situation the addition of uncircumcised Gentiles to the church was an occasion of trouble which Peter needed to explain and defend (11:3ff.). In both Acts 8 and 10, the Spirit fell upon the Samaritans and Gentiles subsequent to the point of their faith in Christ, with an emphasis upon them as a corporate body, rather than as individuals, just as in Acts 2 and 19 the coming of the Spirit took place after saving faith.<sup>lxxi</sup> Since Peter states, “the Holy

Ghost fell on them [Gentiles, Acts 10], as on us [Jews, Acts 2] at the beginning” (Acts 11:15), the book of Acts indicates that it is appropriate to view the pouring out of the Holy Ghost on the church in Acts 2 as another instance of the Spirit falling upon a body of people. It is likely that the *falling upon* terminology emphasizes the coming of the Spirit from heaven upon a particular group of believers and is thus appropriately employed for any of the miraculous bestowals of the Spirit recorded in Acts 2, 8, 10 and 19. However, this terminology is never employed for the receipt of the Spirit by individuals at the moment of conversion; nor is it ever found apart from the miraculous bestowal of the gift of tongues; nor is it ever connected with any kind of PCP blessing on those already Spirit-indwelt.

In Acts two, the Spirit was *poured out* on the 120 pre-Pentecost church members, but Acts 2:38 promised those who “repent . . . [that they] shall *receive* [λαμβάνω] the gift of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>lxxxii</sup> *Receive* terminology is employed both for the indwelling of the Spirit experienced by all believers after the transitional period connected with the baptism of the Holy Ghost in Acts, which was not connected with signs and wonders (cf. Romans 8:9), and for the commencement of His indwelling in those who experienced Spirit baptism and its concomitant speaking in tongues. Thus, the Spirit was *received* by the 3000 men converted on Pentecost, but He was *poured out* also (and in this manner likewise *received*) by the 120 members of the pre-Pentecost church. There is no evidence that the 3000 spoke in tongues or manifested any miraculous gifts when they repented, or at any subsequent point whatever, other than the certain manifestation of the miraculously bestowed new nature bestowed on all saints in regeneration (2:41-47; 2 Corinthians 5:17). Christ received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost (2:33), and the Son gives the Spirit to all who find salvation (2:38-39), but the “promise” (2:39) of the possession of the Holy Ghost is of Him as a Person, not of some particular manner of His coming, such as Spirit baptism with its accompanying signs and wonders. *Receipt* of the Spirit is thus specified as a gift for believers throughout the dispensation of grace; the Spirit is received at the point of conversion or regeneration (John 3:5) in Luke-Acts (Acts 2:38) and elsewhere in Scripture (John 7:39; Galatians 3:14). However, *receive* language is also used for the action of the Spirit’s falling upon men in the dispensationally transitional events accompanied with miraculous phenomena in Acts 2, 8, and 10 (Acts 8:15-19; 10:47; cf. Acts 19:2, 6; John 20:22).

The baptism of the Holy Ghost, accompanied with tongues speaking,<sup>lxxxiii</sup> is also associated with the Spirit’s *coming upon* (ἐπέρχομαι . . . ἐπί) the church in Acts 1:8. Consequently, this language is employed in the beginning of Acts for the miraculous coming of the Spirit and is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in the beginning

of Luke's gospel, where the miraculous work of the Spirit within Mary is associated with the coming of the Son into the world (Luke 1:35).<sup>lxxiv</sup> The miraculous coming of the Spirit associated with tongues speaking, as found in Acts 19:6, employs similar—but not identical—“coming upon” language (ἐρχομαι . . . ἐπί), found elsewhere in the NT (yet cf. Ezekiel 2:2; 3:24, 37:9; Wisdom 7:7; LXX) only in the record of Christ's baptism with its associated visibly miraculous manifestation of the Spirit (Matthew 3:16). The pneumatological *coming upon* language of Acts is thus appropriately considered as necessarily accompanied with signs and wonders.

The historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism fits the evidence found in the book of Acts. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was the validation of the church as God's new institution for worship, comparable to the coming of the *shekinah* into the tabernacle and temple in the Old Testament. Accompanied by miraculous signs and wonders, Christ baptized the church as a one-time event in Acts two on the day of Pentecost. As the Jewish church of Pentecost spread to the Samaritans (Acts 8), Gentiles connected with Judaism and in the Promised Land (Acts 10), and Gentiles without any previous Jewish connection (Acts 19), the Spirit came upon these new groups with similar signs and wonders, although mediately through the apostles as representatives and leaders of the church, in fulfillment of the outline provided in Acts 1:8. With the immediate baptism of the church by Christ in Acts 2, and the coming of the Spirit as mediated by the apostles on the groups in Acts 8, 10, and 19, Spirit baptism was complete, never to be repeated in the church age. The evidence of the book of Acts contradicts the UCD view. Spirit baptism was corporate, not individual. It was a post-conversion event, not one synonymous with conversion. It was always associated with miraculous signs and wonders including tongues, while tongues and other miraculous gifts have now ceased (1 Corinthians 13:8).<sup>lxxv</sup> Spirit baptism took place after the moment of faith and, with one exception, after baptism as well; it did not take place at the moment of saving faith. It was associated with the historically completed sending of the Comforter, and was very far from being an act unaccompanied by visible miraculous phenomena that is repeated until the Rapture whenever a sinner is regenerated. The evidence of the book of Acts also contradicts the PCP view. PCPs interpret Spirit baptism as an individual, not corporate event. Most PCPs do not claim that they receive the same ability to do miracles, signs, and wonders as were found in Acts, while the evidence belies the claims of those that do so claim.<sup>lxxvi</sup> Furthermore, the Comforter has already come to indwell the church, so Spirit baptism simply does not happen today. Only the historic Baptist doctrine of Spirit baptism fits the evidence of the book of Acts.

#### D. Spirit baptism: The alleged reference in 1 Corinthians 12:13

1 Corinthians 12:13 is the lynchpin upon which the structure of UCD doctrine of Spirit baptism is based.<sup>lxxvii</sup> Deprived of the verse, it is very difficult to even attempt to defend it exegetically. The verse reads, “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”<sup>lxxviii</sup> UCDs argue that “in this dispensation those who place their faith in Jesus Christ have been baptized into the body of Christ, both Jew and Gentile, and are now seen as one in the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12–13). . . . According to 1 Corinthians 12:13, it is the Spirit who baptizes Jew and Gentile into one body.”<sup>lxxix</sup> The UCD affirms: “Every believer is baptized by the Spirit[.] . . . The Spirit forms the church . . . by baptizing all believers into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:12, 13).”<sup>lxxx</sup> However, 1 Corinthians 12:13 teaches nothing of the kind.

In 1 Corinthians 12:13, Paul teaches that the members of the church at Corinth, led by the Holy Spirit, were all baptized in water to join the membership of that local assembly—the particular congregation, not a non-existent universal church, being the body of Christ—and that all the members of that assembly partook of the common blessing of the Lord’s Supper. The theological division between UCDs and historic Baptists on the significance of 1 Corinthians 12:13 may be resolved into the following elenctics: a.) Is the body of Christ the visible congregation or a universal, invisible church? b.) Does Christ baptize with the Spirit, or does the Holy Spirit baptize? c.) Was Spirit baptism a completed historical phenomenon at the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, or is it an event that takes place regularly throughout the entire dispensation of grace?

a.) Is the body of Christ the visible congregation or a universal, invisible church?

The body of Christ, referred to in 1 Corinthians 12:13, is the particular, local assembly. It is not a universal and invisible church, because no such entity is found in the New Testament. While a discussion of the many proofs of the unscriptural nature of the universal church dogma would go beyond the boundaries of the present composition,<sup>lxxxi</sup> it will briefly be noted that the word translated *church*, *ekklesia* (ἐκκλησία), is never used for a universal, invisible entity in any of its 115 appearances in the New Testament.<sup>lxxxii</sup> The LXX, in accord with the significance of the word in classical Greek, likewise employs *ekklesia* of local, visible assemblies, not of anything unassembled<sup>lxxxiii</sup> and invisible.<sup>lxxxiv</sup> While the *family of God* is a universal, invisible entity that consists of all believers everywhere (Galatians 3:26), a *church* is a particular,

local, visible congregation. The major metaphors for the church also demonstrate that the idea of a universal, invisible church is false. The church is Christ's body (1 Corinthians 12:27), His temple (1 Timothy 3:15), and His bride (2 Corinthians 11:2).<sup>lxxxv</sup> Bodies are very local and visible—sundry piles of flesh and bones scattered around the globe do not constitute a body. A temple rests in one particular location, available for everyone to see, but bricks scattered everywhere are not a building at all. And certainly every man on his wedding day rejoices that his bride is very local and visible, not invisible or cut into little pieces which are scattered all over the earth! Christ's church is not a building, a denomination, or something universal and invisible; it is a particular assembly of baptized saints.

Furthermore, the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12:13 demonstrates that the body metaphor refers to the particular congregation. First Corinthians 12:27, the only verse in the New Testament that defines the body of Christ, addresses the particular congregation at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:2) and states, "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular." The Pauline exhortation to unity in 1 Corinthians makes it evident that the apostle employed the body metaphor to emphasize the need for real oneness among the brethren in the city of Corinth. His purpose was not to teach some sort of theoretical church-unity between believers at Corinth, Ephesus, Galatia, and everywhere else. In 12:14-27, Paul tells the members of the Corinthian congregation that each of them is required for the smooth function of the assembly—one is like an eye, the other like a hand, another like a nose, and their united functionality underneath the direction of Christ the Head (Ephesians 1:22-23) is necessary for their congregational "body" to work effectively, just as united functionality of literal body parts is necessary for a healthy human body. The local sense of "body" in verses 14-27 is directly tied to the statement of verse 13 by the explanatory word *for* and requires a local sense of the body metaphor in 12:13. Furthermore, universalizing the Pauline image to make members of the congregation at Corinth into parts of a body cut up into pieces all over the world would not only violate the necessarily localized nature of a living body but would do nothing to advance Paul's purpose of promoting Corinthian unity. Rather, a universal body would have further contributed to Corinthian division, as today the Protestant universal church doctrine, when adopted by Baptist churches, contributes to a neglect of, disrespect for, and a failure to adequately strive for genuine, Scriptural unity within particular assemblies. First Corinthians 12:13 cannot refer to the Spirit's placing someone into the universal, invisible church as the body of Christ, because the body of Christ is the local, visible assembly in the context of 1 Corinthians 12 and in the rest of the New Testament.

First Corinthians 12:25 states that there should be no schism in the body (cf. Ephesians 4:3-4). If all believers are the body of Christ and unity is commanded in the body, then it would be a sin for a fundamental Baptist to separate from any believer whatsoever, whether he is part of the church of Rome, is committing the grossest forms of sexual immorality, or is a terribly compromised neo-evangelical, for such separation would be sowing discord in the body of Christ. Ecclesiastical separation from any believer would be sin. However, such a conclusion directly contradicts the Biblical imperative to separate from disobedient brethren (2 Thessalonians 3:6, 14) and the example within 1 Corinthians itself of separation from an errant believer (5:1-5). The UCD position cannot consistently apply the Biblical standard of unity to its universal “church” and practice the Biblical doctrine of separation.<sup>lxxxvi</sup> Indeed, an examination of the nature of the genuine unity in orthodoxy and orthopraxy commanded within the assembly (Ephesians 4:3-16) demonstrates that the tremendous discord of doctrine and practice within the alleged universal “church” has very little to do with the Bible. Since the body of Christ is the visible and local assembly, the conflict inherent in the UCD view is removed by the historic Baptist doctrine, for an imperative for unity within an assembly of the Lord’s people is entirely consistent with the removal of a disobedient or doctrinally errant brother from a congregation by church discipline.

An advocate of the UCD view might allege that the use of “we” in 1 Corinthians 12:13 demonstrates that Paul was claiming to be part of the same body as the Corinthians, thus validating the UCD asseveration that the body of Christ is all believers worldwide. However, there is no reason to conclude that Paul’s “we” means that the apostle was part of the same body as the Corinthian church. Paul had been water baptized into one local body, just as the Corinthians had been immersed into one local body. A Baptist pastor who holds to local-only ecclesiology can easily say to Baptist brethren from other assemblies, “we have all been baptized into one body,” because all those he addresses thus have indeed been immersed into the membership of the several churches in view. No implication that the various Baptist churches were truly one big church made up of all of the churches put together would follow from such a statement. Why then would Paul’s “we [are] all baptized into one body” do so? Cannot Paul identify himself with his readers in such a manner in 1 Corinthians 12:13? Does he not identify with his audience in this way with some frequency in his epistles?

Even if one did not accept the explanation above for Paul’s *we* in 1 Corinthians 12:13, a speaker or writer may at times employ *we* without including himself. A teacher in a classroom might say to his students, “If we break the rules, we will be in big trouble,” but he clearly addressed the students alone in such a situation. A fundamentalist

preacher may say, “If we do not get saved, we will go to hell,” but one certainly hopes that he does not make such a statement because he is himself yet unconverted. Such a sense of *we* has New Testament support.<sup>lxxxvii</sup> The use of the first person plural pronoun in 1 Corinthians 12:13 does not prove that the verse refers to a universal, invisible church.

Paul’s use of both “we” and “body” in 1 Corinthians 12:12-13 refer back to the usage of 1 Corinthians 10:16-17: “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we *being* many are one bread, *and* one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.”<sup>lxxxviii</sup> The thematic connection between 1 Corinthians 12:13, a verse (as explicated below) about unity around the church ordinances—including the Supper, as expressed by “drink into one Spirit,” and 1 Corinthians 10:16-17, the previous passage about unity around the Supper that begins Paul’s discussion of this topic (as elaborated in more depth in chapter 11)—is confirmed by the linguistic connection through the use of “cup”<sup>lxxxix</sup> and “made drink,”<sup>xc</sup> the repeated “one,”<sup>xcii</sup> “body,”<sup>xciii</sup> “we all,”<sup>xciii</sup> and the phrases referring to the unity of the many (οἱ πολλοί) into one.<sup>xciv</sup> First Corinthians 10:16-17 provides a strong precontext for the use of “we” in 1 Corinthians 12:13. However, in 10:16-17 the use of the singular in the phrases “the cup” and “the bread” do not establish that every member of the Corinthian assembly, along with the Apostle Paul, together broke only a single piece of bread into tiny pieces and drank out of only a single cup when they took the Lord’s supper together (so that Paul, although not present with them, still drank from the same cup as the Corinthians and ate the same piece of bread). Rather, the words emphasize the generic category of “bread” and “cup” in connection with the generic Greek article.<sup>xcv</sup> One who wished to deny the categorical or generic use of the articular words “bread” and “cup” would also, for consistency, need to affirm that the assembly used the same loaf of bread every time they celebrated communion, in light of the customary present tense<sup>xcvi</sup> verbs employed in 10:16-17 to indicate the repeated, continuing action of the celebration of the Supper.<sup>xcvii</sup> It would be a wonder indeed, on this view, that the one piece of bread eaten by every member of the congregation every time the Supper was celebrated never was used up—it must have been exceedingly large to begin with and required a very large oven to bake. As “the bread” did not indicate that there was only one piece of bread—and certainly not a universal, invisible piece of bread—no more does “the body” of 1 Corinthians 12:13 indicate a solitary body, much less a universal, invisible body for Christ. The nouns “bread,” “cup,” and “body” are all generic nouns. Likewise the uses of “we” in both 10:16-17 and 12:13 are generic references indicating what typically happened in the

congregation at Corinth. The “we” of 10:16 did not require that every member of the Corinthian church was present and participated every time the Supper was celebrated—some were doubtless not in the assembly on any given occasion because of sickness, travel, or other such reasons; those who were holding on to sin had no right to partake; and Paul, who wrote the “we,” was not in Corinth at all. If the “we” in 10:16-17 (and in the very closely related reference to the Supper in 12:13 in “we . . . have been made to drink”) does not even require the inclusion of every member of the Corinthian assembly, how much less does it require the inclusion of the Apostle Paul? Was Paul present with the church at Corinth, and thus included in the “we . . . break . . . bread” of 10:16-17, every time that assembly celebrated communion? If not, how can the “we [are] . . . one body” of 10:17 or the “we” and “body” of 12:13 establish that Paul and the Corinthian church members were part of the same church body—a supposed universal, invisible church which cannot be exegetically established from the meaning of the word *ekklesia*, the clear use of the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians 12:13-27 for the particular, local assembly, and any reasonable understanding of the necessarily localized nature of a body? The *we* in both 1 Corinthians 10:16-17 and 12:13 simply establishes that the respective actions indicated in the respective passages were going on among the Corinthians and with the apostle Paul. The word emphasizes the fellowship around the church ordinances among the members of the church at Corinth in both passages.

One cannot affirm that Christ has both a universal, invisible body and a local, visible one, and that 1 Corinthians 12:13 speaks of the universal body but 12:27 of the local one, since the metaphor of the body of Christ is not bifurcated: Christ has but one body (Ephesians 4:4).<sup>xviii</sup> Additionally, even if Scripture taught—which it does not—the existence of a universal body of Christ, it would be impossible to contextually support a universal reference in 1 Corinthians 12:13. Where in the flow of v. 13-27 would Paul change from speech about the allegedly universal body of Christ to the local body clearly in view in v. 27? What part of the body metaphor in v. 14-26 is local, and which universal? No acceptable answer exists. Both the fact that there is but one type of body of Christ and the unity of 1 Corinthians 12:13-27 obliterate the UCD view of 1 Corinthians 12:13.

First Corinthians 12:27 defines the body of Christ as an ecclesiological metaphor, but the UCD makes the body of Christ soteriological. The UCD view thus confuses ecclesiology and soteriology. This confusion suits the historical development of the universal church doctrine; post-apostolic, proto-Popish apostasy from the faith developed the idea of a universal or catholic church<sup>xcix</sup> and the related idea encapsulated in the Cyprianic formulation *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, “Outside the church there is no

salvation.” The Protestant movement transferred the notion of the essentiality of church membership to salvation from the visible universal (catholic) church concept of Rome to the allegedly invisible universal church,<sup>c</sup> a view adopted by UCDs in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Historic Baptists, following Scripture, reject entirely the notion that there is no salvation outside of the church, maintaining rather that one must be saved before he can properly join the local, visible congregation, the only church that exists, and that salvation is not conjoined to membership in either a universal visible or invisible church, since such concepts are not taught in the Bible. The confusion of ecclesiology and soteriology involved in the UCD view of 1 Corinthians 12:13, but avoided in the historic Baptist view of the text, demonstrates the superiority of the latter.

The first commentary we have on the Corinthian epistles, 1 Clement, written by the pastor of the church at Rome to the Corinthian church around the turn of the first century, understands the metaphor of the church as “body” in a local sense, not a universal one (37:5; 38:1; 46:7). Contrary to later patristic baptismal regeneration, universal ecclesiology, hierarchicalism, works salvation, and other grievous heresies, Clement’s epistle evidences local-only ecclesiology, congregational church government, the unity of the office of presbyter/bishop, justification by faith, and other Baptist doctrines.<sup>ci</sup> Thus, the earliest known historical commentary on the body metaphor, composed only decades after Paul wrote his epistle, supports the historic Baptist view of the body metaphor against the UCD position.

The fact that the church of Christ is only a local, visible institution, the fact that the body of Christ metaphor throughout the New Testament is employed for the particular congregation, the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12, the nullification of the Scriptural doctrine of separation involved in the UCD position, the fact that there is but one type of church body, the confusion of soteriology and ecclesiology involved in the UCD doctrine, and the evidence of 1<sup>st</sup> century extra-canonical Christian understanding of the body metaphor all tell heavily against the UCD view of 1 Corinthians 12:13. Certain of these evidences, of themselves, make the UCD view of the verse entirely impossible. Moreover, alleged proof of the UCD view from the use of *we* in the verse falls very short. First Corinthians 12:13 cannot teach that the Holy Spirit baptizes people into the universal, invisible body of Christ, because there is no universal, invisible body of Christ. The UCD view does not affirm that the Spirit baptizes people into the membership of local assemblies, but the body of 1 Corinthians 12:13 is the local, visible congregation. Thus, the UCD view is not taught in 1 Corinthians 12:13. The historic Baptist understanding of the verse avoids all the problems in the UCD position and gives a satisfactory and consistent understanding of 1 Corinthians 12.

b.) Does Christ baptize with the Spirit, or does the Holy Spirit baptize?

An examination of the gospel accounts of the promise of Spirit baptism manifest that Christ is the One who baptizes with the Spirit; the Spirit is not said to baptize anyone. In Matthew 3:11 (cf. Mark 1:7-8; Luke 3:16) John the Baptist predicted, “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 likewise stated that “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” (John 1:33). These are all the explicit references to baptism with the Holy Spirit in the gospels, and Christ is the agent performing the baptism in every case, while the Holy Spirit is the means or instrument<sup>cii</sup> through which the baptism takes place. The fact that Spirit baptism took place when Christ, in conjunction with the Father, sent the Comforter—the Holy Ghost (John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; Acts 1:4-8)—to abide with the church at Pentecost (Acts 2) also demonstrates that the Lord Jesus, not the third member of the Trinity, is the agent in Spirit baptism. In Acts 1:5, referring back to these predictions and forward to their fulfillment on the day of Pentecost, the Lord Jesus stated, “John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.” Again, the Holy Spirit is not the agent performing the baptism, but the medium or instrumentality whereby Christ baptizes. The evidence in the gospels and Acts is uniformly against the Holy Ghost being the agent in Spirit baptism.

Both the Old Testament prediction of Spirit baptism and the statement of fulfillment in Acts, employing the language of the Spirit being “poured out,” deny the agency of the Holy Ghost in Spirit baptism. Jehovah affirms in Joel 2:28-29, “I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.”<sup>ciii</sup> On Pentecost, Peter referenced this text, stating that “God [promised], I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.” Consistent with the Old Testament, Peter affirmed that the Spirit did not pour Himself out in the action of Spirit baptism. The Holy Spirit was poured out by the other two members of the Trinity, the Father (Acts 2:17-18) and the Son (Acts 2:33).

The UCD view of 1 Corinthians 12:13 avers that the Spirit baptism allegedly set forth in the text is performed by the agency of the Holy Ghost. Such a view of the text disregards the Old Testament predictions of Spirit baptism and contradicts every statement concerning the nature of this baptism in the gospels and in Acts. The historic Baptist view avoids these extreme hermeneutical difficulties by correctly recognizing that Christ was the agent in the completed action of Spirit baptism and 1 Corinthians 12:13 speaks not of baptism with the Holy Ghost but of the immersion in water through which a believer is united to the membership of a local, visible church body.

c.) Was Spirit baptism a completed historical phenomenon at the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, or is it an event that takes place regularly throughout the entire dispensation of grace?

In his epistle to the Ephesians, Paul indicates that there was but “one baptism” (Ephesians 4:5), demonstrating that by the time he wrote the epistle (c. A. D. 57-62) Spirit baptism was already a completed historical phenomenon and only immersion in water remained for the rest of the age of grace.<sup>ciiv</sup> In fact, the cessation of Spirit baptism had already occurred by the time 1 Corinthians was written (c. A. D. 54); for, subsequent to the events of Acts 19:1-7—or, more properly, after Acts 2 itself—Spirit baptism ended, having fulfilled its purpose.<sup>cv</sup> Because the Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles had received the Spirit (Acts 1:5, 8; 2; 8; 10; 19), the dispensational transition connected to the baptism of the Holy Ghost was complete, and all who subsequently came to faith received the Spirit immediately at the moment of their regeneration (Romans 8:9). Christ baptizes no further groups or individuals with the Spirit. While Spirit baptism was a transitional event, and nothing in Scripture states or hints that it would continue until the end of the church age, the Lord Jesus specifically declared that water baptism would continue to be practiced by His church until His return (Matthew 28:18-20; Mark 16:15-16). For the entirety of the dispensation of grace, immersion in water is commanded; but no such command is found for the transitional and passing event of Spirit baptism. “Repent and be baptized” in water (Acts 2:38, 41; 8:12, 36-39; 16:13-15, 32-33; 18:8; 22:16) is the continuing, enduring order from heaven, and refusal to do so is to reject the counsel of God (Luke 7:29-30). Thus, when Ephesians 4:5 indicates that one baptism, not two,<sup>cvi</sup> was extant at the time of its composition, Spirit baptism must by that time have passed away.<sup>cvi</sup> Water baptism could not have ceased, since it is to continue until the return of Christ and is mentioned in epistles composed after Ephesians (cf. 1 Peter 3:21). Had both water and Spirit baptism been continuing events at the time the book of

Ephesians was written, Ephesians 4:5 would have read, “one Lord, one faith, two baptisms.” Ephesians 4:5, therefore, demonstrates that Spirit baptism had ceased. This cessation of Spirit baptism also explains the entire absence of reference to it as an ongoing work in the New Testament epistles—indeed, to an almost total absence of reference to Spirit baptism in the epistles at all.<sup>cviii</sup>

The UCD view that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to the Holy Spirit’s baptizing believers into the universal church, the body of Christ, cannot be sustained. Scripture teaches that there is no universal church into which the Holy Spirit can baptize believers. Furthermore, Christ, not the Holy Ghost, is the agent in Spirit baptism. Moreover, Spirit baptism had already ceased at the time 1 Corinthians was written, never again to take place during the church age, while water baptism was ongoing in 1 Corinthians itself (cf. 1:14ff.), enduring until the return of Christ. In sum, the problems of the UCD view of Spirit baptism are avoided by the historic Baptist view, for it is the position taught in the Bible.

#### d.) The Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:13

First Corinthians 12:13 reads, “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.”<sup>cix</sup> The clauses of this passage will be examined in order and their significance evaluated.

“For by one Spirit”: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ Πνεύματι

The historic Baptist position affirms that this clause refers to the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit, as do both the PCP and UCD doctrine. This clause, in the Biblical, historic Baptist view, refers to the Holy Spirit’s leading the members of the church at Corinth to submit to water baptism. Although the members of the Corinthian assembly boasted about the amazing spiritual gifts given them by the Spirit and caused division in the assembly on account of those gifts, the Apostle Paul reminded the congregation that the Holy Spirit had led the members of their church to submit to a common immersion with the phrase “by one Spirit.” First Corinthians 12:13 affirms that the Holy Spirit is the Producer of congregational unity around the ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

Various commentators and writers have advanced the idea that *by* in the verse should be translated *in* and have consequently affirmed either that the correct translation

is either “in one Spirit” or “in one spirit.” The question of a reference to the Holy Spirit, or a “spirit,”<sup>cx</sup> and of the rendition of *en* as *by* or *in*, will be addressed in order.

Thomas Strouse, Baptist seminary professor and advocate of Spirit baptism as a completed historical event, commented concerning 1 Corinthians 12:13:

Paul employed the expression “by one Spirit” (*en heni pneumatī*) in Phil. 1:27 as “in one spirit,” referring to “the spirit of unity.” Since *pneumatī* is anarthrous in I Cor. 12:13, Paul differentiated *pneumatī* (“spirit”) from the seven previous articular references to “the Spirit” (*to pneumatī*) as deity.<sup>cx1</sup>

Strouse affirms that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to a “spirit of unity” that the assembly possessed when its members received water baptism, rather than to the Holy Spirit leading the members of the assembly to receive immersion. However, the idea that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to “a spirit” of unity rather than the third Person in the Trinity cannot be sustained exegetically.

First, the immediate context provides overwhelming support for a reference to the Holy Spirit in 1 Corinthians 12:13. Consider 12:3-13:

Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking **by the Spirit of God** calleth Jesus accursed: and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but **by the Holy Ghost**. Now there are diversities of gifts, but **the same Spirit**. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of **the Spirit** is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given **by the Spirit** the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge **by the same Spirit**; To another faith **by the same Spirit**; to another the gifts of healing **by the same Spirit**; To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another *divers* kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: But all these **worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit**, dividing to every man severally as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also *is* Christ. For **by one Spirit** are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into **one Spirit**.<sup>cxii</sup>

The eleven references to the word *pneuma*, “Spirit/spirit,” in 1 Corinthians 12:3-13, uniformly refer to the Holy Spirit. Changing “by one Spirit” to “in one spirit of unity” in v. 13 is very contrary to the context. For that matter, the “one Spirit” of v. 13 is the “one and the selfsame Spirit” who “worketh . . . as he will” in v. 11. The explanatory words “for” in v. 12 & 13 connect the reference to the “one Spirit” (*hen Pneuma*) of v. 13 immediately back to the “one . . . Spirit” (*hen . . . Pneuma*) of v. 11. Since v. 11 refers to the Holy Spirit, v. 13 refers to the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, that the second half of 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to “drink[ing] into one Spirit,” the Holy Spirit, not a “spirit of unity,” confirms the reference to the Holy Spirit in the first half.<sup>cxiii</sup> The overwhelming evidence of eleven references to the Holy Spirit in the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12:13, the fact that v. 13 explains and develops the reference to the Holy Spirit in v. 11, and the evidence of the second half of v. 13, prove that 1 Corinthians 12:13a refers to the Holy Spirit, not to a “spirit of unity.”

Furthermore, the word “spirit” is not employed anywhere in Scripture as a reference to a “spirit of unity.” If 1 Corinthians 12:13 referred to such a thing, it would be absolutely unique in Scripture in doing so. An alleged parallel to Philippians 1:27 fails because the latter passage refers to the human spirit, as is made obvious by the immediately following reference to another portion of the human person, the mind or soul: “I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit [*en henī pneumatī*], with one mind [*mīa pseuche*] striving together for the faith of the gospel.”<sup>cxiv</sup> Philippians 1:27, along with the similar reference in Acts 4:32 to “the multitude of them that believed [being] of one heart and of one soul,”<sup>cxv</sup> do indeed emphasize unity in the assembly, as in both verses the inner beings, the minds, souls, hearts, and spirits, of the members of the church were to be in agreement as they strove together to serve the Lord. Nonetheless, Philippians 1:27 and Acts 4:32 do not refer to a “spirit of unity” anymore than they do to a “soul of unity” or a “heart of unity.” Thus, unless one wishes to make 1 Corinthians 12:13 into a reference to being baptized and drinking into the human soul and spirit—which would require a definite mental stretch to produce any reasonable signification—there is no parallel whatever between 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Philippians 1:27 in the use of the word *pneuma*, “Spirit/spirit,” as a reference to a “spirit of unity.” None of the 385 references to the word *pneuma* in the New Testament refers to a “spirit of unity.” A very large number of the references to *pneuma*—including ten instances other than 1 Corinthians 12:13a in 12:3-13—refer to God the Holy Spirit.

Strouse’s statement, “Since *pneumatī* is anarthrous in I Cor. 12:13, Paul differentiated *pneumatī* (“spirit”) from the seven<sup>cxvi</sup> previous articular references to ‘the Spirit’ (*to pneumatī*) as deity” cannot be sustained. Several rules of Greek grammar demonstrate that there is no reason to require an article to make “by one Spirit” have a definite signification. Daniel Wallace, in his *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, writes:

The function of the article is *not* primarily to make something definite that would otherwise be indefinite. . . . It is not necessary for a noun to have the article in order for it to be definite. . . . there are at least ten constructions in which a noun may be definite though anarthrous. . . . [A] proper name is definite without the article. . . . There is no need for the article to be used to make the object of a preposition definite. . . . [they are only] occasionally indefinite . . . Thus, when a noun is the object of a preposition, it does not require the article to be definite: if it has the article, it must be definite; if it lacks the article, it may be definite. The reason for the article, then, is usually for other purposes (such as anaphora or as a function marker). . . . [Furthermore,] [a] one-of-a-kind noun does not, of course, require the article to be definite (e.g., “sun,” “earth,” “devil,” etc.). One might consider *πνεῦμα* as monadic when it is modified by the adjective *ἄγιον*. If so, then the expression *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* is monadic and refers only to *the* Holy Spirit.<sup>cxvii</sup>

A reference to the name of the monadic Spirit of God,<sup>cxviii</sup> with Spirit as the object of the preposition “by,” has no need of the Greek article to express definiteness. To argue otherwise neglects important characteristics of Greek syntax.

Furthermore, not all the references to the Spirit of God in 1 Corinthians 12:3-13 contain the Greek article. In 12:3, the Holy Spirit is twice mentioned without an article, both instances following the same preposition (*en*) employed in 12:13.<sup>cxix</sup> Furthermore, the Spirit of God is referred to without the Greek article following *en* (and in a variety of other constructions, naturally, 7:40, etc.) elsewhere in 1 Corinthians (2:4, 13; 6:19). In fact, the construction *en heis*, “in/by one,” is never followed by the Greek article in the epistles of Paul or, for that matter, in any of the New Testament outside of Luke’s gospel<sup>cxx</sup>—but one could not properly supply the English indefinite article after any of the Greek nonarticular *en heis* constructions.

First Corinthians 12:13a of necessity refers to the Holy Spirit. The connection of v. 13 to v. 11 and the eleven uses of *pneuma* for the Holy Spirit in the immediate context compel this conclusion. Arguments in favor of an alternative reading of the text as a reference to a “spirit of unity” fall far short of dismantling the contextual evidence for a designation of the Holy Spirit. Scripture does not refer to a “spirit of unity” with the word *pneuma* anywhere in the Bible. Syntactical asseverations against a reference to the Spirit of God in 1 Corinthians 12:13a entirely fail to establish their conclusions. Indubitably, reference to the great God, the Holy Spirit, must not be removed from 1 Corinthians 12:13a.

Since the Holy Spirit, not any kind of other “spirit,” is found in the first clause of 1 Corinthians 12:13, the question arises whether the sense of *en heni Pneumati* is “by one Spirit,” as in the King James Version, or “in one Spirit.” Should the Greek preposition *en* be translated here as “by” or “in”? Arthur Pink, arguing in favor of an “in one spirit” position, wrote:

[T]he preposition translated ‘by’ in 1 Corinthians 12:13 is ‘en,’ which is translated in the N. T. ‘among’ 114 times, ‘by’ 142, ‘with’ 139, [and] ‘in’ 1863 times. Comment is needless. ‘In one spirit were we all baptized’ should be the rendering of 1 Corinthians 12:13.<sup>cxxi</sup>

Pink expresses the single major argument against the reading of the Authorized Version—the preposition *en* is translated *in* more frequently<sup>cxii</sup> than it is translated *by*. This, however, is not by any means sufficient evidence that *in* is correct for 1 Corinthians 12:13.

First, the fact that *en* “is the workhorse of prepositions in the NT, occurring more frequently and in more varied situations than any other”<sup>cxiii</sup> must be recognized. As the most common preposition in the New Testament, and one used in a greater variety of situations than any other, the size of the word’s semantic range must be recognized. While *in* is the most common translation, it is by no means the universal one, and there are hundreds of verses in the New Testament where it is simply not possible to properly translate the word as *in*. It is clearly invalid to affirm that because *en* is most commonly

rendered *in*, it must be so translated in every instance. Such an argument must ignore around 900 uses of the word.

Second, the underlying question is whether an idea of place or sphere, a locative notion (the common idea when *in* is the translation) or one of instrumentality (when *by* or *with* is commonly the translation) represents the idea in the text. The fact that instrumentality may be expressed in English with more than just *by* also points to the fact that comparing the frequency of that translation alone (to the exclusion of, e. g., *with*, the third most common translation for *en*), against the sphere notion emphasized through the rendition *in*, underestimates the frequency of the instrumental use of *en*.

Third, having concluded that the *Pneuma* of 1 Corinthians 12:13a is the Holy Spirit, not some other kind of spirit, a translation “by one Spirit” rather than “in one Spirit” follows, since advocates of the *in* translation—such as both Strouse and Pink, as cited above—at least nearly universally believe that the phrase does not refer to the “Spirit,” but to a “spirit.” Very few argue for “in one Spirit.” If “one Spirit,” not “one spirit,” is the correct translation, then “by” rather than “in” follows.

Fourth, a consideration of the context of 1 Corinthians 12:13a is determinative for the significance of the phrase. Both the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12 and the comparative grammatical context derived by an examination of uses of *en* in connection with “Spirit,” *Pneumati*, demonstrate that *by* is the correct translation of *en* in 1 Corinthians 12:13.

The New Testament and wider *Koiné* background evidence that a consideration of action *en Pneumati* as “by the Spirit” is not uncommon. The LXX contains the instrumental sense of *en Pneumati*. One finds phrases with *en* and *Pneuma* signifying “by [the, thy, etc.] Spirit (cf. 1 Chronicles 28:12; Nehemiah 9:30; Micah 3:8; Zechariah 4:6).<sup>cxxiv</sup> More importantly, when a reference to the Holy Spirit is in view, an examination of all New Testament verses where *en* is followed within four words by *pneuma* in the dative case will evidence that the definite majority of the time the locative *en* is not the intended sense. In the thirty references to this construction in the New Testament, only nine<sup>cxxv</sup> are rendered as “in the Spirit” in the Authorized Version. The other twenty-one<sup>cxxvi</sup> are rendered otherwise, including twelve instances of “by the Spirit,” the most common single translation.<sup>cxxvii</sup> The broad New Testament context supports the strong possibility that 1 Corinthians 12:13a should be rendered “by the Spirit.”

The book context of 1 Corinthians, and specifically the immediate context of 12:13a in 1 Corinthians 12, supply overwhelming evidence that an instrumental use of the preposition *en* is in view in 1 Corinthians 12:13a, thus validating the accuracy of the

translation *by*, as found in the King James Version. First, elsewhere in Paul’s epistles to the Corinthians, there is no instance of the sense required by the alternative locative translation of *en* as *in*—the Spirit is not the medium of anything in the Corinthian epistles. Second, and in contrast, the idea of the Spirit’s being the agent or instrument, as conveyed in the Authorized Version’s translation of the members of the church at Corinth submitting to baptism in water “by the Spirit,” are found throughout the epistles Paul wrote to Corinth. One notes elsewhere such phrases as “by his Spirit” (2:10), “by the Spirit” (6:11, 12:8, etc.), and many other instances of the Spirit actively engaging in activity, such as teaching (2:13). Third, since 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to baptism in water, the medium of the baptism referred to in the verse is water, not the Holy Spirit. One is immersed in water, not in the Spirit, when one is baptized into a church’s membership; but the Holy Spirit is He who leads a believer to submit to water immersion. A Christian submits to water baptism “by the Spirit,” but water baptism is in water, not “in the Spirit.” Fourth, one notes that when *en* modifies the word *Pneuma* as a reference to the Holy Spirit, it always has an instrumental idea in the Corinthian epistles:

6:11 And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and **by the Spirit** of our God.

6:11 καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε ἀλλ’ ἐδικαιώθητε, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

12:3 Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking **by the Spirit** of God calleth Jesus accursed: and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but **by the Holy Ghost**.

12:3 διὸ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

12:9 To another faith **by the same Spirit**; to another the gifts of healing **by the same Spirit**;

12:9 ἐτέρῳ δὲ πίστις, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι· ἄλλῳ δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι·

6:6 By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, **by the Holy Ghost**, by love unfeigned,

6:6 ἐν ἁγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ, ἐν χρηστότητι, ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀνυποκρίτῳ,

Fifth, the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12:13 has a very great number of references to the Spirit as instrument or agent, employing a variety of Greek forms. Consider 12:8-13:

8 For to one is given **by the Spirit** the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge **by the same Spirit**; 9 To another faith **by the same Spirit**; to another the gifts of healing **by the same Spirit**; 10 To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another *divers* kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: 11 But all these **worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit**, dividing to every man severally as **he will**. 12 For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also *is* Christ. 13 For **by one Spirit** are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

The previous verses consequently strongly indicate that 12:13a expresses the active action of the Holy Spirit. Finally, 12:11 affirms that the “one . . . Spirit . . . worketh,” indicating active agency, so the reference merely two verses later—which is even

connected to v. 11 by the word “for” that begins v. 12, 13—to action “by” the same “one Spirit” is necessarily a reference to the Spirit’s agency or instrumentality. The context of the Corinthian correspondence validates what is required by the immediate context of 1 Corinthians 12:13a—the *en henī Pneumati* of that verse is a reference to action “by the Spirit,” not to something taking place “in the Spirit.”

In sum, 1 Corinthians 12:13a properly signifies and is translated “by one Spirit.” No reference to a “spirit of unity” or anything less than the third Person of the Trinity is exegetically viable. Furthermore, the preposition *en* is necessarily translated in this clause as “by.” The text indicates that the event referred to in the remainder of the verse took place through the instrumentality of the Holy Ghost.

“Are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles,  
whether *we be* bond or free”:

ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε  
δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι

The baptism of 1 Corinthians 12:13 is immersion in water, since, as demonstrated earlier, Spirit baptism had ceased by the time the first epistle to the Corinthians was inspired. Furthermore, a reference to Spirit baptism in 1 Corinthians 12:13 would be unique in the Pauline corpus—all other references to the baptism of the Holy Ghost are in the gospels or in Acts.<sup>cxxviii</sup> Indeed, throughout the entirety of Scripture, whenever baptism is mentioned without a contextual qualifier (“with the Holy Ghost” “with fire” “unto Moses,” etc.) immersion in water is universally the referent. No contextual qualifier is found in 1 Corinthians 12:13. Thus, the verse does not constitute a unique reference to Spirit baptism contrary to the uniform Pauline usage elsewhere in his epistles, but a simple reference to baptism in water, like all other unqualified references to baptism in the Bible. Such general considerations from Scripture establish that 1 Corinthians 12:13 speaks of immersion in water, not Spirit baptism.

The statement of the verse itself supports a reference to immersion in water. As discussed earlier, Christ is the agent of Spirit baptism—the second, not the third Person of the Trinity performs this baptism (Matthew 3:11, etc.). Were 1 Corinthians 12:13 a reference to Spirit baptism, it would contradict all the clear passages on the doctrine by making the Holy Ghost the baptizer. Recognizing in the text a reference to the working of the Spirit in leading the members of the Corinthian church to be baptized in water harmonizes perfectly with the rest of the Bible.

A reference in 1 Corinthians 12:13 to the working of the Holy Spirit in leading the members of the Corinthian church to receive water baptism fits the context of 1 Corinthians. Paul wrote his epistle to a church filled with “contentions” (1 Corinthians 1:11), where factions had formed claiming to follow Paul, Apollos, and others (1:12). The apostle exhorts the church to unity based on their uniform immersion in the name of the Trinity—they were not baptized in the name of Paul or any other affirmed head of a church faction (1:13ff.), but had all pledged themselves to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in the baptismal bath. Likewise in 1 Corinthians 12:13, all the members of the Corinthian church, whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, had received a common water baptism into the body of Christ, the local congregation (12:27), and thus unity was incumbent upon them. Having been added to the body by an identical immersion in water (12:13), each member of the church was a body part which needed the others for the congregation to function properly (12:14-27). The Corinthians exulted in the various pneumatic gifts, often improperly manifested among them (1 Corinthians 12-14), but they were to be unified, as they had all been led by the one Holy Spirit (12:13a) to submit to immersion into a common church body. The assembly was to recognize and prize the unity derived from the identical, Spirit-led immersion in water participated in by all its members. Finally, the reference to the other church ordinance, the Lord’s Supper, in 12:13d, supports a reference to water baptism in 12:13a. The context of 1 Corinthians 12:13 clearly supports a reference to baptism in water, rather than to Spirit baptism.

Paul refers to water baptism “into one body” because the ordinance adds a believer to the membership of the congregation authorizing the immersion. This truth is also manifest in Acts 2:41-47. Those that “gladly received [Peter’s gospel preaching of the] word were baptized: and the same day there were added [to the pre-Pentecost church membership of around 120, Acts 1:15] about three thousand souls.” These three thousand were “added to the church” (v. 47). The verb “add,” *prostithemi* (προστίθημι), is not just a word for joining a church’s membership in Acts 2:41-47, but is also employed in this way in Acts 5:14 & 11:24<sup>cxix</sup> (cf. Isaiah 14:1, Zechariah 14:17, LXX).<sup>cxix</sup> Thus, 1 Corinthians 12:13 affirms that, led by the Holy Spirit, the members of the Corinthian church had been immersed in water and by that means had been added to the membership of the congregational body in that city.

“And have been all made to drink into one Spirit”  
καὶ πάντες εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν

As the members of the church at Corinth had been contentious and factious over the issue of baptism (1 Corinthians 1), so they had been practicing the Lord’s Supper improperly (1 Corinthians 11). As Paul had exhorted the congregation to Spirit-led unity around their common immersion in the first half 12:13, so he reminds them that they had all participated in the Lord’s Supper, had “been all made to drink,” with reference to the same unifying Holy Spirit. The verb *make drink* is used for literal drinking in Scripture.<sup>cxxxix</sup> The use of the passive voice for the verb is parallel to the passive voice for *were baptized*; indeed, the clauses discussing the two church ordinances manifest strong parallelism<sup>cxxxix</sup>—a strong argument that the phrase refers to the church ordinance that complements believer’s immersion, the Supper,<sup>cxxxix</sup> the celebration of communion with reference to (*eis*) the one Holy Spirit. The topical and linguistic connection of 1 Corinthians 12:12-13 to the discussion of communion in 10:16-17, as explained earlier, further supports this interpretation. While a reference to the Lord’s Supper is natural when compared to the first half of the verse, and the perspicuity of Scripture supports the fact that one can indeed determine the significance of the text, the question of why the Supper would be referred to as “drinking” rather than “eating” (cf. 1 Corinthians 11:20), along with the use of *potidzo* as “make drink” rather than the verb *drink* elsewhere used for the Supper, *pino*, makes understandable a view that the clause refers more generally to common blessings received from the Spirit, including (but not exclusively referring to) the Lord’s Supper. However, both of these arguments for a wider reference to spiritual blessing, rather than a restricted one to the Supper, can be effectively answered.<sup>cxxxix</sup> While the verb *potidzo* is not used elsewhere of the Supper in Scripture, the related noun *poterion* is regularly employed in the New Testament in connection with communion (Matthew 26:27; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:20; 1 Corinthians 10:16, 21; 11:25-28), and the noun is exclusively used of the Supper in eight references, the only references to the word in Paul’s epistles, all of which are in the two chapters immediately preceding 1 Corinthians 12. Furthermore, the specific sense of *potidzo* as *made to drink*, in contrast to the simple idea of *drink* with *pino*, emphasizes the work of the unifying Spirit in bringing the Corinthians to both immersion and the Supper. The connection of 12:13 with 10:16-17, with its mention of the Supper first as drinking, explains the reference in 12:13 to the ordinance as a common drink rather than a common eating—contextually, greater clarity is achieved through the representation of the Supper in this manner.<sup>cxxxix</sup> Furthermore, one wonders what substance, other than the fruit of the vine, could possibly be drunk in 1 Corinthians 12:13, since drinking is not clearly a metaphor anywhere in the Bible for general Spirit-produced spiritual blessings. The fruit of the vine from the church ordinance complementing baptism, which is spoken of in parallel syntax in the

first half of the verse, is the logical reference. Contextual and lexical considerations demonstrate that the final clause of 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to participation in the Lord's Supper.

e.) A Summary of the Conclusion of the Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12:13

In the divided church at Corinth, the ordinances of baptism and communion, which were intended as sources of unity, had been distorted and were associated with divisiveness and strife within the Corinthian congregation (1 Corinthians 1:11-17; 11:20-22). The Corinthian strife was further worsened by the misuse of spiritual gifts (1 Corinthians 12-14). In 1 Corinthians 12:13, Paul reminded the church that God had given them a common baptism and Lord's Table, and called them to the unity the Lord intended for their congregation as the body of Christ. In 1 Corinthians 12:13, Paul told the Corinthians, in paraphrase, "Spiritual gifts are for unity in the congregation, the body of Christ: the Spirit who gave these gifts to your church also worked in you to receive a common immersion and to partake in a common Lord's Supper—so be unified!"

f.) Support from Commentators for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a Reference to the Church Ordinances

Many Biblical commentators, both Baptist and non-Baptist, have viewed 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to baptism in water and the Lord's Supper. Of course, many other commentators have adopted a large variety of alternative positions. The view that the first half of the verse is a reference to water baptism is somewhat more widespread than the position that the second half refers to communion. Some commentators hold that baptism in water is spoken of in the first half of 1 Corinthians 12:13 while positing that the second half refers to something else. On the other hand, almost all who view the second half of 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to communion likewise see water baptism in the first half of the verse. Some examples are worthy of citation.

A. T. Robertson affirmed that the baptism of 1 Corinthians 12:13 is water baptism, "a reference to a definite past event with each of them of different races, nations, classes, when each of them put on the outward badge of service to Christ, the symbol of the inward changes already wrought in them by the Holy Spirit."<sup>cxv</sup> Albert Barnes stated: "Many suppose that there is reference here to the ordinance of baptism by water. . . [including] Bloomfield, Calvin, Doddridge, etc."<sup>cxvii</sup> John Wesley saw water baptism

in 1 Corinthians 12:13,<sup>cxviii</sup> as did G. W. H. Lampe, evaluating both the New Testament and patristic doctrine.<sup>cxviii</sup> Henry Alford, in his classic *Alford's Greek Testament*,<sup>cxli</sup> states that the verse speaks of “the water of baptism . . . so (understanding the whole verse of baptism) Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecolampadius, Rückert, Meyer, De Witt.” Alford also declares that “Luther, Beza, Calvin, Estius, Grotius, [et.] al., refer the latter half to the Lord’s Supper.” The *Expositor’s Greek Testament*, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll,<sup>cxlii</sup> states that “Paul refers to actual Christian baptism” in 1 Corinthians 12:13 and further indicates that “Augustine, Calvin, Estius, [etc., understand] the *poterion* of the Lord’s supper (10:16, 11:25),<sup>cxliii</sup> as though *kai* coupled the two sacraments.” John Calvin, commenting on 1 Corinthians 12:8-13, wrote:

“We are,” says [Paul], “engrafted by baptism into Christ’s body[.]” . . . He speaks . . . of the baptism of believers . . . Hence, with respect to God, this invariably holds good—that baptism is an engrafting into the body of Christ[.] . . . The Apostle, also, observes here a most admirable medium, in teaching that the nature of baptism is—to connect us with Christ’s body. . . . We have drunk into one Spirit . . . [Paul refers] to the Supper, as he makes mention of *drinking* . . . Now, though the cup forms but the half of the Supper, there is no difficulty arising from that, for it is a common thing in Scripture to speak of the sacraments by synecdoche. Thus he mentioned above in the tenth chapter . . . simply the *bread*, making no mention of the cup. . . . He teaches, therefore, that believers, so soon as they are initiated by the baptism of Christ, are already imbued with a desire of cultivating mutual unity, and then afterwards, when they receive the sacred Supper, they are again conducted by degrees to the same unity, as they are all refreshed at the same time with the same drink.<sup>cxliii</sup>

The *Jamison, Faucett, and Brown Commentary*,<sup>cxliv</sup> commenting on “drink into one Spirit,” affirms, “There is an indirect allusion to the Lord’s Supper, as there is a direct allusion to baptism in the beginning of the verse.” Matthew Poole, commenting on “drink into one Spirit,” stated:

[M]any others choose rather to interpret drinking in this place, of drinking at the table of the Lord, partaking of that whole action being set out here by one particular act there performed. This is probable, considering that the apostle, in the former part of the verse, had been speaking of the other sacrament of the gospel, and that he, speaking of the Lord’s supper, 1 Cor 10:17, had used this expression: *For we being many, are one bread, and one body.*<sup>cxlv</sup>

Albert Barnes commented on the second half of 1 Corinthians 12:13:

This probably refers to their partaking together of the cup in the Lord’s Supper. The sense is, that by their drinking of the same cup commemorating the death of Christ, they had partaken of the same influences of the Holy Ghost, which descend alike on all who observe that ordinance in a proper manner. They had shown, also, that they belonged to the same body, and were all united together; and that, however various might be their graces and endowments, yet they all belonged to the same great family.<sup>cxlvi</sup>

While it would be inaccurate to affirm that viewing 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to the two ordinances the Lord Jesus gave His church is anything like the unanimous position among commentators on the passage, the position is very widely represented. Indeed, within the wider world of Christianity “the most popular view of 1 Corinthians 12:13 is that Paul is describing Christian water-baptism . . . which incorporates the baptisand into the Body of Christ.”<sup>cxlvii</sup> A reference in 1 Corinthians 12:13 to immersion

in water cannot be dismissed as a new and novel position, for it has been believed by many of the Lord's churches and people, as well as within Christendom generally, and deserves to be evaluated sympathetically and accepted on account of the strong exegetical merits indicated above.

E. Historic Baptist support for a first-century fulfillment of Spirit baptism and for interpreting 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to the church ordinances

While many in certain circles have not given much consideration to the view maintained above, and an unfortunately large number of advocates of both the PCP and UCD doctrine have never even heard about the historic Baptist position on Spirit baptism, the view of 1 Corinthians 12:13 expounded above, where the passage is considered as a reference to the church ordinances of baptism and the Supper, has strong Baptist support historically.<sup>cxlviii</sup> Indeed, the fulfillment of Spirit baptism as a past event that ended in the first century is an important Baptist position in the history of doctrine.

In 1802, Pastor T. B. Montanye, representing the "elders and messengers of the Philadelphia Association," wrote the work "On the Baptism of the Holy Ghost" as a circular letter, which was "signed by order of the Association" by the Association moderator.<sup>cxlix</sup> This letter, as representative of the beliefs of the most influential Baptist body of the time, is worth quoting at some length. The letter stated:

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost . . . was never inculcated . . . [as] the work of regeneration and sanctification . . . in the Gospel, and we think ought not to be considered as constituting any part in the office work of the Divine Spirit in renewing the heart. . . . [O]ur respected [non-Baptist but Christian] friends . . . may be regenerated, and enjoy the highest consolation in the sweet incomes of the Holy Comforter, and the most sensible communion with Christ; yet as all this does not constitute the baptism of the Holy Spirit, nor is designed by it in the sacred Scriptures, it follows of consequence, that, rejecting the water baptism, they have no baptism whatever, and ought cheerfully to submit to that prescribed in the example of Jesus Christ. . . . [T]here is no well founded evidence of [the] present existence . . . of the baptism of the Holy Ghost . . . The term baptism of the Holy Ghost . . . was first taught by the harbinger of Jesus Christ, Matthew 3:11, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire" . . . the accomplishment of the promise made by Jesus Christ [of Spirit baptism was in] . . . Acts 2:16-22 . . . [as predicted in] Luke 24:49 . . . Acts 1:4, 5 . . . [and it was] the ground on which the apostles went to Jerusalem, and there in holy concert joined in prayer and supplication for the accomplishment of such qualifying aid, to [promulgate] the knowledge of their exalted Redeemer. . . .

The nature of this baptism, most clearly evinces it to be distinct, and materially different from that of regeneration. The one a still small voice, saying "this is the way;" the other, that of "a rushing mighty wind." One invisible, "A white stone, and a new name given, which no man knew save he that had received it;" the other, to be seen, "Cloven tongues of fire sat on them." One internal, filling the heart with secret consolation, joy, and pleasure; the other external, "The whole house where they were sitting."

This renders the term *baptism* proper, because they were immersed in the fountain of the Spirit, and thereby made partakers of such extraordinary and miraculous influence, as in regeneration and conversion were never promised.<sup>cl</sup> . . .

The subjects of this baptism differ essentially from those of regeneration. The work of grace is upon the hearts of the unregenerated, bringing them from a state of moral death to life, from darkness to light, and from the power of sin, and service of Satan, to the liberty of the gospel, and the enjoyment of fellowship with God. Whereas, the baptism of the Holy Ghost was upon the apostles; who, having experienced the work of grace upon their souls, and being thereby made partakers of all that is peculiar to regeneration, could not be regenerated by the descent of the sacred Spirit, which being a work only once in the divine life, could not be effected again. . . .

Here it is proper to remove some apparent difficulties, which are a means of puzzling the minds of many. First, what baptism the apostle denominates one baptism? We answer, The instituted appointment of Jesus Christ, which he authorized after his resurrection, which remains a standing ordinance in the church, and which Peter, when filled with the Holy Ghost, enjoined on Cornelius and the rest of the believing Gentiles, even after they were baptized with the Holy Spirit; though the baptism of the Spirit was never an essential prerequisite to water baptism[.] . . . [I]n 1 Corinthians 12:13 . . . there seems no absurdity in saying that the same Spirit influences all nations to yield an obedience to the instituted appointments of Jesus Christ, and so come [by immersion in water] into the union of the body the church. As for sundry other Scriptures, such as Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21; Galatians 3:27; they have an evident relation to water baptism, and are no way connected with, nor yet refer to, the work of grace in the heart. . . .

We . . . leave you to [some closing] further instruction. 1.) That though regeneration and sanctification be essential to the character of a Christian, yet neither of them constitute the baptism of the Holy Ghost. 2.) However much you may enjoy of the Spirit, as the Spirit of life, light, and love; you have no Scripture grounds to call this the inward baptism, and so the one baptism, and thereby live in the neglect of the appointments of Jesus Christ. 3.) That as the baptism of the Holy Ghost was given for the confirmation of the gospel dispensation, it has effected its design; the sacred prophecy is fulfilled, and it has ceased. 4.) That as [this] extraordinary work, and no other, is known in the gospel as the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and that took place after faith in Christ, or regeneration, we have no right to call regeneration baptism. 5.) Though we are the hopeful subjects of divine grace, and live in the smiles of heaven; it is both our duty and privilege to submit to the appointments of Jesus Christ, as laid down in his word.

And now, dear brethren, you may perceive, that our intention is not to deny any of the blessed operations of the holy Ghost upon the human mind; but to distinguish between truth and error. . . . And as churches, we would exhort you to live in the Spirit, and grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed until the day of redemption. In the mean time, pray for us, that as instrumental of your joy, you and we may honor our profession by holy living, in the smiles of God's gracious Spirit.

The historical fulfillment of Spirit baptism was affirmed with striking clarity in 1802 by the Philadelphia Association. A position very similar to that advocated in this composition, and very different from both the PCP and UCD view, was thus the official doctrine of the most influential body of American Baptists in that era. Similarly, Texas Baptists of the nineteenth century believed:

When the Holy Spirit came with power upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:2), and fell on the house of Cornelius (Acts 11:15-16), while Peter preached to them, it was called a baptism of the Holy Spirit. In both cases, and all cases of such baptism, speaking with tongues followed. . . . The ordinary operation of the Holy Spirit in the first century, in the regeneration and conversion of men was [not] called a baptism . . . of the Spirit. . . . To speak of the operation of the Holy Spirit in regeneration and conversion as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, is both unscriptural and misleading. For it is not a baptism, even figuratively.<sup>eli</sup>

Dr. Alvah Hovey was a Baptist pastor and then a professor of Hebrew, church history, theology, and Christian ethics at the Newton theological institution, a Baptist college, for a number of decades, starting in 1849. He became the president of the college in 1868,

the year he also became a member of the executive committee of the American Baptist missionary union, a position he held until 1883. Concerning Spirit baptism, he wrote:

Do the Scriptures speak of a “baptism in the Spirit” after regeneration, as something to be expected by all Christians to the end of time? . . . [T]he baptism of the Spirit . . . embraced the gift of inspiration, and, indeed, the other miraculous gifts of the first age. . . . [such as] a mysterious power of using languages which they had never learned. . . . [A] miraculous endowment was an important part of the baptism of the Spirit. . . . [T]he gift of prophecy . . . was an effect of “baptism in the Spirit” . . . [B]aptism in the Holy Spirit included miraculous gifts . . . extraordinary powers . . . special and visible effects[.] . . . The questio[n] . . . [whether] “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” after regeneration, [is] something to be expected by all Christians to the end of time . . . ha[s] been answered in the negative. [One who does not have] miraculous gifts . . . should not profess to have been “baptized in the Holy Ghost,” nor apply to [himself] those texts which refer to this baptism. . . . [Through] the apostolic age . . . [there was a] gradual decrease of [miraculous] “gifts” of the Spirit. . . . “baptism in the Holy Ghost” conferred miraculous powers, as that of speaking with tongues, of prophesying, of healing the sick, and . . . these extraordinary gifts, having served their purpose, were [then gradually] withdrawn from the Church. . . . Plainly, then, the work of the Spirit, by which extraordinary powers were conferred . . . might cease with the apostolic age, while the work fo the same Spirit in other forms adapted to the needs of the saints might continue until the second coming of Christ.<sup>cliii</sup>

The view that Spirit baptism was a post-conversion phenomenon which conveyed supernatural powers and was limited to the apostolic age, is indeed the historic Baptist position.

Considering specifically 1 Corinthians 12:13, one notes that the Baptist *Confession of 1527* affirmed the faith of all Baptists accepting the document that being “baptized into one body” referred to that immersion in water by which one joined the membership of the local, visible assembly:

In the first place, mark this concerning baptism: Baptism should be given to all those who have learned repentance and change of life, and believe in truth that their sins have been taken away through Christ; and to all those who desire to walk in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and to be buried with him in death, that with him they may rise; and to all those who with such intention themselves desire and request it of us. By this is excluded all infant baptism, the Pope’s highest and first abomination. . . . In the second place, we were united concerning excommunication, as follows: Excommunication should be pronounced on all those who have given themselves to the Lord, to walk in his commandments, and on all those who have been baptized into one body of Christ, and who call themselves brothers and sisters, and yet slip away and fall into sin and are overtaken unawares. . . . Thirdly, we were one and agreed concerning breaking of bread, as follows: All who would break one bread for a memorial of the broken body of Christ, and all who would drink one draught as a memorial of the poured out blood of Christ should beforehand be united to one body of Christ; that is, to the Church of God, of which the head is Christ, to wit, by baptism.<sup>cliii</sup>

The pastor of the first American Baptist church, John Clarke,<sup>cliv</sup> believed that 1 Corinthians 12:13 referred to immersion in water and gave no indication that he believed that Spirit baptism was still occurring after the first century:

Believer’s baptism by immersion was a cardinal tenet of Clarke’s church way. . . . Clarke wrote only of water baptism. Although he spoke of being filled with the Holy Spirit, he never suggested a “baptism of the Spirit.” . . . [I]n his discussion of 1 Corinthians 12:13 . . . Clarke glossed . . . it as “knit together in one by his Spirit.”<sup>clv</sup>

A historical fulfillment and cessation of Spirit baptism, and a view of 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to immersion in water and the Lord's Supper, was advocated in 1828 by the congregations of the Georgia Baptist Association, which affirmed that the "plain" interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12:13 was one which read the verse as a reference to the church ordinances:

The Georgia Baptist Association of Elders and Brethren, to the Churches which they represent, send Christian salutation [in 1828]: . . . We now advance some plain Bible proof of that gospel order observed by us. . . . We believe that water baptism and the Lord's Supper, are ordinances of the Lord, and are to be continued till his second coming[,] that true believers in Jesus Christ are the only subjects of baptism . . . that dipping is the mode[,] [and] [t]hat none but regularly baptized church members have a right to commune at the Lord's Table. In vindication of these doctrines we bring the following plain scriptures: . . . For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one spirit.<sup>clvi</sup>

Similar declarations from other Baptist groups of that era and afterwards are found:

For we believe that Christian baptism is the first ordinance a believer ought to comply with; and persons cannot become regular church members without first being baptized according to the word of God. This appears from the conduct of the apostles in the first gathering of the churches of Jesus Christ. Acts 2:41, 42. They that gladly received the word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they (i. e., those baptized) continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Also it is said, "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." 1 Corinthians 12:13. That is, by the leading and teaching of the Holy Spirit we are all baptized into one body, i. e. the church. And we cannot find from the Holy Scriptures, and we think no man can, that since the ascension of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that any were received members of the visible church before they submitted to the ordinance of baptism.<sup>clvii</sup>

A belief that Spirit baptism ceased in the first century, and that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to immersion in water and the ordinance of communion, is not a new view among Baptists. Many of the Lord's churches have demonstrably held this view of the verse for centuries.

#### F. Spirit Baptism: Other Alleged References in the Epistles: Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21<sup>clviii</sup>

It is very rare for one who recognizes that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to immersion in water and the Lord's Supper to consider any other references to baptism in the epistles as setting forth the baptism of Holy Ghost. All other texts sometimes alleged to refer to Spirit baptism, when taken in their natural sense, speak of the church ordinance of immersion. The position of the Philadelphia Baptist Association in 1802, as quoted extensively above, is still true: "As for sundry other Scriptures, such as Romans 6:3, 4; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21; Galatians 3:27; they have an evident relation to water baptism, and are no way connected with, nor yet refer to, the work of grace in the heart." The only substantive reason typically given to attempt to prove that these passages refer

to Spirit baptism is that, were a reference to immersion in water in view, the heresy of baptismal regeneration would allegedly follow. Having dispelled this notion and demonstrated the entire compatibility of justification by faith alone with a reference to the church ordinance of baptism in these texts, no reasons remains to deviate from the normal sense of these verses as references to immersion. Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; and 1 Peter 3:21 will consequently be analyzed in order, and the entire compatibility of interpreting them as references to immersion in water with justification by faith alone will be demonstrated. Indeed, affirming the necessity of considering these texts as references to Spirit baptism, because of a supposedly unavoidable necessity of affirming baptismal regeneration if they are recognized as simple verses about immersion, gives far too much exegetical favor to the baptismal regeneration heresy. Since the simple fact of the matter is that the verses in question are about immersion in water, not Spirit baptism, affirming that they require salvation by baptism if the ordinance is in view would in fact go far to establish, rather than refute, baptismal regeneration.<sup>clix</sup>

#### 5.) Romans 6:3-4

Baptismal regenerationists allege that Romans 6:3-4 teaches that baptism is the literal means through which one is united to Christ. They argue that spiritual blessings are said to be “in Christ” (Ephesians 1:3) and that these verses say one is “baptized into Jesus Christ” (Romans 6:3). They conclude that a person is out of Christ until he is baptized, and through baptism “into” Christ he gets “in” Christ and begins receiving spiritual blessing for the first time. However, an exposition of the passage in its context demonstrates the fallacious nature of this claim. This argument for baptismal regeneration also cannot be supported by an analysis of the phrases “into Christ” and “in Christ” that are found throughout the Bible. One is “in Christ” at the moment of faith, prior to baptism.

In chapters 1-5 of the book of Romans, Paul clearly explains that the gospel, “the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,” is “that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law,” that “to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness,” so that “being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ” (Romans 1:16, 3:28, 4:5, 5:1). Having explained that sinners are justified by faith alone in these chapters (where the words *believe* and *faith* are found almost fifty times, and baptism is never mentioned), Paul then begins in Romans 6-8 to explain the implications of justification

by faith in the life of the saved individual. He naturally mentions baptism early in this section of his discourse, since it publicly identifies the saint with the people of God, and is one of the first acts of obedience for the newly regenerate individual. Romans 9-11 then surveys God's relationship to Israel, while chapters 12-16 discuss God's righteousness at work in the believer's life. The greater context of the book of Romans supports the conclusion that baptism, as mentioned in 6:3-4, is not the means through which one is declared just before God, for it appears in a section dealing with the Christian life, not the reconciliation of the lost. A careful examination of the passage also yields the same conclusion.

Romans 6:1-11 reads as follows:

1 What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? 2 God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? 3 Know ye 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 like 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 planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of his resurrection: 6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. 7 For he that is dead is freed from sin. 8 Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: 9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. 10 For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. 11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In verses one and two, Paul deals with the slanderous notion that the doctrines of justification by faith alone and the eternal security of the believer provide a license to sin; the enemies of the gospel had affirmed as much (Romans 3:8). He counters that one who dies to sin<sup>clx</sup> at the time he is justified by faith (as expounded in chapters 1-5, cf. Galatians 2:19-21) and so is now "dead to sin" cannot "live any longer therein" (v. 2). A dead man is not influenced or affected by the affairs of this life; its sounds, tastes, pleasures, ambitions, and all else mean nothing to him. God gives a sinner a new heart and nature at the moment of regeneration (2 Corinthians 5:17, Hebrews 8:10-12), so that his "old man" is now "crucified" with Christ and he henceforth will "not serve sin" any longer (Romans 6:6). Paul argues that, since God breaks the dominion of sin over men when they believe, justification by faith leads to a holy life, not lawlessness. He then reminds his readers that their baptism was a symbol or "likeness" (v. 5) of their death to the old life of sin and resurrection to a new holy life in Christ at the moment when they trusted in Him. They were "baptized into [Greek *eis*, "with reference to"]<sup>clxi</sup> Jesus Christ," and so were "baptized into [Greek *eis*, "with reference to"]<sup>clxii</sup> his death" (v. 3). They were "buried with him<sup>clxiii</sup> by baptism into [Greek *eis*, "with reference to"] death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so [they] also should walk in newness of life." Since Paul taught justification by faith, not

baptismal regeneration, he affirmed, as Baptists do today, that baptism is connected with a “walk in newness of life.” Nothing in Romans six states that the ordinance is administered “in order that men might obtain the remission of past sins.” Nor does the chapter affirm that baptism is the act that makes one dead to sin. On the contrary, it states baptism is a picture or “likeness” (v. 5) of Christ’s atoning work, which is the true foundational cause of deliverance from sin’s penalty (Revelation 1:5) and power (Hebrews 9:14). Indeed, baptismal regenerationists must affirm the incongruity that one buries a man in baptism in order to kill him to sin, rather than burying one who is already dead to sin, as do true churches. Happily, very few of the advocates of forgiveness through water bury people in order to kill them, or argue in favor of such a practice, at any other time than when they attempt to prove their views from Romans 6. When baptismal regenerationists affirm that a person dies to sin when he is buried in baptism, the ordinance is no longer a true likeness of Christ’s death (v. 5), for Christ died before He was buried, just as in Baptist baptism one is dead to sin before he is buried beneath the baptismal waters. Furthermore, v. 5 states that those Biblically baptized (“planted together in the likeness of his death”) “shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection.” Since only true believers can be baptized, and all true believers are eternally secure, this certain promise of resurrection with Christ for the Scripturally baptized fits well within the Biblical view of baptism. However, baptismal regenerationists almost always deny that those they baptize are eternally secure; thus, the “shall be” guarantee of v. 5 creates a significant problem for them. Paul’s argument in v. 6-10 also gives no solace to advocates of water salvation; the passage never states that one actually dies to sin in baptism, while the use of the Greek perfect tense to state that one dead “is freed”<sup>clxiv</sup> from sin (v. 7) buttresses the fact that those so dead will never be alive to sin again, and so are eternally secure. Finally, v. 11 commands believers to constantly “reckon . . . yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” The dominion of sin having been shattered when justified by faith, the saints are to count themselves dead indeed to sin as they grow in holiness day by day. Nothing in Romans six affirms that one gains forgiveness of sin or is literally made dead to sin at the moment of baptism. On the contrary, the chapter invalidates baptismal regeneration.

Not only does the context of Romans 6:3-4 nullify the affirmations of baptismal regenerationists, but a study of the Biblical uses of *eis* + *Christon* (“into . . . Christ,” Romans 6:3) and *en* + *Christo* (“in Christ”) demonstrate the fallacious nature of the baptismal regenerationist assertion that one only becomes *en* or “in” Christ at the time of baptism. The word “Christ” is the object of the preposition *eis* nineteen times in the New Testament.<sup>clxv</sup> Examination of these verses demonstrates that the two New Testament

instances of the presence of the word “baptize” after the preposition *eis* prove nothing about how one gets *en* or “in” Christ. If baptism *eis* Christ proves one literally enters into Christ at the moment of the ordinance, then why cannot one believe *eis* Christ to get in Him, since believing *eis* Christ is found more frequently than is baptism *eis* Christ (Acts 20:21, Galatians 2:16, Colossians 2:5)? In fact, one is said to believe “into” (*pisteuo* + *eis*) the Lord Jesus Christ in 45 verses.<sup>clxvi</sup> If baptism *eis* proves one is “in Christ” only after the ordinance, why does one not actually speak *eis* or “into” Christ (Ephesians 5:32), or even sin *eis* Christ (1 Corinthians 8:12)? Why is it that baptism *eis* proves that one is not “in (*en*) Christ” until baptized, and baptism is the means through which one becomes “in Christ,” but belief *eis* Christ does not prove that one is “in Christ” at the moment of faith? Why not affirm that one is *eis* or “into” Christ whenever he speaks, or that one must actually sin *eis* or “into” Christ? Baptismal regenerationists who argue that baptism *eis* Christ proves one is unforgiven until he receives the ordinance evidence either ignorance or dishonesty concerning the preposition *eis* as found in New Testament Greek. When it employs the preposition *eis*, Romans 6:3 simply asserts that one is baptized “with reference to” Christ.

Furthermore, the New Testament does not associate the state of being “in (*en*) Christ” with baptism. Eighty-five verses in the New Testament contain the terms “in (*en*) Christ,” but not one connects baptism with the phrase.<sup>clxvii</sup> This is a devastating fact for one who would assert that one is *en* Christ through baptism. It is further compounded by the fact that the forty-six verses that speak of being “in the Lord” (*en Kurio*),<sup>clxviii</sup> the fifty-two verses that use “in Him” (*en auto*) with reference to Christ,<sup>clxix</sup> the twenty-three verses where the phrase “in Me” (*en emoi*) references being “in Christ,”<sup>clxx</sup> the references where “in Thee” is used of being “in Christ,”<sup>clxxi</sup> the twelve references to being “in God” (*en Theo*),<sup>clxxii</sup> the references to being in the Father or *en Patri*,<sup>clxxiii</sup> to being in the Son or *en Huio*,<sup>clxxiv</sup> and to being *en* the Spirit (*en Pneumati*)<sup>clxxv</sup> never state or even hint that through baptism one enters into the state of being in Christ, in God the Father, or in God the Holy Spirit. If people were to become *en* Christ through baptism, one would expect to find a great number of verses that connect the two; but never once, in the two hundred seventy-nine verses which deal with the appropriate phrases in Scripture, does such an assertion appear.

While Scripture never affirms that one is “in Christ” (*en Christo*) at the moment of baptism, it does make affirmations about the “in Christ” state that are incompatible with the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Nothing can remove one who is “in Christ” from that blessed state; he is eternally secure therein (Romans 8:37-39).<sup>clxxvi</sup> All who are “in the Spirit” are saved (Rom 8:9), but people were so before water baptism (Acts 10:44-

48). Only *en* the Spirit can one confess Jesus as Lord (1 Corinthians 12:3), but this profession must be made before baptism is Biblically possible. Indeed, the Spirit leads one to submit to baptism (1 Corinthians 12:13), for one has Him before immersion.<sup>clxxvii</sup> Furthermore, men are “in Christ by the gospel” (Ephesians 3:6), and it is “the gospel . . . by which also ye are saved” (1 Corinthians 15:1-2). Truly God’s “purpose and grace, which was given [the elect] in (*en*) Christ Jesus before the world began” is “manifest by . . . our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . through the gospel” (2 Timothy 1:9-10, note v. 12), but the gospel is defined with no mention of baptism (1 Corinthians 15:1-4) and is, in fact, even contrasted with baptism (1:17). These references alone refute the notion that one is *en* Christ by means of baptism.

Christ's high priestly prayer in John 17 demonstrates that one is “in Christ” by faith, not by baptism. The Savior asks His Father that “them . . . which shall believe on me . . . may be one in (*en*) us . . . I in (*en*) them . . . that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me” (John 17:20-23). Since all Christ’s prayers are answered, all who believe on Him are in the Father and the Son. Christ is also in all of them (v. 23; note also Galatians 2:20, “Christ liveth in me . . . I live by the faith of the Son of God,” and 2 Corinthians 13:5). The Lord’s intercessory prayer never mentions baptism. It indicates, rather, as do other passages of Scripture, that one is in Christ by faith, and that the Son likewise indwells all believers.

The book of 1 John also devastates the idea that one is “in Christ” only upon baptism. It affirms that we can know that we are in Him if we are keeping His Word, not if we are baptized (1 John 2:5-6, 3:24). The transforming power of spiritual union with Christ is altogether different from the ordinance of baptism. All who are in Christ have been given the Holy Spirit, and they can know they are saved because of the Spirit’s presence (1 John 4:13), but the Holy Ghost is received before baptism. God the Spirit also guarantees that all truly in Christ “shall abide” in Him (1 John 2:25-27). Consequently, were one were “in Christ” through baptism into a congregation’s membership, church discipline or excommunication would be impossible. Further, those in Christ cannot live in continual sin (1 John 3:5-6, 9), but church members can do so. God dwells in all who from a heart of faith confess Jesus (1 John 4:15-16), but such a confession is a prerequisite to baptism (Acts 8:36-38). Similarly, all who love God, which they begin to do when they first know and believe the love God has for them, are in Him (1 John 4:16). If baptismal regeneration is true, one must baptize someone who does not have the Spirit and so is not led by Him into its waters. Baptism would be for those who do not confess Jesus as Lord, who do not obey God’s Word, who live in sin, and who do not love God, but hate Him. When such Spirit-resisting, non-confessing,

disobedient and sinful God-haters are baptized, they then could not be subsequently be removed from the church rolls, for one “in Christ” remains there forever. Either all this is true, or baptismal regeneration is false, and one is “in Christ” before baptism. Furthermore, John writes “unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that ye may know that ye have eternal life,” and this life “is in (*en*) his Son.” (1 John 5:13, 11). His audience is “in (*en*) him that is true, even in (*en*) his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life” (1 John 5:20). Believers constitute John’s intended audience in his epistle, and his audience is *en* Christ and has eternal life as a consequence of faith. 1 John proves that believing, not baptism, gets one in or *en* Christ.

Indeed, the doctrine that one is “in Christ” or *en Christo* by faith is very frequently taught in scripture. In Galatians, Paul associated being *en Christo* and faith, declaring that “a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ . . . even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified . . . we seek to be justified by (*en*) Christ” (Galatians 2:16-17). Galatians 3:14 is similar: “That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through (*en*) Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” Galatians 3:26 reads, “For ye are all the children of God by faith in (*en*) Christ Jesus.” Galatians 5:5-6 states, “We through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in (*en*) Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.” Note also Galatians 2:20-21; 3:2. Galatians repeatedly associates the “*en* Christ” state with faith.

The book of Ephesians also indicates that one is in or *en* Christ by faith. Ephesians 1:1 refers to the “faithful [*pistos*—translated “believing” in John 20:27; Acts 10:45; 16:1; 2 Corinthians 6:15; 1 Timothy 4:10; 5:16; 6:2] in (*en*) Christ Jesus.” Ephesians 1:12-15 declares that we “trusted in (*en*) Christ . . . [upon hearing] the word of truth, the gospel of . . . salvation,” and that when one “believe[s], [he is] sealed with that holy Spirit of promise . . . the earnest of your inheritance,” for “faith [is] in (*en*) the Lord Jesus,” and God demonstrates “the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe” (v. 19). All the spiritual blessings “in Christ” of Ephesians 1:3-14 are given to those who believe or trust in Him (v. 12-19). Ephesians 2:6-10 clearly links being in Christ with faith, stating that God “hath raised *us* up together, and made *us* sit together in heavenly *places* in (*en*) Christ Jesus: that in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in *his* kindness toward us through (*en*) Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in (*en*) Christ

Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” Ephesians 3:11-12 states that we are “in (*en*) Christ Jesus our Lord: in (*en*) whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.” Thus, Ephesians 1-3 repeatedly links the state of being in or *en* Christ and faith, but baptism is not mentioned anywhere in these chapters.

Other books of the Bible also associate faith and the “in (*en*) Christ” position. Colossians 1:4 refers to “faith in (*en*) Christ Jesus”; 1 Timothy 1:14 to “faith . . . in (*en*) Christ Jesus”; 1 Timothy 3:13 and 2 Timothy 3:15 to “faith which is in (*en*) Christ Jesus”; 1 Corinthians 4:17 to those who are faithful/believing “in (*en*) the Lord”; Philippians 2:19, 24 to “trust in (*en*) the Lord Jesus . . . trust in (*en*) the Lord”; Colossians 2:5 to “faith in (*en*) Christ”; 2 Thessalonians 3:4 to “hav[ing] confidence [or trust]<sup>clxxviii</sup> in (*en*) the Lord”; and 1 Timothy 6:17 to “trust . . . in (*en*) the living God.” We are “found in (*en*) him, not having [our] own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith” (Philippians 3:9). Dozens of passages indicate that one is “in (*en*) Christ” by faith. Many others that do not make the connection to faith explicit are nevertheless incompatible with baptismal regeneration. Not one of the two hundred seventy-nine relevant texts connect being “in Christ” and baptism.<sup>clxxix</sup>

Romans 6:3-4 provides no support whatever for baptismal regeneration. Neither the passage in its context, nor the phrase “into (*eis*) Christ,” nor the phrase “in (*en*) Christ,” provide a shred of evidence for salvation by baptism. At the moment of faith one is in Christ, and the Lord Jesus indwells all believers, not the baptized only. Those who argue for baptismal regeneration using passages such as Romans 6 “do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God” (Matthew 22:29).

## 6.) Galatians 3:27

Galatians 3:27 states that “as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” Since the verse declares that in baptism one puts on Christ, baptismal regenerationists argue that forgiveness for (past) sins is only received at the point of baptism.<sup>clxxx</sup> This view has a number of major problems.

First, “put on” (*enduo*) is never plainly used for anything that relates to the immediate forgiveness of sin in any of its twenty-eight appearances;<sup>clxxxi</sup> the baptismal regenerationist must simply allege, without any evidence, that to “put on” Christ refers to justification. *Enduo* (“put on”) is, in contrast, clearly used in a number of passages for the walk of the already forgiven Christian, and of those already baptized. In Romans

13:12-14, Paul exhorts the baptized believers at Rome to “cast off the works of darkness, and . . . put on (*enduo*) the armour of light . . . put ye on (*enduo*) the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to *fulfill* the lusts *thereof*.” His command to the church at Rome to “put on” Christ and the armor of light is an exhortation to live for God, not to receive forgiveness of past sins by being rebaptized. Paul similarly commands the church at Ephesus to “put off concerning the former conversation the old man . . . and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and . . . put on (*enduo*) the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (Ephesians 4:22-24). Again, the text calls already baptized believers to live for God. It is not an exhortation for church members to submit to a second baptism. Later in the same epistle, the apostle commands the congregation at Ephesus to “put on (*enduo*) the whole armour of God. . . . Stand therefore . . . having on (*enduo*) the breastplate of righteousness.” Similarly, Colossians 3:10-14 relates an appeal to the church at Colosse to “put on (*enduo*) the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. . . . Put on (*enduo*) therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind . . . and above all these things *put on* charity, which is the bond of perfectness.” 1 Thessalonians 5:8 likewise commands “us, who are of the day, [to] be sober, putting on (*enduo*) the breastplate of faith and love.” In all these instances, those who are already forgiven are commanded to “put on” a variety of things that relate to the Christian life. One could compare baptism to the uniform donned by an enlisted man when he joins the army;<sup>clxxxii</sup> the recruit is enrolled before he gets his uniform and puts it on. The uniform simply makes him easier to identify than civilian clothing would. Since “put on” is terminology for those already justified before God, the statement of Galatians 3:27 indicates that those already forgiven should “put on” Christ in baptism as a public testimony of a previously received pardon and as a public identification with Christ. The verse does not teach that one receives remission of sins or becomes a Christian through baptism.

Second, both the immediate and wider context of Galatians 3:27 explode the claim that the verse teaches baptismal regeneration. Galatians 3:26, the verse immediately preceding v. 27, indicates that “ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.” If Paul were to affirm in v. 27 that one becomes a child of God through baptism, he would contradict what he had said the verse before.<sup>clxxxiii</sup> Paul’s contextual point is the equality of Jew and Gentile (v. 28); both are saved in the same manner by faith (v. 26) and both receive the same baptism (v. 27). The immediate context of Galatians 3:27 destroys the baptismal regenerationist argument.

The wider context of Galatians 3 also demolishes the argument of baptismal regenerationists in 3:27. Paul argues that the Spirit was received “by the hearing of faith” (3:2), that the ministration of the Spirit and the working of miracles was not “by the works of the law” but by the “hearing of faith” (3:5), and that “Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness” (v. 6). He concludes, “know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham” (v. 7). As Abraham was justified by faith, so today men are justified by faith. Abraham was certainly not baptized, so baptismal regeneration confounds Paul’s comparison. The doctrine also confounds Paul’s assertion in Galatians 3:8 that the Scripture “preached before the gospel unto Abraham . . . foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith,” unless one wishes to argue the *non sequitor* that Abraham received prophecies concerning baptism. Paul concludes that “they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham” (v. 9). The chapter then asserts that “the just shall live by faith . . . the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit by faith” (v. 12, 14). Paul proceeds to vindicate justification by faith on the basis of God’s offer of the gospel to Abraham before the giving of the Mosaic law (v. 15-21), completing his argument with the recognition that “the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe” (v. 22). An unbaptized Abraham cannot be the prototype of a supposed New Testament teaching of baptismal regeneration, but an Abraham saved by faith in the coming Savior is a great proof for New Testament justification by faith in Christ. The Law of God itself is “our schoolmaster to *bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (v. 24), for “ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” (v. 26). The rest of Galatians chapter three, along with the rest of the book (2:16, 20-21; 5:5, etc.), demonstrates the folly of affirming baptismal regeneration in Galatians 3:27.

Galatians 3:27 utterly fails as a proof-text for remission of sins through baptism. “Put on” is not Biblical terminology for the receipt of remission of sins; it is a term of Christian growth. Both the immediate context, Galatians 3:26, and the wider context of the chapter and the rest of the book preclude baptismal remission in 3:27. Those who use the verse to prove that baptism is the gateway to heaven completely miss the point.

#### Colossians 2:12

Colossians 2:12 states that believers are “buried with [Christ] in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with *him* through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.” It is alleged that since people are “buried with him” in baptism, and also

“risen with him” in the ordinance, one must therefore be baptized to have his sins removed. However, the verse does not say that sins are removed through baptism; it affirms that in the ordinance one is buried and risen with Christ.<sup>clxxxiv</sup> The true churches of the Lord Jesus affirm both justification by grace through faith alone and that, having already been justified and become dead to sin, men are to be outwardly buried with Christ in baptism by immersion<sup>clxxxv</sup> and rise with Him when they come up out of the water. Since the verse never states that forgiveness of sins happens at the moment of baptism, one cannot legitimately draw such a conclusion. Furthermore, the spiritual circumcision of verse 11, which does take place at the point of faith and so regeneration (cf. Deuteronomy 10:16; 30:6; Jeremiah 4:4; Romans 2:28-29),<sup>clxxxvi</sup> is “without hands”; God performs this new birth as a work of His mighty power apart from human agency. In contrast, baptism is very much a work of man and is certainly not performed “without hands.” As in Romans 6:4,<sup>clxxxvii</sup> the only other passage in Scripture where the verb “buried with”<sup>clxxxviii</sup> appears, Colossians 2:12 affirms that in baptism believers publicly identify with Christ but fails miserably to prove that the unbaptized are damned.

#### Titus 3:5

Baptismal regenerationists attempt to use the fact that Titus 3:5 refers to the “washing of regeneration” to prove their doctrine. This washing, they affirm, is baptism. However, the complete verse reads, “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” In addition to the omission of any mention of baptism, the verse specifically states that men are not saved “by works of righteousness.” Since baptism is a work of righteousness, as is plain upon consideration of its nature and purpose, and as Matthew 3:15 specifically indicates, Titus 3:5 clearly eliminates it as a prerequisite to forgiveness. The “washing of regeneration” is the cleansing by the blood of Jesus that takes place the moment a sinner forsakes confidence in his works and believes in Christ alone for justification. For water salvation advocates to make the “washing of regeneration” a reference to the unmentioned and unimplied act of baptism, despite the fact that a handful of words earlier the text excludes the ordinance, is to “wrest [this verse] . . . as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction” (2 Peter 3:16).

#### 1 Peter 3:21

The final major attempt to support baptismal regeneration with Scripture comes from 1 Peter 3:21. This verse states that “baptism doth also now save us,” while verse 20 mentions that “souls were saved by water.” Baptismal regenerationists argue on this basis that the unbaptized are lost. However, this view takes the verses out of context, as a study of the passage and Peter’s teaching elsewhere indicates.

First Peter 3:18-22 reads:

18 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: 19 By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; 20 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. 21 The like figure whereunto *even* baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: 22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

Within the wider context of a primary theme in 1 Peter, suffering for Christ (v. 13-17), verse 18 mentions the Lord Jesus’ substitutionary death for sin, as He, “the just for the unjust,” suffered in the place of mankind. The verse then recounts His “death in the flesh,” and explains how, by the Holy Spirit, Christ was “quickened” or “made alive.” Verses 19-20 mention that by this same Spirit He preached to those who are now “spirits in prison,” but were, at the time of the preaching, the rebellious and ungodly generation of men that “sometime were disobedient . . . in the days of Noah.” When Noah, a “preacher of righteousness” (2 Peter 2:5), proclaimed the truth to his contemporaries, he functioned as God’s mouthpiece, so that, by the Spirit, it was really Christ preaching to that rebellious generation. However, since the men of Noah’s day did not receive the truth in that time “while the ark was a preparing,” they died in the flood and went to hell, where they are now “spirits in prison.” Eight people or “souls,” namely, Noah, his wife, and their three sons with their wives (Genesis 6:18; 7:7, 13) were then “saved by water”; that is, they were separated and saved from the ungodly world system by means of the waters of the flood. They were not saved from their sins by the floodwaters, and the water certainly did not save them from either physical or spiritual death—those in the water and not in the ark drowned and were damned. Verse 21 then explains that as Noah and his household were saved from the ungodly world by the flood waters, so Christians today are saved from the ungodly world by baptism (v. 21a), which is not the act which actually puts away sin (v. 21b) but is rather the “answer of a good conscience toward God” (v. 21c). The doctrines mentioned in the text are only possible because of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (v. 21d), who has ascended into heaven and has all authority (v. 22). Furthermore, these truths can encourage the suffering Christian (4:1ff.). Having

surveyed 1 Peter 3:18-22, an analysis of its alleged support for baptismal regeneration is now possible.

First, the parenthesis in verse 21 demonstrates that Peter does not here teach baptismal regeneration. On the contrary, it expressly disclaims the doctrine. It could well have been included specifically to forestall the danger of abusing the passage to unwarrantedly conclude that baptism is required for forgiveness. The parenthetical statement teaches us that baptism is “not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God.” Peter’s affirmation that baptism does not put away filth is incongruous if regeneration takes place by means of the ordinance.<sup>clxxxix</sup> Conclusive evidence against baptismal forgiveness is found in the affirmation that baptism is the “answer of a good conscience toward God.” Peter affirms that one has a good conscience prior to his baptism, which is his “answer<sup>exc</sup> . . . toward God” resulting from his reconciled state and peace of mind and heart.<sup>excj</sup> If one heading up to the baptistry is, as baptismal regeneration teaches, still lost and a child of the devil (John 8:44) who is under the wrath of God, a heartbeat from the fires of hell, and an unforgiven, Spirit-resisting, non-confessing, disobedient God-hater<sup>excii</sup> who still sinks under the weight of every sin he has ever committed his entire life, how can he possibly have a “good conscience” toward God, as 1 Peter 3:21 affirms one must prior to baptism? The lost have, rather, a “reprobate mind” (Romans 1:28) and a “corrupt mind” (2 Timothy 3:8). They are “vainly puffed up by [their] fleshly mind” (Colossians 2:18). They have “their mind and conscience defiled” (Titus 1:5) and “seared with a hot iron” (1 Timothy 4:2). They need to have their conscience “purge[d] . . . [with] the blood of Christ” (Hebrews 9:9, 14; 10:2,<sup>exciii</sup> 22). The fact that baptism is a good conscience’s answer<sup>exciv</sup> toward God proves that baptismal regenerationists err in their view of 1 Peter 3:21.

Second, a study of the specific words used in 1 Peter 3:20-21 indicates that spiritual salvation from sin and hell is not in view. In verse 20, the word “saved” (“in the days of Noah . . . eight souls were saved by water”) is *diasodzo*. This Greek word is never used in the New Testament for salvation from sin;<sup>excv</sup> instead, it means “to rescue or deliver from a hazard or danger, bring safely through.”<sup>excvi</sup> A first century Christian reading Peter’s epistle in Greek might be saved in the *diasodzo* sense by means of baptism if he hid in the baptistry and so escaped from Roman soldiers seeking his arrest, but he would not have used *diasodzo* to convey the idea of salvation from sin. The idea is similar to the declaration in Hebrews of Noah’s physical deliverance and separation from the world system when he “prepared an ark to the saving [physical deliverance, not spiritual salvation] of his house” and in so doing “condemned the world” (Hebrews 11:7). The use of *diasodzo* in verse 20, which also fits with the background of Hebrews 11:7,

controls the understanding of Peter's use of the verb *sodzo* in verse 21 ("baptism doth also now save us"). This word<sup>excvii</sup> is used for both physical deliverances such as salvation from drowning (Matthew 14:30) and for salvation from sin (Matthew 1:21). The connection with the *diasodzo* of verse 20 indicates that in verse 21 *sodzo* does not speak of baptism saving in the sense of forgiving sin.<sup>excviii</sup> Rather, baptism "doth also now save us" in the sense of disassociating believers from this world and its ungodly system and identifying them with God's new order. God "spared not the old world, but saved Noah . . . bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly" (2 Peter 2:5). As Noah was saved from "the world that then was" (2 Peter 3:6) by the Deluge, being separated from its influence and power, so baptism saves a Christian from the ungodly world with its influences and power and identifies him with God, His redeemed people, and His new order. When the Christian identifies himself with Jesus Christ in the ordinance, he outwardly and publicly cuts himself off from his old life and ways. Having submitted to Christ as his King and entered His kingdom at the moment of repentant faith, in baptism he publicly puts on the uniform, as it were, of His Master's host (cf. Galatians 3:27).<sup>excix</sup> Baptism's saving the Christian from the world's ungodly system and publicly separating him unto God fits the words used in 1 Peter 3:20-21. Baptism to achieve forgiveness of sin does not.

Third, Peter's comparison between the events in the days of Noah and baptism nullifies claims of regeneration by the ordinance. Noah's deliverance or salvation "by water" is "the like figure"<sup>cc</sup> whereunto baptism saves us. Noah, however, was by no means saved from his sin by the waters of the Flood. The book of Genesis recounts that "the wickedness of [the entire race of] man was great in the earth, and *that* every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Genesis 6:5); therefore, Noah was a sinner deserving condemnation along with the rest of the mankind. However, "Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD" (Genesis 6:8); God saved Noah by His grace, by undeserved favor, and so justified him entirely apart from any righteous act of his. As Romans 11:6 states, "if [salvation is] by grace, then *is it* no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if *it be* of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." Noah was "heir of the righteousness which is by faith" and was saved "by faith" (Hebrews 11:7). Furthermore, God commanded Noah to enter the ark because he was "seen righteous" (Genesis 7:1), "just," and "perfect" (Genesis 6:9) before Him, being justified on the basis of Christ's blood and righteousness (cf. Revelation 13:8b) when he believed in the coming Savior. Because he had been justified by faith, Noah manifested his change of state in a change of life—he "walked with God" (Genesis 6:9). Having been "seen righteous" judicially before Jehovah, he

“did according unto all that the LORD commanded him” (Genesis 7:1, 5) in his practical life. Christ was in fact preaching through Noah (1 Peter 3:18-19) for one hundred twenty years (Genesis 6:3) before the flood; by the grace of God, the sinner Noah was transformed into a “preacher of righteousness” (2 Peter 2:5). Clearly, he was saved from his sin and manifested his change of life far before the time of the flood. Indeed, God saved him from the evil world by the Flood specifically because of his state as an already justified individual (Genesis 7:1). As evidenced in the life of Noah, individuals today must be justified and show evidence of regeneration before they are Biblically baptized (Matthew 3:8). The comparison with Noah in 1 Peter 3:20-21 demonstrates that one must be justified by faith before he can rightly enter the waters of baptism. As Noah was justified before he passed through the flood, so for Christians today justification by faith takes place before one reaches the water and is a prerequisite for a proper relationship to it.

Fourth, a recognition that Noah’s ark pictures Christ provides further evidence that 1 Peter 3:20-21 does not teach baptismal regeneration. As the ark was “lift[ed] up” (Genesis 7:17), so “the Son of man [was] lifted up: that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life” (John 3:14-15). As there was only one ark, so there is only one Savior (Acts 4:12; 1 Timothy 2:5). Only one door saved from destruction in Noah’s day, and Christ, the only way to heaven (John 14:6), said, “I am the door” (John 10:9). The ark was sufficient and complete to save from destruction, as Christ is sufficient to save (cf. Hebrews 9:12-14; Hebrews 10:10-14). The ark was available for all men who believed God’s promise of judgment and accepted His provision for salvation (cf. Revelation 22:17; 1 Timothy 2:4) which was needed by all (Romans 3:10, 23); so it is with Christ. God waited patiently before the Flood (Genesis 6:3; 1 Peter 3:20; 2 Peter 3:9), but there came a time when it was too late to accept His offered escape (Genesis 7:11-13; 2 Corinthians 6:2; 2 Thessalonians 2:10-14); likewise He waits patiently today for men to repent and believe in His Son, but a time will come when the opportunity to receive salvation has passed. Furthermore, all that were in the ark were secure and saved, shut into it by God’s power; not one person on the ark was lost or died, just as all who believe are in Christ and will never suffer eternal death (Genesis 7:16; 1 Corinthians 15:22, John 10:27-30, 1 John 5:11-13). Those who are in Christ will never have the wrath of God poured out upon them, as it was poured out on the inhabitants of the world in Noah’s day who were outside the ark (Psalm 79:6; Ezekiel 22:31; Revelation 14:10-11), since Christ, pictured by the ark, saves men from their sin. Only those first in the ark passed through the water with Noah; it was the “ark . . . wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.” As Noah and his household were

in the ark, shut into it by a miraculous act of God (Genesis 7:16), a week before the flood began (Genesis 7:1, 4), so a man must be “in Christ” by faith before he can enter the waters of baptism.<sup>cci</sup> One certainly did not pass through the waters of the flood in order to enter the ark—nor does one become “in Christ” by means of baptism. The ark saves from destruction, and the water from the world system. The “figure” of Christians and their baptism (1 Peter 3:21) provided by Noah’s passing through the flood fits very well with the Biblical truth that men are justified before their immersion; it does not fit baptismal regeneration well at all.

Fifth, 1 Peter 3:20-21 does not affirm baptismal regeneration because Peter earlier in his epistle, and elsewhere in Scripture, taught justification simply by “precious faith” (2 Peter 1:1). 1 Peter 1:1-5 affirms that the “elect . . . are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation” (1 Peter 1:1, 5). Peter establishes in the beginning of his epistle that God’s elect, all believers, are eternally saved and secure by Divine power. He affirms that “believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of *your* souls” (1:8-9). Further, he contrasts redemption by the incorruptible blood of Christ (1:18-19), received by supernaturally given faith (v. 21) in the imperishable Word of God (v. 23) with redemption by “corruptible things” (v. 18), which would include the solely temporal waters of baptism. The apostle also states that “he that believeth on [Christ] shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe *he is* precious” (2:6-7).<sup>ccii</sup> When Peter speaks of the new birth, he never connects it with baptism (1 Peter 1:3, 23). In Acts, Peter’s message was: “repent . . . that your sins may be blotted out” (Acts 3:19); “repentance . . . and forgiveness of sins” (5:31); and that “through [Christ’s] name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins” (10:43). Peter declared: “God gave them the [Holy Spirit] . . . who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ” (11:17), since “the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost . . . purifying their hearts by faith” (15:7-10).<sup>cciii</sup> Peter did not contradict his teaching elsewhere and affirm baptismal regeneration in 1 Peter 3:20-21. As the waters of the flood lifted up the ark (Genesis 7:17), baptism is designed to exalt Christ, who in His death, burial, and resurrection, provides the meritorious cause of justification, which is received instrumentally simply by faith.

The conclusion that 1 Peter 3:20-21 does not teach forgiveness by baptism is clear. The parenthesis of verse 21, the words used for “saved” in the passage, the comparison to Noah’s deliverance by the Flood, and Peter’s teaching elsewhere in his epistles and in Scripture prove this fact. Baptismal regenerationists must mangle this

verse, as they do the handful of other passages examined earlier, to invent support for their view, since the Word of God provides no support for their devilish perversion of the precious gospel of Christ. Those who neglected the ark and were in the water in Noah's day died. Those who look to the waters of baptism for deliverance from sin will likewise be destroyed.

Conclusion to Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21

Since none of the alleged references to Spirit baptism in the epistles teach baptismal regeneration when analyzed with grammatical, historical hermeneutics, the affirmation that one must abandon the natural interpretation of these passages, which recognizes them as references to immersion in water, to refer them instead to Spirit baptism, fails to convince. The historic Baptist position, which considers all these texts as references to immersion in water,<sup>cciv</sup> should be maintained. Indeed, since none of the passages, interpreted naturally, have anything to do with Spirit baptism, arguing that they teach baptismal regeneration—if interpreted of immersion in water—actually plays into the hands of the advocate of sacramentalism, since he can demonstrate that the texts in question do not deal with Spirit baptism. Whenever baptism is spoken of in the epistles of the New Testament, immersion in water is in view. This is not unusual in light of the transitional and temporary nature of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The Pentecostal events of Acts 2 were already complete when the epistles were written.

#### IV. Conclusion

Scripture teaches the Baptist doctrine that Spirit baptism was a historical event completed in the first century. Both the post-conversion special power (PCP) and the universal church dispensational (UCD) views of Spirit baptism are erroneous. The references to Spirit baptism in the Old Testament, in the Gospels, and in the book of Acts all corroborate the classical Baptist view and contradict both the UCD and PCP positions. Passages that speak of baptism in the epistles and that are used by PCP's and UCD's to support their respective doctrines fail to do so, because in every case the texts refer to the church ordinance of believer's immersion. Believing the Biblical, historic Baptist doctrine of Spirit baptism will protect God's people from serious and harmful errors in pneumatology, soteriology, and ecclesiology. It will preserve them from false religious systems, such as Pentecostalism, that are largely based upon erroneous views of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It will enable them to more effectively grow in grace and in

the knowledge of their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (2 Peter 3:18) as they have a more Biblical understanding of the doctrine and practice of sanctification. Most importantly, it will enable them to more greatly love, honor, and serve the Triune God as they live by every word that proceeds from His mouth (Matthew 4:4; John 14:15). To Him alone be the glory for the wondrous truths about Himself and the ineffable graces bestowed on His saints that were authenticated and enacted in the Biblical, Baptist doctrine of Spirit baptism!

V. Appendix: Excerpts from the sermons “The First Pentecost” and “The Church, The Inhabitation of the Holy Spirit” by B. H. Carroll, Pastor of First Baptist Church of Waco, TX, Professor of theology and Bible at Baylor University and Seminary from 1872-1905 and professor and president of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary from 1908-1914.<sup>ccv</sup>

#### Sermon #1: The First Pentecost

“And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” Acts 2:1-4

“And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a mighty rushing wind,” not a wind, but a sound like that which a mighty wind makes. The sound was audible evidence of a Presence. “And it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them tongues parting asunder like as of fire.” Not fire, but “like as of fire.” That does not necessarily mean that the tongues were red. The reference is not to color but to the fact that a blaze of fire went up in a tongue-shape, lambent flame, reaching out as if licking up the substance it played about. Hence, because of shape and movement, we say, “a tongue of flame.” This visible manifestation, accompanying the sound, was divided into tongues, not cloven tongues, one tongue divided into two parts, but the whole appearance distributed it self into tongue-shapes and sat upon each. Following these phenomena of sound and sight, the record concludes: “And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.”

It is an amazing thing that, after so long an interval, the people of God do not yet have clear conceptions of the significance of this wonderful transaction. Indeed, if you want your mind tangled up and confused, all of its ideas reduced to thick mist and shifting shadows, you have only to read the miscellaneous literature extant upon the subject.

I first mention some of the errors, the misconceptions, that attach ordinarily and with most people, to this transaction of the Day of Pentecost. You hear some say that on the Day of Pentecost the kingdom of God was set up; that there and then the church was established or organized.

There is in this second chapter of Acts not even an indirect hint toward the establishment or organization of either a kingdom or a church. And if you have allowed anybody to impose such a thought upon you with whatever specious pleading or argument, you have received great damage. On so vital a point there cannot be exercised too critical a supervision of the literature we place in the hands of our children. It is a lamentable misrepresentation of a great truth to say that on the day of Pentecost any kingdom was set up, any church was established or organized.

Again, you find in many books placed in young people's hands, or frequently hear in discussing this Pentecost occasion, expressions such as this: "In the days of John the Baptist and in the life of Christ, was water baptism. Here was Spirit baptism. The first was formal, external, symbolic; the latter was spiritual and antitypical, and hence is the real baptism. It matters not much about the first: it matters a great deal about the second."

And the question is pressed upon the young heart: "Have you received the baptism of the Spirit?" And all sorts of vague notions are taught about that baptism, some making it synonymous with regeneration. It is a common expression, "I may not have water-baptism, but I have the Spirit-baptism. I am a child of God. I am converted." As if the baptism of the Spirit meant conversion, meant regeneration. It is an awful perversion of the truth. It overclouds and puts out of sight a mighty doctrine to have the mind rest upon any such statement as that.

What is the baptism in the Spirit? This is an important inquiry on which you are entitled to a clear conception. Indeed, your conception of it should be so clear that as soon as you hear the expression, "baptism in the Spirit," you may know what that means, just as you say you know what it means when it is said, "Jesus was baptized in the river Jordan." And so quickly ought the true idea of it flash into your mind with the naming of it, that it would be impossible for a wrong view of it to get before you at all.

Few people will claim that, when the expression, "the baptism in the Spirit," is mentioned, they have as definite, well-defined idea of its import as they have when water-baptism is named. Hence the importance of this lesson.

If you permit yourself to think that you have already received the baptism in the Spirit, or that you are now entitled to it, then you have fixed your mind upon a vain delusion. You put a palpable discredit upon the teaching of God concerning one of the highest doctrines of the gospel.

Let me give you one profitable statement. Jesus is the administrator of the Spirit-baptism, and Jesus never did baptize a single individual under any circumstances in either water or Spirit. You can remember that, can't you? I say that the Lord Jesus Christ never

baptized an individual in water nor an individual in the Spirit. Spirit-baptism does not relate to the individual. Can you bear that in mind? There never has been but one baptism in the Spirit, and that was the baptism of a church, of an organization, and that baptism was immediate. Do you know what the word “immediate” means? It means without means, without the intervention of any instrumentality.

I mean to say that the Lord Jesus Christ himself, without employing a second or third party, baptized His church on the Day of Pentecost. After that when other people got the benefits of the Spirit-baptism they got it mediately, not immediately. They got it through an Apostle. For instance, Peter, in preaching to Cornelius as an Apostle, inducted Cornelius into the benefits of Spirit-baptism, whatever it means. And in Samaria, when Philip had preached there, the Apostles came down and, through laying on of hands, imparted the miraculous gift. Similarly at Ephesus, through Paul as an intermediary. The presence of an Apostle was always necessary.

Let us get this a little more clearly before us. There has never been but one baptism in the Spirit. That baptism took place on the occasion of this text, the first Pentecost after the passion of Christ. That was not the baptism of an individual. It was the baptism of an organization. It was the baptism of a church, as such, strictly. And it was immediate, without the intervention of any means whatever. Later, but limited exclusively to apostolic times, the benefits of that baptism were conferred upon others mediately, that is, through the Apostles.

Let us notice another error, for I want to get the errors before you. It relates to the church and is of two kinds. You hear on the streets, you read in the books you come in contact with, wherever you go, the phrase, “church universal,” that is to say, there may be a church particular in a place, but the church universal is the aggregate of the local churches.

There is no such idea conveyed anywhere in the Book of God as the church universal, and to take a local congregation of one faith, and a local congregation of another faith, and a third, fourth, fifth, and sixth kind of faith in a city, and then lump all of these heterogeneous communities, in all of the different localities spread out all over the world, and call that aggregate the church universal, is a degradation of the teaching of God’s Word. You ought never to think in that direction. Your mind cannot form a definite conception when you use the term “church universal.” You cannot put it in a clear expression, and if you do put something in a clear expression as your mind sees it, it is an unscriptural concept.

Another form of the error comes by confounding the local church, in the given place, with the church in glory, the completed body of Christ in heaven. Beyond a few anticipative references, the New Testament tells us nothing of the church in glory until we come to the last two chapters in the Book of Revelation. That . . . church is not referred to in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

It is an awful perversion of the New Testament teaching to designate local congregations of different faiths or of various denominations as so many branches of that heavenly church. I trust that you and I will be present when the last stone is put in that true spiritual temple, and until the last stone is placed, it will not be a completed house, ready for a tenant, but when the last man is saved, thereby completing the spiritual house of God, then, and not till then, will it become the permanent habitation of God.

Here in the second chapter of the Acts, He went into the local, earthly congregation. The last two chapters of the Book of Revelation tell us exactly how the heavenly house will be occupied. It gives first a word description of it and then permits the prophet to see it in vision. The house will descend from heaven—the full, completed church, in the heavenly sense, in the glorified sense, when the last man will be saved that ever will be saved and the work of redemption be completed as to all its units, and as to the fullness of all its parts. Then that house will descend with God for its inhabitant, fulfilling the Scripture, “The tabernacle of God is with men, and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.” And there shall be no temple in it. There shall be no altar of burnt-offering in it, and it shall be lighted by God and the Lamb. It shall be the everlasting habitation of God. But we have not arrived at the state set forth in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, and it is an awful perversion of the truth to apply the thought concerning what will take place as described in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation as applicable to what took place described in the second chapter of the Acts.

What, then, is the meaning of the second chapter of the Acts? One writer rightly abandons the idea of its being a building, establishing and organizing of a church, but he compares it—and he is much nearer the truth—to the launching of a ship. That is a better illustration; it is nearer the truth, but it is about a thousand miles yet from the truth. You know what takes place when a ship is launched. While the ship is actually built, while it is being completed, before it is launched, it has never sailed a foot. It has never as a ship moved on the waters that are to be its home. Launching is putting it in the water. But the church our Lord Jesus Christ built had been launched before this and it had made a good many long voyages. They were not distant, but what you would call trial voyages. It had been launched by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, who built it, but it had been confined to Jewish waters. And if you ask me, under the image of a ship, to tell you what the second chapter of Acts means, it means this: not indeed the launching of the ship of the church but the putting out to the open seas. Heretofore it had been in Jewish harbors and in the rivers and along the coast, but on the Day of Pentecost it pushed out from all shores and went into the boundless sea of all nations and tongues and kindreds and peoples of the earth. Now, that illustration would suit.

Then let me give you very briefly the meaning of this second chapter of Acts. There was not an atom of uncertainty about the time nor the import. Both time and import had not only been fixed but crystallized in monumental teaching for thousands of years. I shall quote you a passage from Leviticus showing that the day must be what we now call the Lord’s Day; that commencing from the morrow after the Sabbath, which is our Sunday, and the Sabbath must be the Sabbath that followed the sacrifice of the Paschal

lamb, you count full seven weeks, which bring you to Pentecost, the fiftieth day, making it Sunday, the Lord's Day.

The Lord Jesus Christ baptized His church as certainly on the day that He rose from the dead (I mean the day of the week that He rose from the dead), which was the first day of the week, as Leviticus is true[.]

Not only then was the date fixed but the import of it. Let us see what it was. We read concerning three houses in the Bible; I think I may say four—one yet future. That house that Moses built was the tabernacle in the wilderness, built according to a pattern as exact as the draft of an architect according to which our houses are constructed. Moses built a house, and when that house was completed, when everything was done called for by the plan, then the cloud came down and filled it. (See Exodus, chapter 40). That cloud was a symbol; that house was a type. That house was a type of the church. That cloud was a symbol of the coming of the Spirit into the church. The cloud came down and occupied the house, not when the foundation was laid, not when the walls were half-way up, but when the tabernacle was complete. Then the cloud filled the house that Moses built.

In the First Book of Kings (fifth and sixth chapters), we have an advance in the typical and symbolical idea, showing the house that Solomon built. The first house related to the wanderers, before they had a settled habitation; later another house was built, the immovable and enduring temple. Solomon built it. Away out in Lebanon's forests and in the mountain quarries, preparations went on. Each piece of timber and each rock that went into the wall was individually gathered out and prepared. Then around by Joppa the timbers were brought, the stones were gathered together, and they were all brought into one place. But if you had been there when every piece of material had been brought to the ground and looked at the great pile of the finished rock and timber, you would not call that a house any more than you would a pile of bricks stacked out there in the street, a house. Before there can be a house, the pieces must be brought together and adjusted, fitted up. Now, when that building was completed, the Scriptures tell us a cloud came down and filled Solomon's Temple.

Now, let us look at the house that Jesus built. He is the builder of the two. He built a house for the earth and is building a house for heaven. According to strict correspondence, the tabernacle, or house built by Moses, was the type of the New Testament church, an earthly, militant organization. But the Temple or house built by Solomon, was a type of the heavenly body. In both cases, Jesus himself built the antitypical house.

Just now we are talking about the house on earth. We are not looking at the other. That is in the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, or more dimly seen in Ezekiel's vision of the Temple. We are talking about His house on earth. There was to be a house set on earth, having earthly visibility, having earthly ordinances, having earthly officers, having earthly forms and ceremonies, and there will be one having nothing earthly in it whatsoever, and that one is the one I speak about, the one that is to be occupied by the

Holy Spirit as an everlasting habitation after the judgment. The constituent stones of that house harmonize, name by name and stone by stone, with the names that are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. But now the earthly house is not so. It will not harmonize that way.

But let us look at the earthly house. That is the one of which you are a member. That is the one with which you have to do. That one is a business body. That one receives and develops and disciplines members. That one has a commission given to it. That is the one church preaching the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ to the whole world, and that is the one about which Pentecost speaks, and no other.

Let us look, therefore, at that one. When did the preparation of the material for this house commence? I can tell you exactly; I can put my finger right on the starting-point. It was the day that John the Baptist preached his first sermon, the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the voice of one preaching in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord. Make ready a people for the Lord. Make ready a people." As if to say, "John, go out yonder and cut down your timber. Go out yonder and quarry your stone. We will want them after a while, when we are ready to put them into a house." How did he quarry them? By preaching repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. How did he ceremonially prepare them? By baptism in water, a new ordinance hitherto unknown to the world.

When Jesus came, He took this material John had prepared and added to that material. From the day that Jesus came John decreased and Christ increased. Christ entered into possession of John's work, and made and baptized more disciples than did John; and Christ, like John, preached, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." And Christ through His disciples baptized those that had repented and believed, and the work of preparation went on.

When did He begin to put these materials together? I can tell you when He commenced. You know a house commences when its foundation is laid. That is when you commence to put a house together, isn't it? Well, this house that Jesus built, (Jesus and nobody else), was built upon the foundation of the New Testament apostles and prophets. When did that commence? You read in the tenth chapter of the gospel of Matthew that Jesus commenced the work of organization, construction, putting together. How did He do it? He called unto Him twelve and ordained them to be apostles. There the work of construction properly commenced. And later we learn that He appointed seventy others also; and then that He brought in the last ordinance, to-wit, His Supper. Here is the ordinance of baptism and there is the ordinance of the Supper. There were no others.

Let no man dare to add another unless he assumes to make an improvement on the building that came in its perfection from the plan and hand of the Divine Architect. Do not add others and call them sacraments. Do not say that there are seven, when God's Word shows only two ordinances and the Supper is the last one.

Thus Jesus built the church-ship and Himself made several trips with it—what I referred to a while ago by harbor sailing, sailing in the rivers, sailing near the coasts, with local, circumscribed boundaries. What did He say when He looked at it? He said, “I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do.”

“Finished, Lord?” “Yes, finished.” “Oh, no; shall we not organize that church on the Day of Pentecost, days and days after your passion?”

From the cross comes the rebuke as from the realms of sacred death, “It is finished.”

Let not man take up the saw and the hammer and talk about building a church on the Day of Pentecost or organizing a church on the Day of Pentecost. “On this Rock,” says Christ, “I will build my church.”

Who is going to claim equality with Him in that structure? Let thy tongue cleave to the roof of thy mouth before making an assertion that Peter could set up a kingdom or organize a church. If Peter could do it, why can not you do it? When you admit that this building can be done by anyone but the King of kings and Lord of lords, you encourage this idea, sweeping about over the world, that just any fellow can go out and make a church of his own. “I will start a church, a new church. I will set up a church.”

The church of the Lord Jesus Christ, the church that He built on the earth, commenced in His lifetime, in all of its essential parts, was completed in His lifetime, and any institution pushed out into the waters at a later date stands accursed for lack of time in the start.

And I say to you boldly that if the local congregation is not after the model embodied in the first and mother church, Jerusalem, as ordained and established by the Lord Jesus Christ, then do not claim that it is a church of Jesus Christ. Do not claim it. Call it a society, and a human society at that.

Now, I say that our Lord Jesus Christ, having fashioned His church, built it and finished it prior to the day of Pentecost. He then appointed a day when a tremendous transaction was to take place, and that is the transaction recorded in the second chapter of the Acts. That is exactly what we are to look at. That is the thing whose import we are to fix in our minds. On a specific day, the fiftieth day from the passion, or seven full weeks from the morrow after—on that day there was to take place as regards His earthly house, the antitype of what took place after Moses’ house was built, to-wit: the descent of the Holy Spirit to occupy the house. I do not hesitate then to affirm that the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles records a transaction that was initial. I mean that up to that day there never had been on this earth a church of Jesus Christ occupied by the Spirit.

Well, hadn’t the Spirit been at work? Oh, yes, the Spirit converted men in Abel’s time, but there was never a baptism of the Spirit until the Day of Pentecost. Therefore, conversion and baptism are not the same. You could not say of conversion, “The Holy

Spirit was not yet.” You could not say of sanctification, “The Holy Spirit was not yet.” But I will tell you what you could say; you could say that the descent of the Spirit to occupy a New Testament church was not yet. That you could say. So then, on that day the Lord Jesus Christ baptized His church in the Holy Ghost—His *church*. . . .

Then why did He send the Holy Spirit down on the Day of Pentecost—to what end? Why baptize a church? Why didn’t He baptize it before? I shall tell you why. Before that, the church He organized was making its trial trips and He was in it Himself. He was here. His hand was at the helm. He was moving and directing everything in it. But in the development of His plans and of God’s purposes it became necessary for Him to go away, to go up to heaven. And there is the ship without a captain. Jesus is gone. But he says, “I was with you in your trial trips and took care of you. But before you put out to the open sea (and I command you to go out on every sea, to carry the Gospel to all nations), before you put out to the open sea, wait for your captain, the other Paraclete. On the day appointed of old I will send Him.”

The coming of the Holy Spirit that day, the baptism of the church in that Spirit, was for what end? To accredit the church; to accredit and authenticate the church as God’s organization. There had been miracles before, but the miracles before accredited men. Now, the Day of Pentecost was to be signalized by an accrediting of an organization, and that was a new thing under the sun. On that day the church was to be demonstrated as divine, as being sent forth of God to do its work; Therefore, they were to wait; not to push out into the ocean by themselves; wait until they were indued with power from on high.

Mark how exactly the credentials correspond to the scope of the voyage, to the work they were to do. What is the instruction? What is written in the orders? “Go ye into all the world. Preach the gospel to every creature. Go ye and make disciples of all nations.” When this ship approaches a foreign shore and a Parthian or an Elamite or a Persian or a Grecian or a Roman or a dweller in Mesopotamia shall ask, “Where are your credentials?” our text answers: “And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.” There were present men from every nation under heaven, and these men heard the church, through its representatives, speaking unto them in their own tongue, wherein they were born, and they were accredited; there was the amazing miracle that authenticated the church of Jesus Christ as being commissioned to carry the gospel to all nations.

Well, is this accrediting a thing to be perpetually repeated? No, accrediting has limits as to time. Just as soon as its functions are performed there is no repetition of it. Therefore, said the apostle, in speaking to the local church at Corinth, which had received its heavenly credential, a credential that spoke with tongues, “Whether there be tongues they shall cease.” It was not designed that this baptism in the Spirit should be perpetual. It had a function. When its function was accomplished, then it ceased. The church was to go out and prove itself to be from God by the ability to speak in every tongue. That was one thing. “But whether there be tongues they shall cease.” The church was to go out having

also upon her the power of prophecy: “But whether there be prophecies, they shall fail.” The church was to go out having power to work miracles, but miracles also were to cease.

Now, I want to prove that to you, taking a case in the days of the apostles, in the days when the credentials had to be exhibited. It is said that “These signs shall follow them that believe.” What signs? The signs of what? These signs shall follow: That they shall take up serpents harmlessly, and if they eat or drink poison, it shall not hurt them, and they shall lay their hands upon the sick and heal them. Is that so? Certainly. When our Lord sent them out, as we find in the tenth chapter of Luke, He said, “If you find any sick anoint them with oil, and raise them up,” and the raising up of the sick was to constitute the credentials of that man in that community. . . .

But do you mean that this is for today? Not a breath of it. I do affirm that God’s Word distinctly restricts such signs to the days of authentication. Miraculous healing pertains to the credentials, and I would just as soon stand out yonder in the cemetery and ask an old inhabitant, buried forty years ago, to rise up from his grave, and expect to see him rise up, as I would . . . [to] go today to a sick man and anoint him with oil and expect to see the sick rise up.

The attempt would be blasphemous in either case. Why blasphemous? Simply because it would say to the Lord Jesus Christ, “Your church whom you baptized in the Holy Spirit, was not sufficiently accredited. We want new credentials issued. We want the signs repeated in our time.” It argues that the work then done was not completed.

And the whole of this Christian Science business is predicated upon that misconception of God’s Word and is as diametrically opposed to the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ as any other heresy that ever cursed the world by its introduction. . . . It is important to have clear ideas on all these lines.

Let me advance in that thought just a little and I am through. Of course, there are thousands of other things that could be said on it, for its boundaries are immense, but you cannot hear all of them in one day. I have shown you before, but I want to show you again; I want to make it just as clear as a sunbeam, that this baptism of the church in the Spirit and by the Lord Jesus Christ was temporary in its nature, that it referred to a special object, and that object was accomplished; and then I want to show you that the church, in the New Testament sense, when we come to that word in the New Testament, must all the time be construed as applied to one local congregation. . . .

[B]aptism in the Spirit [would] cease [while] certain other things should abide; . . . the graces would stay; . . . faith, hope and love would continue, but this thing stop. This is for a sign, he said. . . . [N]o man ever did receive a baptism in the Spirit to affect him as an individual only. No man ever did receive a baptism in the Spirit except as a constituent part of the church.

Christ baptized the church, and when He baptized the church all were baptized[.] . . . It was one baptism once for all. In other words, one might never claim that the baptism in the Spirit prompted him to set up a new order of things. He might not say, “I am

guided by the' baptism in the Spirit to go off at a tangent, to set up a different establishment, to defy church authority, to go off as a free lance." No, sir. . . . [N]one might dare claim Spirit guidance for separatist work. Much less do you do it now. Don't you say, when you are despising dignitaries, and speaking evil of them, and bringing about schism and disrupting and dividing the people of God—don't say the Spirit prompts you, that the baptism in the Spirit makes you do this. If you had the Spirit baptism it would be *into*, it would be *for* the church; it would be with reference to the church and not contrary to it and against it. . . .

Do you yet say you have the baptism of the Spirit? Well, if you say it, then I ask you to give me the signs. These signs shall follow. "Which things," says Paul, "are for a sign." They were to be a sign of something, accrediting in certain directions. You have it? Give me a sign. What is the sign? Well, let a rattlesnake bite you. Raise the dead. Let me see you do it. Give me the sign. And not in some dark corner bring about a miracle, but in the open daylight, before competent witnesses, as Christ wrought in the presence of thousands. Let there be such miracles wrought as cannot be questioned. Give me the signs.

A picture I leave with you. I have it in my own mind. It makes my heart thrill as I look on the mental canvas. I see the Master coming here on earth. I see the harbinger hewing down the trees and shaping them and exhuming the rocks and finishing them. I see him pointing to the Architect and saying, "Oh Thou Divine Builder, here is the material. You told me to get it ready." I see the Builder take the material and, commencing with the foundation, building and building and building, until at last before my eyes is a New Testament church, organized, established, set up, with officers, with ordinances, complete and tried under the Master's own hand, to show that it would work, and that it would do the things appointed in Judean localities. But it-has a wider destiny.

I see the Captain standing on the deck and reading orders for that ship: "Go ye into all the world. Heretofore I said, Go not to Samaria. Go not to the cities of the Gentiles. I lift the embargo. I tear down the dividing wall. I now order the ship which I have built to go to earth's remotest bounds—long, perilous voyages, mighty undertakings." But the Captain says, "I am about to leave you. You never will see me here again in this ship. Therefore, wait; do not put up the sails. Do not lift the anchor. Wait until you are indued with power from on high. Wait until your credentials as a church come down. Wait until you are authenticated to the nations. Wait until the time appointed, and then you put out to the open sea and you keep to the sea. Don't ever come back to port anymore. Keep to the sea as long as your mission lasts. O Ship of Zion, sail on, sail yonder, and there, and everywhere. Go to this ocean and that bay and that lake. Go on, Ship, ever sailing in storm and calm and sunshine. O Ship, sail on until your Captain comes again." And so on the Day of Pentecost, when it was fully come, suddenly by sound speaking to the ear, by sight speaking to the eye, by feeling speaking to the inner senses, the credentials come, the accrediting takes place.

They speak with tongues. They are now ready to go forth. And I hear a voice, saying, "Up with your anchor; hoist your sails. Move out of the harbor and away and away and away until the Master comes. On for the long voyage in His name." The other

Paraclete, the other Captain, the Holy Ghost, is in the ship yet, not now to authenticate it, but to guide and give power. He remains not in the universal church (there is no such organization), not in the heavenly church—its time is not yet come—but in the local congregation. Read Revelation concerning the seven churches of Asia; behold Jesus Christ, through the Spirit, moving, not in the church universal, but among the churches—this church, that church, the other church. And as Paul says in his letter to the Ephesians, “Each several building,” not all the buildings making a town, but “each several building is a church of God,” this one here, that one yonder. Each single local congregation is the house of Jesus Christ, infilled and guided by the Holy Ghost.

Now, I hope that your speech will be conformed to the true New Testament idea when you speak of these things. I do not pretend in this day to work miracles; they have passed. The credentials are completed. The attesting is consummated. But I do say that the local congregation is to be the house of Jesus Christ inhabited by the Holy Ghost. . . . Amen.

### Sermon #2: The Church, The Habitat of the Holy Spirit

Perhaps the most perplexing of all the questions to be answered today are these: What is meant by the Scripture, “The Holy Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified”? And in what new sense did the Holy Spirit come on the first Pentecost after the ascension of Jesus? And does He abide with us in any sense peculiar to New Testament times? No other questions relating to the interpretation of God’s Word have more engaged my own mind and heart for years than these.

And now I am going to answer them so these Sunday-school children will understand. Let us commence with an examination, in order, of several Scriptures that constitute our text.

First, the *tabernacle*: “Our fathers had the tabernacle in the wilderness.” The tabernacle, or tent, was a movable house for God, to serve only while Israel was on the road. Many chapters in Exodus are devoted to telling how it was constructed, but the significant fact, the one most pertinent to this discussion, is recorded in Exodus 40:33, 34: “So Moses finished the work. Then a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.”

Here observe:

- (1) This was the house that Moses built;
- (2) every part of it was fashioned separately according to the divine pattern furnished Moses;
- (3) though each part was complete in itself, and all the parts were gathered in one place, as a workman gets together his material on a building site, they did not make a house until they were *put together*. It took *all* of them to make the house and all of them *united*, that, “fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplied, according to the working in due measure of each several part”;

(4) When the house was *finished*, *God moved in and inhabited it* in the presence of all the people.

Pass now to a second Scripture: “But Solomon built him a house.” You will find the history in the fifth and sixth chapters of the First Book of Kings. This was after the traveling days of Israel were ended and they had become thoroughly established in the Promised Land. God now needed a *permanent* house instead of a tent. Again we find the same significant fact so pertinent to our discussion—1 Kings 6:37-38; 8:10-11: “In the fourth year [i.e., of Solomon’s reign] was the foundation of the house of the Lord laid, in the month Zif. And in the eleventh year, in the month Bul, which is the eighth month, was the house finished throughout all the parts thereof, and according to all the fashion of it. So was he seven years in building it ... And it came to pass, when the priests were come out of the Holy Place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord.”

Here again observe:

- (1) This was the house that Solomon built;
- (2) Every part of it was fashioned separately, according to the divine pattern given David;
- (3) Though each part was complete in itself, and all the parts were gathered in one place, they did not make a house until they were *put together*. It took all of them to make one house and all of them properly *united*;
- (4) As the stones put in the walls were not rough ashlar, but each previously shaped and numbered and as the timbers were all thoroughly dressed and adapted beforehand, there was no sound of the saw or hammer in putting them together. The mighty building was set up in silence;
- (5) When the house was finished, then and not until then, *God moved in and inhabited it*.

Now, the tabernacle of Moses and Solomon’s Temple were types of the New Testament church, and the cloud was a type of the Holy Ghost. But after all, Solomon’s house was made with hands and in reality God “dwelleth not in temples made with hands.” The cloud was not the Holy Ghost himself but just a symbol of Him.

The Temple, however, did foreshadow a *real* house, built not with human hands and skill, which the real God would inhabit. One greater than Moses or Solomon must build this house. In the fullness of time came Jesus, the real builder. “I will build my church,” said He. . . . The process of the building was this:

First, John the Baptist was sent before to announce that the kingdom was at hand and to prepare the material, that is, make ready a people one by one for the coming Lord. How did he make them ready? By utterly discarding all idea of a national basis or fleshly descent from Abraham; by insisting upon a personal and voluntary repentance and faith and confession of sins and reformation; by giving them “the knowledge of salvation in ‘the remission of their sins;’” and by baptizing these saved people.

Second, Jesus received this prepared material and added more to it in precisely the same manner. So far, the work was individual, that is, it consisted merely of getting out

the timbers, quarrying the stones, and dressing them in proper shape to fit into a house yet in his own mind.

Third, He next began to lay a foundation, i.e., to organize His ready-made people. This He commenced by the ordination of the Twelve Apostles and subsequently of seventy prophets, or teachers. As one of our Scriptures says: “Ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets [of course he means New Testament prophets].” Here was the beginning of His church. This was the first step in organization.

Fourth, by His Sermon on the Mount and His subsequent parables, He instructed these apostles in all the fundamental principles of His kingdom.

Fifth, according to the tabernacle-type, this was His itinerant church moving about wherever He moved. As a present, living Paraclete, He administered all its affairs while the building progressed. At Caesarea Philippi He announced the foundation principles of church-membership:—a God-revealed and personal faith in Him, saying, “Upon this rock I will build my church.” Later he instructed them (Matthew 18) in the discipline and authority of the church: “Tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. Again I say unto you, that if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven. For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” Mark that word “agree,” and note that phrase “on earth,” and that other phrase, “gathered together.” We shall need them all after a while.

Sixth, having unfolded His doctrines, organized His material, laying the foundation in the apostles and teachers, it now became necessary to unite the walls with the great, elect, precious corner-stone, Jesus Christ himself. So He made known fully His approaching death and instituted His second and last memorial ordinance, the Lord’s Supper.

Now hear the builder: “Father, the hour is come; ... I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do” (John 17:1-4). Hear Him again in His death agony: “It is finished: and He bowed His head, and gave up the ghost” (John 19:30). And thus the house was built.

Here in the antitype observe:

(1) This was the house that Jesus built: “Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to Him that appointed Him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but He that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken afterward; but Christ

as a son over His own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end” (Hebrews 3:1-6). This house was built “without hands.” It was no material structure of stone and timber. It was a spiritual house. The foundation stones—apostles and teachers—were living stones. The only dead stone in the foundation—Judas Iscariot, the son of perdition—was eliminated, and Matthias, a living stone, replaced him before the house was occupied. Hence one of our Scriptures: “Coming unto Christ, himself a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious, ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house.” This “spiritual house” is expressly declared by another Scripture to be the “church of the living God,” a church to which the truth is committed for propagation. So, expressly, the church at Corinth is called “God’s building,” “a temple of God.” So likewise the church at Ephesus is called a “holy temple, builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.” So also when we compare 1 Corinthians 3:9, 17, with 1 Peter 2:4-5, we have the Spirit’s own interpretation of Matthew 16:18: “Upon this rock I will build my church.” That rock is Christ himself.

(2) That every stone was prepared separately—made a living stone by personal regeneration, repentance, and faith, and was then baptized.

(3) That these individuals were organized into a body with ordinances, and the gospel work committed to them.

(4) That while our Lord had *finished* His house, it, as a *house*, remained without an occupant<sup>ccvi</sup> to the first Pentecost.

Whatever influence of the Holy Spirit had been exerted on them and in them as individuals to make them Christians, this was in their separate capacity. As an organization—a composite structure—fitly joined together, it was vacant. A hundred thousand bricks, lying apart, make no house, however perfect each brick. When these bricks are put together in the wall and according to the architect’s plan, united by mortar, and a turn-key job of a finished structure is turned over for acceptance, though a complete house, it is yet unoccupied.

We now see the new house built by Jesus Christ. It is a church composed exclusively of regenerated individuals. There is no provision in it for any unconverted man, woman, or child. The laws are complete. The ordinances are complete. Its uses and duties are all defined, and no new thing was ever added, the Spirit afterwards only bringing to their remembrance what Christ had previously taught.

We pause here to emphasize that the earth in all its history had never before known a Christian church. It was an absolutely new organization. And now we are prepared to see it occupied. Such a building needs an inhabitant.

In a word, then, what is the significance of the second chapter of Acts? Was it the setting up of a kingdom or the building of a temple? Nay, verily, the God of heaven, Jesus Christ, in His own person, while on earth, had already set up His kingdom and built His house.

What was it Peter had?

The keys of an established kingdom.

Why had he the keys?

That he might open its door to people that they might enter.

When he did open the door, did he open it from the inside or from the outside? And if he opened it from the outside when and by what process did he himself get in? Did God give Peter the keys, and while He held the keys up in His hand, build a kingdom to fit the keys?

The house was finished. Peter was in it and opened it from the inside. What then signifies the second chapter of Acts?

The simple answer is this: That day God, the Spirit, moved into the house that Jesus had built, as His cloud-type had moved into the typical house built by Moses and Solomon.

How then was the descent of the Spirit on that day different from any past work of His?

In this, that never before had He inhabited an organization of Christians. Individual Christians, like Abel, Enoch, Abraham, Moses, and David, he had made and indwelt. But the patriarchal and Mosaic organizations were not spiritual but fleshly. It was the family and the nation typifying, indeed, the church, but they were not the real church itself. Hence the cloud that occupied the house of Moses and the house of Solomon was only a symbolical presence of God. But on the Day of Pentecost God himself came down and filled His house. In this sense, then, the Holy Spirit had not been given, because Jesus had not been glorified. And therefore it was expedient for Jesus to leave His little flock that the Comforter might come.

We now open another important inquiry. In coming on the Day of Pentecost He came with miracles, i.e., conferring miraculous power.

Were there no miracles wrought by the Spirit before the Day of Pentecost? What was there *new* here?

Moses was accredited by miracles. So were the prophets. So was Jesus. What, then, was *new* here?

This was new, that on this day the church, as the executive of her absent Lord, was accredited for the first time in the history of the world. Miracles were now the credentials of the church and authenticated its Gospel message.

This, my brethren, was the baptism in the Spirit, a baptism in miraculous power, authenticating and accrediting the church as the house Jesus built. And, mark me well,

just here. No man on that day, or subsequently in apostolic times, received this baptism of miraculous power *apart from his relation to the church*. He was baptized *in the Spirit unto*, i.e., with reference to, *the church*. That is to say, he did not receive this miraculous power, whether of tongues or interpretations of tongues, or healing, or inspiration, or prophecy, or in any other gift as an *individual*, that he might go off at a tangent and become a separatist, or glorify himself, but he was “baptized in the Spirit *unto the church*.” The gifts were for edification, upbuilding the church. . . .

[The] baptism of miraculous power . . . [and] temporary gifts . . . [were inferior to] the enduring graces of regeneration, [and] were temporary—were for a sign, that is, to accredit the church and [then they] would then cease: “Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge [supernatural], it shall vanish away.”

(5) And here in this very text he assured them that this very “baptism in the Spirit” was [for] . . . the church - not out of it, not against it, not to its detriment, but *for it*; not to its confusion, but to its order; not to its shame, but to its glory; not unto its destruction, but unto its upbuilding. The whole context shows, as other Scriptures abundantly confirm, that the baptism in the Spirit was a baptism in miraculous power, for a temporary purpose, but that baptism, while it lasted, was to give credentials unto the church. Hence the baptism in the Spirit was a baptism *unto*, or *into*, the church.

(6) Believing as I do, that in Apostolic times the church was thoroughly and sufficiently accredited, to my mind there is now no need for this baptism in the Spirit, and as the Scriptures were completed, inspiration ceased with John. . . . What then does remain of the *new* enduement received on the Day of Pentecost? The Spirit did not occupy the house of Jesus merely to accredit it by miracles but to fill it with ability to do the work assigned it, to enable it to carry out all its mission. This is our everlasting heritage.

Do understand me here. When I say the Spirit fills the church today, I do not refer:

1. To that mere concept of the mind—all the elect as they are or shall be in heaven. I refer to no *invisible* church.
2. Nor do I refer to any provincial, national, or world-wide organization of professed believers.
3. I do refer to independent, local, visible organization of baptized believers. There was one such organization at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. That was the church. There was afterwards one such in Corinth, to which Paul wrote, and he called that one a temple of the Holy Ghost. There was one such at Ephesus, and he wrote to that one and called it a temple of the Holy Ghost. And wherever elsewhere one was organized, it became a temple of the Holy Ghost. They were all visible and had visible ordinances. All of them were working bodies here on earth. To such a one, and only to such, could our Savior’s precept apply: “Tell it to the church.” These were the organizations that received, educated, disciplined, and, if need be, excluded members. These preached the gospel. Each was the house of God, the church of the living God, and pillar and ground of the

truth. The Holy Ghost does not inhabit a denomination. He inhabits a church. The Holy Ghost does not inhabit a nation. He inhabits a church—a local church.

This was the new thing at Pentecost. Christ built the first one. It was designed not only to perpetuate itself but to multiply itself.

Do listen carefully again to my fourth Scripture: “In Jesus Christ *each several building*, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord.” If this general proposition of Paul be true, that “every several building” which is “fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple,” of course, it would follow just as he states concerning the particular Ephesus church: “In whom ye also are builded for a habitation of God through the Spirit.” That is to say, if it is the law of Jesus Christ that wherever local churches are organized on New Testament principles, each for itself would be a temple of God, then it would follow that if this local church is organized on the New Testament, “we also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.” Now mark two things:

1. That a denomination in a particular section or country, is not a temple of God. There is no such thing as a state or national church. If God ever thought of such a thing, He did not reveal His thoughts.

2. That Christian people even in one city or community are not a temple of God, any more than a hundred thousand loose bricks make a house. A temple is an organic structure. The parts must be put together according to a plan and so united as to make one building. That is a house. And for Christians to unite themselves together into any kind of human society, whether creditable or innocent its objects, is no temple of God. *The Spirit of God inhabits only one organization on this earth*—the church of Jesus Christ. And unto no other organization as Jesus given His commission and ordinances. And no other organization is the pillar and ground of the truth. The Confederate Veteran Association, the Bar Association, the Medical Association, the Democratic and Republican parties, . . . all of them man-made, may be good and serve good purposes, but none of them is the house of the living God, the holy temple the habitation of the eternal Spirit.

Yea, more, the Young Men’s Christian Association, the B.Y.P.U. of America, or the South, or of the State, or the Salvation Army—*none of them is the temple*, or even a temple of God. To none of them has God committed the world’s evangelization.

But, you will say, “Brother Carroll, where does this doctrine lead? Have you looked to the end of it?” No matter where it leads I am willing to follow it, as confidently as Moses followed the pillar of cloud and fire, even if need be into deserts and waterless and foodless places, and simply trust God.

“But don’t you believe in ladies’ aid societies, and Sunday-schools, and young people’s unions?”

In the local church, yes; as working committees of the church, yes; working in and through and by and for the church, yes. Representing for themselves and from themselves into any State or National organization, *no*, SO HELP ME GOD. . . .

I mean to say this much: That if the human societies for doing the work of the church were disbanded-every one of them-the church of Jesus Christ could go right on with the work of evangelizing the world and Christ would have the glory in the church more fully. The following corollaries set forth a summary of the whole matter:

1. This explains the sense in which the Holy Spirit was given after Christ's ascension.
2. This also explains the baptism of the Spirit as never before existent, and here by miraculous endowments bestowing credentials on the church.
3. And how these endowments ceased with the accomplishment of their purpose.
4. An explanation . . . that the baptism in the Holy Ghost was into or unto one body and subordinate to the church.
5. [I]n an accommodated sense, used one time only, a single Christian is called a temple and might have been so called before Christ as well as since Christ[,] [but]
6. No other organization *whatsoever* is an habitation of the Spirit.
7. No other is the pillar and ground of the truth.
8. No other has committed to it the ordinances and possesses one atom of official authority from God.
9. All the good accomplished by any other can be better done through the church.
10. For purposes of cooperation in evangelization the churches may [assist each other]. . . .
11. My deliberate conviction is that no work of evangelization *whatsoever* should be committed to any organized convention or association *whatsoever* except such as are composed solely of the representatives of the churches. [Though Biblically there is no basis in Scripture for any organized parachurch conventions or associations at all.]
12. I do not deny their work or its value, but it could have been better done by honoring the church and with less harm. I do not oppose, but favor Sunday-schools, Ladies' Societies, Young People's Unions, as working committees in the local church, doing all their work in, through, by, and for the church and *representing as societies in nothing*.
13. As this is a spiritual house, I believe its worship should be spiritual, that its choirs that lead the music should be spiritual, just as much as the preachers and deacons. In other words, it is just as lawful and congruous to employ an unconverted, professional elocutionist or actor to do your preaching and an unconverted business expert to manage the temporalities of the deacons' office as to employ unconverted singers.
14. If this is a spiritual house to offer spiritual sacrifices, and as contribution for Christ's sake is a part of this worship, all secular methods of raising money by pew-rents, fairs, raffles, suppers, balls, etc., are an abomination in the sight of God. Let the world raise its money that way if it wants to.
15. That we ought never to canvass the world for church-money. If any voluntarily, without solicitation, and from respect to religion, wish to aid, receive it. If, however, the circumstances of the tender show it to proceed from a spirit of patronage or a *means of advertising* you had better let it alone.

16. That every dollar expended in meeting-houses that apes the temple or cathedral idea as if brick and wood and stained glass spires were holy; and every dollar put into mere style or ornamentation, such as would make the poor feel not at home, leave it out. Whatever is necessary to endurance, size, safety, ventilation, warmth, acoustics, ingress and egress, and especially acoustics, have them, of course. Simplicity and utility may combine with taste.

## VI. Bibliography

- Accordance Bible software, OakTree Software, Inc., Palm Springs Drive, Suite 100, Altamonte Springs, FL 32701. Tools used included:
- Apocrypha, King James Version, Revised English Bible, & Revised Standard Version.*
- Apocryphal Gospels, The*, Greek text prepared by Craig A. Evans, English Translation Craig A. Evans.
- Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, ed. & rev. Michael W. Holmes.
- Aramaic Targums (Onkelos, Jonathan, and the Writings, Neofiti & Esther Shenit, Pseudo-Jonathan, Fragment Targums, Cairo Geniza Texts)*, text from The Complete Aramaic Lexicon Project. English Translations, Eldon Clem.
- Bible Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity*, G. Adolf Deismann, trans. Alexander Grieve.
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. by Karl Elliger, William Rudolph, et al.
- Byzantine/Majority Textform Greek New Testament* (1991).
- Church Fathers: The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 1 and 2*, ed. Alexander Roberts, Philip Schaff, et. al.
- Christian Apologists, The*, a digital version of selected works from Jacques-Paul Migne, *Patrologiae Graecae* (Paris, 1866). Volume 6.
- Dictionary of Early Christian Biography and Literature to the End of the Sixth Century A. D., with an Account of the Principal Sects and Heresies*, ed. Henry Wace.
- Easton's Bible Dictionary*, M.G. Easton.
- Expositor's Bible Commentary*, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelin.
- Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, An*, Bruce K. Waltke & M. O'Connor.
- King James Version* of the Bible.
- Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature (BDAG)*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., rev. & ed. Frederick W. Danker.
- Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, Johannes P. Louw & Eugene A. Nida, ed.
- Greek New Testament: Textus Receptus*, Stephanus 1550/Scrivener 1894. *The Greek New Testament: The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*," by the Trinitarian Bible Society.
- Greek Pseudepigrapha, The*, elec. text Craig A. Evans. English Translation *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. R. H. Charles, and *The Pseudepigrapha (English)*, trans. Craig A. Evans, et. al.

*Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Ludwig Koehler & Walter Baumgarnter, rev. Baumgarnter & Stamm.

*Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, gen. ed. Chad Brand et. al.

*Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon, An, Founded Upon The Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon*, Liddell & Scott.

*Nestle-Aland Greek New Testament*, 27<sup>th</sup> ed.

*New International Dictionary of Biblical Archaeology, The*, Edward M. Blaiklock, et. al.

*New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, J. D. Douglas, gen. ed.

*Septuaginta*, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs.

*Synonyms of the New Testament*, Richard Chenevix Trench.

*Textus Receptus*, Scrivener 1894/Stephanus 1550.

The Theological Journal Library, Version 5, Galaxie Software. Numerous issues of the Journal of Christian Apologetics, Bibliotheca Sacra, Chafer Theological Seminary Journal, Conservative Theological Journal, Emmaus Journal, Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society, Grace Seminary Journal, Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, Master's Seminary Journal, Michigan Theological Journal, Trinity Journal, and the Westminster Theological Journal are included.

*Tyndale New Testament (1525)*, William Tyndale.

*Word Biblical Commentary*. gen. eds. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, & Glenn W. Barker; OT ed. John D. W. Watts, NT ed. Ralph P. Martin. Thomas Nelson: 1996.

*Works of Flavius Josephus*, Greek text from the 1890 Niese ed. English Translation *The Works of Flavius Josephus, Complete and Unabridged*, trans. William Whiston.

*Works of Philo*, Greek text from The Norwegian Philo Concordance Project. English Translation *The Works of Philo, Completed and Unabridged*. New Updated Ed., trans. C. D. Yonge.

*Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, The*, gen. ed. Merrill C. Tenney.

Alford, Henry, *Alford's Greek Testament: An Exegetical and Critical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980 (reprint of 1874 ed.).

Armitage, Thomas, *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 2. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Asher, Louis Franklin, *John Clarke (1609-1676): Pioneer in American Medicine, Democratic Ideals, and Champion of Religions Liberty*. Pittsburg, PA: Dorrance Publishing, 1997. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

*Baptist Heritage Journal*, “The Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach.” Baptist Heritage Press, 1991. 1:1 129-140.

*Baptist History Collection CD*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005. Accessed the *Confession of 1527*, *Second London Confession of Faith* of 1677, the *Orthodox Creed* of 1679, the *Philadelphia Confession of Faith* of 1720, the 1847 *German Confession of Faith and Constitution of the Churches of Baptized Christians commonly called Baptists*, and the 1879 *French Baptist Confession*.

Bammell, C. P. Hammond, “Ignatian Problems.” *Journal of Theological Studies*, C. P. Hammond Bammel, 33:1 (April 1982) 62-97.

Basil, *On the Spirit*.

*Bible, Holy: The Holy Scriptures in the Original Languages: תורה נביאים כתובים*, 1894/1998, Bomberg/Ginsburg ed. *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ*, Beza/Scrivener, 1894. London, England: Tyndale House/Trinitarian Bible Society, 1894/1998.

Blomberg, Craig, “Baptism of the Holy Spirit.” *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996.

Brand, Chad, gen. ed. *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism*. Contributors Ralph D. Colle, H. Ray Dunning, Larry Hart, Stanley Horton, & Walter Kaiser, Jr. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004.

Brumett, John, “Does Progressive Dispensationalism Teach A Posttribulational Rapture?—Part I.” *Conservative Theological Journal*, 2:5 (June 1998) 191-205.

Bruner, Frederick Dale, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1970.

- Burkitt, Henry L. rev., Burkitt, Lemuel & Read, Jesse, *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association*. pub. 1850. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- Calvin, John, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series, vol. 7, John Calvin Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Software, 1998.
- Carroll, B. H., *Ecclesia*. Elec. acc. AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006.
- Carroll, B. H., comp. Crowder, J. W., ed. Cranfill, J. B., *The Holy Spirit: Comprising a Discussion of the Paraclete, the Other Self of Jesus, and Other Phases of the Work of the Spirit of God*. Elec. acc. in the AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006.
- Carroll, B. H., *The Three Baptisms*. Elec. acc. AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006.
- Carson, Alexander, *Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, 5<sup>th</sup> rev. ed. Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1860; elec. acc. <http://books.google.com>.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry, *Systematic Theology: Pneumatology*, reprint ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1976.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry, "The Teachings of Christ Incarnate, Part 3: The Upper Room Discourse." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 109:434 (April 1952) 103-136.
- Christian, John T., *A History of Baptists*, vol. 1. Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1922.
- Compton, R. Bruce, "1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts." *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 97-144.
- Cumming, James Elder, *Through the Eternal Spirit: A Biblical Study on the Holy Ghost*. Chicago, IL: Revell, 1896.
- Damascus, John of, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*.

Danker, Frederick William (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

*Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887* (Orthodox Quaker).  
<http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml>.

Delitzsch, Franz, *A System of Biblical Pyschology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> English ed., trans. Robert Ernest Wallis. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1885.

Dunn, James D. G., *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism Today*. Chatham, England: SCM Press, 1970.

Eusebius, *Church History*.

Feinberg, J. S., ed., *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments: Essays in honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.* Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1988.

Fredericks, Gary, "Rethinking The Role Of The Holy Spirit In The Lives Of Old Testament Believers." *Trinity Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1988) 81-104.

Gaebelen, Frank E., ed., *Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990.

Gillette, A. D., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Graves, J. R., & Adlam, S., *The First Baptist Church in America Not Founded by Roger Williams*. Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1995 (reprint of 1928 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

Grillmeier, Aloys, *Christ in Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chacedon (451)*, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden. Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1975. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.

Hah, Kyu Sam, "Theology Of Prayer In The Gospel Of Luke." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 43:4 (Dec 00) 675-695.

Hamel, Ken, *The Online Bible for Mac*, version 3.0. Oakhurst, NJ: Online Bible Software, 1996. Modules used included:

*Annotations upon the Holy Bible*, Matthew Poole (1700).

*Brenton's English Septuagint*, Lancelot Brenton (1851).

*Commentary on the Bible* Adam Clarke (1832).

*Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments* R. Jamieson, A. R. Faussett, and D. Brown (1871).

*Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, John Gill (1809).

*Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, Matthew Henry (1721).

*Family Bible Notes*, Justin Edwards (1861).

*Geneva Bible Notes* (1599).

*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Joseph Henry Thayer (1889).

*Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Brown, Driver, Briggs (1907).

*King James Version* (1769).

*Nestle 27/UBS 4 Greek New Testament*.

*New Testament in the Original Greek according to the Byzantine/Majority Textform* (1991).

*Notes on the New Testament*, Albert Barnes.

*Notes on the Old and New Testaments*, John Wesley (1767).

*Textual and Translation Notes on the Gospels*, Jay P. Green (1994).

*Textus Receptus*, Scrivener 1894.

*Textus Receptus*, Stephens 1550.

*Westcott-Hort Greek New Testament* (1881).

*Word Pictures in the New Testament*, A. T. Robertson.

Hengstenberg, E. W., *Christology of the Old Testament*. Trans. James Martin. 4 vol., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858.

Hiebert, D. Edmond, "Selected Studies from 1 Peter, Part 2: The Suffering and Triumphant Christ: An Exposition of 1 Peter 3:18-22." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 139:554 (April 1982) 146-159.

- Hiscox, Edward T. *Principles and Practices for Baptist Churches*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, orig. pub. 1894.
- Hodges, Zane C., Book Review of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, James Hope Moulton. Vol. 4: Style, Nigel Turner (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976). *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135:539 (Jul 1978), 272-273.
- Hoekema, Anthony A., *Holy Spirit Baptism*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Holy Bible, 1611 edition*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2003 (reprint ed).
- Hovey, Alvah, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*. Boston, MA: Henry A. Young, 1885.
- Kaiser, Walter, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985.
- Kelley, J. N. D., *Early Christian Creeds*. London: Longman, 1972. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.
- Lampe, G. W. H., ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007, 20<sup>th</sup> ed.
- Lampe, G. W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*. London: S. P. C. K., 1967. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Link, John B., ed., *Texas Historical and Biographical Magazine*, vol. 1 (1825-1894). Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- Longenecker, Richard N., "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19-4:7." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25:1 (Mark 1982) 53-61.

- Mason, Roy, *The Myth of the Universal, Invisible Church Theory Exploded*. Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, 2003.
- Mercer, Jesse, *History of the Georgia Baptist Association*. Washington, GA, pub. 1838. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- McClintock, John & Strong, James, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 2. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2006.
- Montanye, T. B., *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, October 5-7, A. D. Gillette, 415-420*. Elec. acc. *Baptist History Collection*, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- Mouring, Steve, *Encyclopedia Puritannica Project*, CD Version 3.0. Bealton, VA. <http://www.puritannica.com>. Works accessed included:  
 Boston, Thomas, *Works*, 12 vol.  
 Charnock, Stephen, *Existence and Attributes of God*.  
 Dabney, Robert, *Discussions*.  
 Edwards, Jonathan, *Works*.  
 Manton, Thomas, *Works*.  
 Poole, Matthew, *Commentary*.
- Mullins, E. Y., "Baptism of the Holy Spirit." *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, gen. ed. James Orr. Orig. pub. Eerdmans, 1939; elec. acc. *Online Bible For Mac* software, Ken Hamel.
- Murray, Iain H., *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism, 1750-1858*. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1994.
- Nazianzen, Gregory, *Orationes*.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson (ed.), *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002 (reprint ed.).

- Orchard, G. H., *History of Baptists*. Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1987.
- Owen, John, *Pneumatologia: A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005.
- Packer, J. I., *Keep in Step with the Spirit: Finding Fullness in Our Walk with God*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight, *Things To Come*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958.
- Pettegrew, Larry D. "Dispensationalists and Spirit Baptism." *Master's Seminary Journal* 8 (Spring 1997) 29-46.
- Pink, Arthur W., "Does First Corinthians 12 Mean the Universal Church or a Local New Testament Church?" <http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Miscellaneous/universal-or-local.htm>.
- Pink, Arthur W., *The Holy Spirit*. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: AGES Software (ver. 1.0), 2000.
- Robertson, A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Ross, Thomas, "An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians." <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.
- Ross, Thomas, *Heaven Only For the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ versus Baptismal Regeneration*. <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.
- Ross, Thomas, "Pauline Images of the Church in 1 Clement." <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.
- Ross, Thomas, "The Great Commission in Scripture and History." <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>.

- Russell, Walt, "The Anointing with the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts." *Trinity Journal* 7:1 (Spring 1986) 47-63.
- Ryrie, Charles, *The Holy Spirit*. Chicago, IL: Moody, 1965.
- Sargent, Robert, *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine*, 4 vol. Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.
- Sattler, Michael, *Confession of 1527*. Cited in *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 2, Thomas Armitage. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- Schaff, Philip, *History of the Christian Church*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910. Vol. 2, *Ante-Nicene Christianity*.
- Schreiner, Thomas R., book review of *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998. *Trinity Journal* 20:1 (Spring 1999) 95-100.
- Scofield, C. I., ed, *Scofield Reference Bible*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Silva, M., Book Review of *Christian Words*, by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980). *Trinity Journal* 3:1 (Spring 1982) 103-109.
- Skilton, John H., Book Review of Turner's *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. *Westminster Theological Journal* 29:2 (May 1967) 214-221.
- Stott, John R. W., *Baptism & Fulness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978.
- Strong, Augustus, *Systematic Theology*, part 7 (Ecclesiology), elec. acc. Systematic Theologies, vol. 17, Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software library, 2006.
- Strouse, Thomas M, "Ye Are The Body of Christ." elec. acc. [http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body\\_of\\_christ.html](http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body_of_christ.html).

- Thayer, Henry, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978 (reprint ed.).
- Tottingham, Ron, *The Door-Step Evangel*, 24:2 (March-April 2008) 1-6. Empire Baptist Temple/Great Plains Baptist Divinity School, Sioux Falls, SD.
- Turner, Nigel, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.
- Unger, Merrill F., “The Baptism with the Holy Spirit,” part 1. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 101:402 (Apr 1944) 232-247.
- Unger, Merrill F., “The Baptism with the Holy Spirit,” part 2. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 101:403 (Jul 1944), 357-374.
- Unger, Merrill F., “The Baptism with the Holy Spirit,” part 3. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 101:404 (Oct 44) 483-500.
- Van Braght, Thieleman, J., *The Bloody Theater or Martyr’s Mirror of the Defenseless Christians, Who Baptized Only Upon Confession of Faith, and Who Suffered and Died for the Testimony of Jesus, Their Saviour, From the Time of Christ to the Year A. D. 1660, Compiled From Various Authentic Chronicles, Memorials, and Testimonies*, trans. Joseph F. Sohm. 2<sup>nd</sup>. Eng. ed. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999.
- Van Gelderen, John R., “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit.” *Revival magazine*, 1:2009, 13-18.
- Verduin, Leonard, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965.
- Wallace, Daniel, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Walvoord, John F., *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958.

Walvoord, John F., "The Person of the Holy Spirit Part 7: The Work of the Holy Spirit in Salvation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 98:392 (Oct 41) 421-447.

*Westminster Confession of Faith.*

## VII. Endnotes

<sup>i</sup> Ephesians 4:5 is evaluated in the section “Was Spirit baptism a completed historical phenomenon at the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, or is it an event that takes place regularly throughout the entire dispensation of grace?”

<sup>ii</sup> Some of the major divisions of the post-conversion special power position are: 1.) The Wesleyan view, which connected Spirit baptism with an experience of entire sanctification and perfect love; 2.) A large variety of Methodist and revivalist views, which developed from the Wesleyan doctrine, such as the doctrine of the Oberlin evangelist and Pelagian Charles Finney’s belief that Spirit baptism brought special holiness and empowerment, a view that influenced the post-conversion empowerment views of Spirit baptism held by men such as D. L. Moody, R. A. Torrey, and John R. Rice. The early Keswick employment of Spirit baptism language for what it later generally called Spirit filling also bears a substantial relationship to the earlier Oberlin position. 3.) The classical Pentecostal view, which developed under Wesleyan, Methodist, and revivalist influences, connects the baptism with the ability to speak in tongues. 4.) The Oneness Pentecostal view, which likewise associates the baptism and tongues speaking, but affirms that it is absolutely necessary to salvation and that it occurs only after one has believed, repented, and been baptized with a “Jesus only” formula in order to obtain the remission of sins. It should be noted that this fourth view is somewhat different from the first three divisions listed in that it affirms that all Christians receive Spirit baptism, because one must, after being baptized with a “Jesus only” formula, receive Spirit baptism and speak in tongues to become a Christian. No true Christian can hold view four, as it entirely corrupts the gospel and all who hold it are accursed of God (Galatians 1:8-9). True believers can hold the first three views, although these views are erroneous. Note also pgs. 9-14, *Holy Spirit Baptism*, Anthony A. Hoekema (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972) for the special benefits and powers bestowed in what the book terms the Neo-Pentecostal view. John R. Van Gelderen tries to combine the PCP and UCD positions in “The Baptism of the Holy Spirit” (pgs. 13-18, *Revival* magazine, 1:2009).

<sup>iii</sup> Disagreements among UCDs exist, although the divisions are not as wide as the chasms that separate proponents of many of the subdivisions in the PCP position. See “Dispensationalists and Spirit Baptism,” Larry D. Pettegrew, *Master’s Seminary Journal* 8 (Spring 1997): 29-46.

<sup>iv</sup> In the words of Lewis Sperry Chafer (*Systematic Theology: Pneumatology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1976 (reprint ed.), pgs. 142-143, vol. 6, chap. 11): “[T]he Spirit’s baptism . . . is a joining of the believer to, the bringing into, the Body of Christ—in other words, the forming of that organic relation between Christ and the believer which is expressed by the words *in Christ* and which is the ground of the Christian’s positions and possessions. . . . The members are a unity, being in one Body . . . joined to its Head . . . [t]hey are said to be *baptized* into this Body by one Spirit. . . . The central truth is that one Spirit baptizes all—every believer—into the one Body. What is thus accomplished for every believer is a part of his very salvation, else it could not include each one.”

<sup>v</sup> Individual advocates of the UCD or PCP position are also referenced below as UCDs or PCPs.

<sup>vi</sup> Documentation for the affirmation that this view is the classical Baptist position is found below in the section “Historic Baptist support for a first century fulfillment of Spirit baptism and for interpreting 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to the church ordinances.” Note the brief exposition of the historic Baptist view in *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine*, Robert Sargent (Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, n. d.), vol. II:4, pgs. 293-299.

<sup>vii</sup> Baptists believed in doctrines connected with modern dispensationalism before the days of John Darby and the popularization of the system within Protestantism; thus history documents, e. g., that English Baptist pastor Benjamin Keach was put on trial in the 1600s as a heretic because he believed in a literal millennium (see *The Baptist Heritage Journal*, Vol. 1, #1, Baptist Heritage Press, 1991, “The Tryal of Mr. Benjamin Keach,” pgs. 129-140).

<sup>viii</sup> While the overwhelming majority of advocates of the PCP doctrine believe in a universal, invisible church, such an ecclesiological position is not key to their position on Spirit baptism, as it is to the UCD. If there is no universal, invisible church, the UCD position is absolutely impossible.

<sup>ix</sup> See endnote 79 for works refuting universal ecclesiology and establishing a local-only position.

<sup>x</sup> Indeed, such has been the falling away from the old Baptist doctrine of Spirit baptism that evangelicals affiliated with churches in bodies such as the modern Southern Baptist Convention are almost universally ignorant of its existence, as are many neo-fundamentalist and truly fundamental Baptist

---

churches connected with larger bodies such as the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches or the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship, although the historic Baptist position remains dominant among the generality of unaffiliated Baptist separatists. Baptist pastors trained in parachurch institutions generally affiliated with generic fundamentalism (such as Bob Jones University) often are never even presented with the historic Baptist position, while those trained in church-run fundamental Baptist colleges and local-church specific Baptist Bible institutes tend to both learn about and embrace the historic Baptist position on Spirit baptism.

Baptists who read only neo-evangelical or non-historic Baptist compositions on Spirit baptism will probably never even have the historic Baptist position presented to them. For example, in critiquing the PCP position in favor of a UCD view of 1 Corinthians 12:13, the evangelical J. I. Packer wrote, “Can it be convincingly denied that 1 Corinthians 12:13 . . . refers to one aspect of what we may call the ‘conversion-initiation complex’ with which the Christian life starts, so that according to Paul every Christian as such is Spirit-baptized? Surely it cannot. The only [emphasis added] alternative to this conclusion would be to hold, as the late R. A. Torrey influentially did, that Paul here speaks of a ‘second blessing,’ not mentioned in his letters elsewhere, which he knew that he and all the Corinthians had received, though some Christians today have not” (pg. 163, *Keep in Step with the Spirit: Finding Fullness in Our Walk with God*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005). Packer goes on to (effectively) critique the PCP view of 1 Corinthians 12:13. What is noteworthy is that he presents his UCD position as the “only” alternative. The historic Baptist position is entirely ignored. Packer is typical of evangelical books and articles on Spirit baptism, as even a cursory examination will verify. Journal articles such as “Dispensationalists and Spirit Baptism,” Larry D. Pettegrew, *Master’s Seminary Journal* 8 (Spring 1997): 29-46 ignore the historic Baptist view, despite historic Baptist acceptance of dispensational distinctions. Dictionary articles such as “Baptism of the Holy Spirit,” by Craig Blomberg in the *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996) ignore the historic Baptist position. Evangelical books such as *Baptism & Fulness: The Work of the Holy Spirit Today*, John R. W. Stott, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978) and *Holy Spirit Baptism*, Anthony A. Hoekema (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972) ignore the historic Baptist position. It is noteworthy, however, that Hoekema admits that the passages concerning Spirit baptism in the gospels, as well as Acts 1:5, refer to Pentecost alone, stating: “This outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost Day . . . was a historical event of the greatest importance—unique, unrepeatable, once-for-all. It may be thought of as an event comparable in magnitude to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. . . . In Jerusalem the Holy Spirit was poured out on the 120 disciples . . . in fulfillment of the promise of the Father; this outpouring was a great salvation-history event[.] . . . In this sense, therefore, Pentecost can never be repeated, and does not need to be repeated. . . . [T]he expression ‘to be baptized in the Spirit’ is used in the Gospels and in Acts 1:5 to designate the once-for-all, historical event of the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost Day. In this sense the baptism of the Spirit is never repeated” (pg. 17-20, cf. 15-29). However, Hoekema then argues for a UCD perspective based on Acts 11:16 and 1 Corinthians 12:13, interacting with the PCP doctrine but engaging in no interaction at all with the historic Baptist position. His bibliography (pgs. 94-95) lists no books by historic Baptists, so it appears that his affirmations on the Spirit baptism texts in the gospels and in Acts 1:5 agree with the conclusions of the classic Baptist doctrine simply from the force of grammatical-historical interpretation, and potentially without any knowledge on his part of the existence of the view.

*Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in relation to Pentecostalism Today* by James D. G. Dunn (Chatham, England: SCM Press, 1970) may be considered as representative of treatments of Spirit baptism by those less conservative than historic Baptists, fundamentalists, or evangelicals. Dunn writes:

Of particular interest to the NT scholar is the Pentecostal’s teaching about the baptism in the Spirit, for in it he claims to have discovered the NT pattern of conversion-initiation—the only pattern which makes sense of the data in Acts—and also the principal explanation for the amazing growth of the early Church. But does the NT mean by baptism in the Holy Spirit what the Pentecostal understands the phrase to mean? Is baptism in the Holy Spirit to be separated from conversion-initiation, and is the beginning of the Christian life to be thus divided up into distinct stages? Is Spirit-baptism something essentially different from becoming a Christian, so that even a Christian of many years’ standing may never have been baptized in the Spirit?

These are some of the important questions which Pentecostal teaching raises, and it will be the primary task of this book to re-examine the NT in the light of this teaching with a view to answering these questions. Put in a nutshell, we hope to discover what is the place of the gift of the Spirit in the total complex event of becoming a Christian. This will inevitably involve us in a wider debate than merely with Pentecostals. For many outside

---

Pentecostalism make a straightforward identification between a baptism in the Spirit and the Christian sacrament of water-baptism, while others distinguish two gifts or comings of the Spirit, the first at conversion-initiation and the second at a later date, in Confirmation or in the bestowal of charismata. I shall therefore be defining my position over against two and sometimes three or four different standpoints. . . . I hope to show that for the writers of the NT the baptism in or gift of the Spirit was part of the event (or process) of becoming a Christian, together with the effective proclamation of the Gospel, belief in (ἐἰς) Jesus as Lord, and water-baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus; that it was the chief element in conversion-initiation so that only those who had thus received the Spirit could be called Christians; that the reception of the Spirit was a very definite and often dramatic *experience*, the decisive and climactic experience in conversion-initiation, to which the Christian was usually recalled when reminded of the beginning of his Christian faith and experience. We shall see that while the Pentecostal's belief in the dynamic and experiential nature of Spirit-baptism is well founded, his separation of it from conversion-initiation is wholly unjustified; and that, conversely, while water-baptism is an important element in the complex of conversion-initiation, it is neither to be equated or confused with Spirit-baptism nor to be given the most prominent part in that complex event. The high point in conversion-initiation is the gift of the Spirit, and the beginning of the Christian life is to be reckoned from the experience of Spirit-baptism." (pgs. 3-4)

One notes that Dunn equates Spirit baptism and the gift of the Spirit and adopts other elements of the UCD view while corrupting the doctrine of conversion by mixing in baptism in water and other heresy as a consequence of his non-evangelical, anti-inerrancy, semi-sacramentalist position. (Compare his statement that "[W]ater-baptism can properly be described as the vehicle of faith; but *not* as the vehicle of the Spirit. It enables man to approach God . . . but otherwise it is not the channel of God's grace." Pg. 100, *Ibid*. Dunn states that Paul's sins were forgiven at the time of his baptism, pg. 75, and argues against the view that baptism is a sign of a conversion which has already taken place, pg. 145, 226-227. His acceptance of forms of higher criticism is obvious throughout his book.) Dunn also interacts with the PCP position and rigid sacramentalism in his book, speaking of his "debate with Pentecostal and sacramentalist" (pgs. 21, 170), but he never acknowledges the existence of the historic Baptist view. Advocates of the historic Baptist doctrine do not appear in his index of modern authors and works (pgs. 230-236). Similarly, neo-orthodox theologian Frederick Dale Bruner in his *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* never mentions or interacts in any way with the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism. Bruner can nevertheless assert: "To be literal, being 'baptized with the Holy Spirit' is not a doctrine which Acts teaches for the on-going church since the phrase occurs only at the crisis initiations of the Jews and the Gentiles into the church. After Caesarea the phrase disappears from the vocabulary of Acts" (pg. 195). However, being ignorant of the true view, and being an unregenerate person, Bruner goes on to argue that Spirit baptism takes place at the moment of water baptism. Non-evangelical writers, like many of their modern fundamental and evangelical counterparts, are entirely ignorant of the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism.

Most ironically, the book *Perspectives on Spirit Baptism* (gen. ed. Chad Brand; authors Ralph D. Colle, H. Ray Dunning, Larry Hart, Stanley Horton, & Walter Kaiser, Jr. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2004) ignores the historic Baptist view, although it contains chapters presenting and then critiquing what are termed the Sacramental, Wesleyan, Charismatic, Pentecostal, and Reformed views of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The book ignores the historic Baptist position despite asserting that it "presents in counterpoint . . . the basic common beliefs on Spirit baptism which have developed over the course of church history with a view toward determining which is most faithful to Scripture." Amazingly, the book is edited by a Southern Baptist professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and published by the same Southern Baptist Convention that, only a half century earlier, had a president and long time professor at the very same seminary that advocated the historic Baptist view in the classic and widely circulated *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*.

Thus, as indicated, the historic Baptist position is advocated in the article "Baptism of the Holy Spirit" within the *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* (gen. ed. James Orr. orig. pub. Eerdmans, 1939; elec. acc. *Online Bible For Mac* software, Ken Hamel). The article's author, E. Y. Mullins, was professor and later president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at the turn of the nineteenth century, and, from 1921-1924, president of the very Southern Baptist Convention that in modern times either ignores or repudiates his doctrine of Spirit baptism. "The question is often raised whether or not the baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred once for all or is repeated in subsequent baptisms. The evidence seems to point to the former view to the extent at least of being limited to outpourings which took place in connection with events recorded in the early chapters of the Book of Acts. . . . [Evidence is then presented in favor of the conclusion that Spirit baptism was limited to the events in Acts.] . . . [N]owhere in the epistles do we find a repetition of the baptism of the Spirit. This would be remarkable if it had been

understood by the writers of the epistles that the baptism of the Spirit was frequently to be repeated. There is no evidence outside the Book of Acts that the baptism of the Spirit ever occurred in the later New Testament times. In 1 Corinthians 12:13 Paul [makes] . . . reference . . . not to the baptism of the Spirit, but rather to a baptism into the church.” The historic Baptist view ignored by the modern Southern Baptist Convention was also affirmed by other prominent Southern Baptists in the time of Mullins, such as B. H. Carroll, professor of theology and Bible at Baylor University and Seminary from 1872-1905 and professor and president of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary from 1908-1914. (See the appendix: “Excerpts from the sermons ‘The First Pentecost’ and ‘The Church, The Habitat of the Holy Spirit’ by B. H. Carroll.”)

<sup>xi</sup> Quoted by Peter as Καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ Θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα· καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου καὶ προφητεύσουσι. καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα, πρὶν ἢ ἔλθειν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ· καὶ ἔσται, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται.

<sup>xii</sup> Acts 2 is at most a partial, but certainly not the ultimate, fulfillment of the prediction of Joel 2:28-32. The eschatological events of the Tribulation and Millennium, referenced in Ezekiel 39:27-29 and Zechariah 12:10, the only Old Testament references besides Joel 2:28-29 to the Spirit being massively poured out (קָדַשׁ), constitute the ultimate fulfillment of Joel 2:28-32 as well, when the Jewish remnant in mount Zion and Jerusalem will receive miraculous physical deliverance (The noun מִצְלָה, “deliverance” in 2:32, refers to physical deliverance, not spiritual salvation, in all 28 of its OT appearances, as does the verb מָצַל in the Niphal, “delivered” in 2:32, all 63 times it is found in the OT) from the armies of the Antichrist (Joel 2:32; neither Joel 2:32 nor Romans 10:13 is a promise that unconverted sinners who say a prayer will be regenerated; see “An Exegesis and Application of Romans 10:9-14 for Soulwinning Churches and Christians,” Thomas Ross, <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>). The sun did not turn into darkness, nor the moon into blood, on the day of Pentecost—but they will during the Tribulation period, the seventieth week of Daniel. J. Dwight Pentecost explains well the fulfillment of Joel 2 in the Tribulation on pgs. 444, 486-490, *Things To Come*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958. Concerning Acts 2, Pentecost explained: “Peter is not citing the experience [in Acts 2] as the [ultimate] fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy, so that [the disciples] must be considered to be in the [eschatological] kingdom, but rather Peter is citing Joel’s prophecy to substantiate the fact, which Israel knew through her Scriptures, that such an experience as [the baptism of the] Spirit was possible” (pg. 470, *Things To Come*).

Concerning the use of Joel 2:28-32 by Peter in Acts 2, Paul Feinberg helpfully comments:

In Peter’s sermon on the Day of Pentecost he quotes Joel 2:28–32 in support of what God is doing on that day. . . . Acts 2:16–21, as a fulfillment of Joel 2:28–32, is *one* referent of Joel 2:28–32. This is supported by the introductory formula “this is that” (Acts 2:16). Second, Acts 2:16–21 is not the *complete* referent (fulfillment) of Joel 2:28–32. This can be seen from the *sense* of the OT prediction, and from the fact that section two of the prophecy was not fulfilled on the Day of Pentecost. Third, the amplification or expansion of the promise in Joel to include the church is justified in terms of the OT text itself and antecedent theology. To put it another way, the application of the text to the church is not simply an *ad hoc* resolution of the matter. There is indication in the Joel 2:28–32 text that the application of the promise is to extend beyond the ethnic bounds of the nation. 2:28 says, “I will pour out my Spirit on *all people*” (עַל-כָּל-בָּשָׂר). There are those who hold that this expression refers exclusively to the nation of Israel. However, I think that the best evidence supports usage broader than ethnic Israel. עַל-כָּל-בָּשָׂר occurs thirty-two times outside of Joel in the OT. In twenty-three of these occasions the reference is to Gentiles alone (e.g., Deut 5:26; Isa 49:26; 66:16; Zech 2:13). In the majority of its uses it serves as a reference to everyone regardless of race, sex or age. This outpouring, then, even in its promise, is to be upon some who are not Jews.

Moreover, the promise of the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel is an *amplification* of the promise given to Abraham (Gen 12:1–3). God’s promise to Abraham included promises to Abraham personally, to his descendants, and to *all* the peoples of the earth. Thus, when a part of the referent (fulfillment) of these promises turns out to be the church, we should not be surprised. Furthermore, Paul says that these promises were spoken to Abraham and his seed, namely Christ. That is, the Abrahamic promises find their *fulfillment* in Christ. Since the church is related to Christ, we should not be surprised that Paul can call its members “children of Abraham” (Gal 3:7) and “Abraham’s seed” (Gal 3:29) and make them “heirs according to the

promise” (Gal 3:29). Having established the church’s relationship to the Abrahamic promises, it would be wrong to think that this in any way invalidated the right of those who are Abraham’s physical seed to these promises, or to think that both Israel and the church have the same relationship to these promises. The church has *direct* access to the promises of spiritual blessing because the spiritual blessings are said to be universal in their application, while its access to the national blessings promised to Israel is only *indirect* through the church’s relationship to Israel’s Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .

The sense of the OT text must be determined within its historical and cultural setting, and that sense is determinative for the NT fulfillment. . . . Where a promise or prediction is expanded or amplified, the amplification does not preclude the original addressees as a part of the referent (fulfillment) of that promise. *Expansion* does not require *exclusion*. Exclusion from any promise must be based upon some explicit or implicit statement of subsequent Scripture. Therefore, a concern for those to whom the prediction was given will always be necessary. . . . Where a promise or prediction is expanded or amplified, the amplification is justified in the text itself or in antecedent theology or both. This grows out of the belief that God has a unified plan and that plan is known to him, even if he reveals it to his creatures progressively. . . . The sense of any text is adequate for its fulfillment referents. That is, knowing the sense of a promise should put one in a position to recognize a fulfillment. The relationship between prediction and fulfillment is not arbitrary. This is rooted in the belief that God has intended his word as a revelation, something that could not be true if there was no linguistic relationship between promise and fulfillment. . . .

[T]he *unity* of the two Testaments does not require the *uniformity* of the two Testaments. Unity does not preclude *diversity*. The two Testaments may be unified just as certainly through discontinuity as through continuity. Both continuity and discontinuity are a part of the unity of the biblical revelation. There is both continuity and discontinuity between Israel and the church; and, if I understand Scripture correctly, there will be both continuity and discontinuity in the future between the church and Israel. (pgs. 126-128, *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments : Essays in honor of S. Lewis Johnson, Jr.*, ed. J. S. Feinberg. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1988).

Feinberg’s comments on the כָּל־בָּשָׂר, the “all flesh,” of Joel 2:28, are valid. Note the complete list of references: Genesis 6:12–13, 17, 19; 7:16, 21; 8:17; 9:11, 15–17; Leviticus 17:14; Numbers 16:22; 18:15; 27:16; Deuteronomy 5:26; Job 12:10; 34:15; Psalm 65:3; 136:25; 145:21; Isaiah 40:5; 49:26; 66:16, 23–24; Jeremiah 12:12; 25:31; 32:27; 45:5; Ezekiel 21:4, 9–10; Daniel 4:9; Joel 3:1; Zechariah 2:17. See also pgs. 96-98, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, Walter Kaiser. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1985.

<sup>xiii</sup> Acts 2:22; 3:12; 4:7-10, 33; 6:8; 8:10, 13; 10:38; 19:11; cf. Luke’s uses of the word in his “former treatise” (Acts 1:1; Luke 1:1-4); Luke 1:35; 4:36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13; 19:37; 24:49; also 1 Corinthians 12:29, δυνάμεις, “workers of miracles”; cf. 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28; Hebrews 2:4; Matthew 11:20-23; 13:54, 58; etc. This would be “the power that works wonders,” def. 1b in Danker, Frederick William (ed.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd. ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000 (henceforth cited as BDAG). “δύναμις [like τέρας, σημεῖον, μεγαλειον, ἔνδοξον, παράδοξον, and θαυμάσιον] . . . have this in common, that they are all used to characterize the supernatural works wrought by Christ in the days of his flesh; thus σημεῖον, John ii. 11; Acts ii. 19; τέρας, Acts ii. 22; John iv. 48; δύναμις, Mark vi. 2; Acts ii. 22; μεγαλειον, Luke i. 49; ἔνδοξον, Luke xiii. 17; παράδοξον, Luke v. 26; θαυμάσιον, Matt. xx. 15; while [δύναμις, τέρας, and σημεῖον are] the most usual [and] are in like manner employed of the same supernatural works wrought in the power of Christ by his Apostles (2 Cor. xii. 12); and of the lying miracles of Antichrist no less (2 Thess. ii. 11). They will be found, on closer examination, not so much to represent different kinds of trades, as miracles contemplated under different aspects an from different points of view. . . . [M]iracles are also ‘powers’ (δυνάμεις = ‘virtutes’), outcomings of that mighty *power* of God, which was inherent in Christ, Himself that “great Power of God” which Simon blasphemously allowed himself to be named (Acts viii. 8, 10); these powers being by Him lent to those who were his witnesses and ambassadors. . . . [In] our Version δυνάμεις is translated now “wonderful works” (Matt. vii. 22); now “mighty works” (Matt. xi. 20; Luke x. 13) and still more frequently “miracles” (Acts ii. 22; 1 Cor. xii. 10; iii. 5) . . . the word . . . point[s] . . . to new and higher *forces* (ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργήματα, 1 Cor. xii. 6, 10), ‘powers of the world to come’ (Heb. vi. 5), which have entered and are working in this lower world of ours. . . . With this is closely connected the term μεγαλεία, only occurring at Luke i. 49 (=‘magnalia’) and at Acts ii. 11, in which, as in δυνάμεις, the miracles are contemplated as outcomings of the *greatness* of God’s power and glory.” (pgs. 339-344, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Richard C. Trench. London: 1880, elec. acc. *Accordance Bible* software).

The noun δύναμις is usually translated *power* (77x out of 120 uses); *mighty work* (11x) is the second most common rendering. The word is translated *miracle* in Mark 9:39; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1

Corinthians 12:10, 28-29; Galatians 3:5; Hebrews 2:4. When δύνναμις is used of miracles, it emphasizes the *power* or *capability* involved. While the word is employed in senses where the performance of a miracle is not in view, in every such case a particular act is not under consideration (Matthew 6:13; 22:29; 24:29–30; 25:15; 26:64; Mark 9:1; 12:24; 13:25–26; 14:62; Luke 21:26–27; 22:69; Romans 1:20; 8:38; 1 Corinthians 14:11; 15:24; 15:56; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 4:7; 6:7; 8:3; 12:9; Ephesians 1:21; 2 Thessalonians 1:7; Hebrews 6:5; 7:16; 11:34; 1 Peter 3:22; 2 Peter 2:11; Rev 1:16; 3:8; 4:11; 5:12; 7:12; 11:17; 12:10; 15:8; 17:13; 18:3; 19:1). When a particular act is specified with δύνναμις, the act in question is always miraculous—non-miraculous works are never clearly identified with δύνναμις. Thus, the word is regularly used of the performance of miraculous acts (Matthew 7:22; 11:20, 21, 23; 13:54, 58; 14:2; Mark 6:2, 5, 14; 9:39; Luke 10:13; 19:37; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28-29; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Galatians 3:5; 2 Thessalonians 2:9; Hebrews 2:4), and in other uses the word is clearly associated and related to the performance of miracles (Mark 5:30; Luke 1:17 (a legitimate instance, despite John 10:41, where σημεῖον, not δύνναμις, is employed; John led many to miraculous regeneration—he led many to turn from disobedience to wisdom so that Israel could be prepared for the Lord, as Elijah also had done; cf. 1 Kings 18:39. John’s work of bringing many to regeneration through his preaching as a prophet was a miracle as δύνναμις, but not as σημεῖον.); 1:35; 4:14; 4:36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13, 19; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 3:12; 4:7, 33; 6:8; 8:10; 10:38; Romans 1:4, 16; 9:17; 15:13; 15:19; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 24; 2:4–5; 4:19–20; 5:4; 6:14; 12:10; 15:43; 2 Corinthians 13:4; Ephesians 1:19; 3:7; 3:16, 20; Philippians 3:10; Colossians 1:11, 29; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:7–8; 3:5; Hebrews 1:3; 11:11; 1 Peter 1:5; 2 Peter 1:3, 16; Revelation 13:2). The *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (ed. Kittel, pg. 230, vol. 7) notes that “in the plural δύνναμις even became a technical term for ‘miracles’ in the NT,” an affirmation supported by the evidence (Matthew 7:22; 11:20–21, 23; 13:54, 58; 14:2; Mark 6:2, 14; Luke 10:13; 19:37; 21:26; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Corinthians 12:10, 28–29; 2 Corinthians 12:12; Galatians 3:5; Hebrews 2:4; 6:5—the sole exceptions are instances where does not refer to acts at all, Matthew 24:29; Mark 13:25; Luke 21:26; Romans 8:38; 1 Peter 3:22). The best argument against δύνναμις referring specifically to the miraculous would be the class of texts where the word is employed in association with Christian salvation, a category which is inclusive of sanctification and of the bestowal of spiritual gifts (Romans 1:16; 15:13; 1 Corinthians 1:18; Ephesians 1:19; 3:7, 16, 20; Philippians 3:10; Colossians 1:11, 29; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:7, 8; 3:5; 1 Peter 1:5; 2 Peter 1:3). However, it is better to conclude from the existence of this category that regeneration is a miraculous work of Divine power, and the Spirit’s power in progressively eradicating indwelling sin in Christians, producing spiritual fruit, and performing other works associated with salvation is a similar work of Divine power, rather than *a priori* concluding that Christian salvation is non-miraculous, and from this *a priori* establishing a category, otherwise not clearly attested in the New Testament, where δύνναμις refers to non-miraculous actions. The identification of salvation with the miraculous is clearly supported elsewhere in Scripture with texts that indicate that personal *regeneration* is in the same category as a work of Divine power with the transformation, the cosmic regeneration, involved in establishing the Millennial earth (Matthew 19:28; Titus 3:5; παλιγγενεσία) or the fact that both bringing into being a universe and bringing into being a clean heart are works of *creation* (Genesis 1:1; Psalm 51:10; בָּרָא). See endnote 52.

<sup>xiv</sup> The verb רָשַׁף, employed in Joel 2:28, 29 (MT 3:1-2), does not “does not mean a gradual pouring as required, but rather a sudden, massive spillage . . . this definition can be seen clearly in אֶת־רוּחִי אֲשַׁפֵּךְ Ezk 39:29, אֶת־רוּחִי אֲשַׁפֵּךְ Joel 3:1-2 and . . . וְשַׁפֵּכְתִּי רוּחִי הַזֶּה Zech 12:10 [the only OT references to רָשַׁף in connection with רוּחִי]” (*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Ludwig Koehler & Walter Baumgartner, rev. Walter Baumgartner & Johann Jakob Stamm, trans. & ed. M. E. J. Richardson. New York, NY: Brill, 2000, elec. acc. *Accordance Bible Software*).

<sup>xv</sup> However, the “your sons and your daughters” of Joel 2:28 refers, in its original context, to Jewish sons and daughters—Jehovah will pour our His Spirit upon the entire covenant community of Israel in the Tribulation period, and in Acts 2, the “all flesh” (Acts 2:17) of the entirety of the pre-Pentecost church membership of 120 (Acts 1:15) received Spirit baptism. The Jewish character of Joel 2:28-32 does not mean, however, that the sons and daughters of others are necessarily excluded.

The giving of the Spirit to all the covenant community in Joel 2:28-32, which produced prophecy, is comparable to Numbers 11:24-29; in the Pentateuch Jehovah “took of the spirit that was upon [Moses] . . . and gave it unto the seventy elders: and it came to pass, *that*, when the spirit was upon them, they

---

prophesied, and did not cease.” When Joshua wanted to forbid this prophesying, Moses said, “[W]ould God that all the LORD’s people were prophets, *and* that the LORD would put his spirit upon them!” Moses’ prayer is answered in the fulfillment of Joel 2:28-32, when all the Lord’s people have His Spirit and therefore prophesy. Consider also the typological aspect to Moses as a type of Christ when the seventy received the Spirit after the Lord “took of the spirit that *was* upon [Moses]” and gave it to them, as Christ received the Spirit from the Father and gave Him to the church (John 3:34; Acts 2:33).

<sup>xvi</sup> cf. *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*, John F. Walvoord (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1958), pgs. 18-54, 227-235.

<sup>xvii</sup> Such spiritualization is evident in the gamut of Reformed commentators and writers; see, e. g., John Calvin or Matthew Henry’s comments on Isaiah 44. Similarly, after employing Isaiah 44:3 and other texts as if they related to the work of the Spirit on Christians of the age of grace, and insisting that the Millennial vegetation described in Isaiah 35:1 is really speaking about the Holy Spirit making Christians grow, Arthur Pink laments, “the spiritual meaning of these [Old Testament] passages is commonly unperceived today, when carnal dispensationalists insist on the ignoring of all figures, and the interpreting of everything ‘literally.’” (pgs. 227-228, *The Holy Spirit*, Arthur W. Pink. elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 8, Arthur Pink Collection. Albany, OR: AGES Software (ver. 1.0), 2000).

<sup>xviii</sup> The phrase is employed only in these verses. Luke 11:13 is also related and is discussed below.

<sup>xix</sup> Christ started His church during His earthly ministry (Matthew 18:17) from people converted and baptized by John the Baptist (John 1:35-37). He promised that His assembly would overcome the powers of hell from the time of His earthly ministry to the end of the age (Matthew 16:18). Obviously already extant, the church was “added unto” on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:41, 47) with the conversion of three thousand men. The common idea adopted by UCDs that the church started on Pentecost is unbiblical. No verse anywhere states that the church began on that day. The Lord referred to His church twice in the gospels (Matthew 16:18; 18:17), without any indication whatever that it did not yet exist. Jesus Christ, the Bridegroom, had the church as His bride before Pentecost (John 3:29; cf. 2 Corinthians 11:2; Ephesians 5:22-33). “God hath set . . . in the church, first apostles” (1 Corinthians 12:28), but the Lord appointed the apostles far before Pentecost (Mark 3:13-19; Matthew 10:2-4). Christ sang in the midst of the church (Hebrews 2:12), but His only recorded singing took place at the institution of the Lord’s supper (Matthew 26:30)—an ordinance given to the church before Pentecost (Matthew 26:26-31; 1 Corinthians 11:2, 17-34). Before Pentecost Christ was the shepherd/pastor of His church (John 10:14), which was already His flock (a term for the church; Matthew 26:31; Luke 12:32; Acts 20:28-29; 1 Peter 5:2-3), until He appointed Peter to pastor His first assembly after His resurrection (John 21:15-17). His church had a business meeting (Acts 1:15-26), a membership roll (Acts 1:15), a treasurer (John 12:6; 13:29), baptism (John 4:1-2), the Lord’s supper (Matthew 26:26-31), church discipline (Matthew 18:15-18), the power to bind and loose (Matthew 18:17-18), and the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20) before it was it was “added unto” on Pentecost (Acts 2:41, 47). On the day of Pentecost in Acts 2 the church simply received the permanent indwelling of the Spirit and public recognition as the new institution for the course of the age of grace (cf. Exodus 40:35; the tabernacle; 2 Chronicles 7:1; Solomon’s temple; Ezekiel 43:4-5; the Millennial temple).

In relation to the only really significant objection to a pre-Pentecost foundation of the church, the question of how the assembly could begin before the official inauguration of the New Covenant with the death of Christ, Dr. Ron Tottinham writes, “[The objectors ask how] could you have a ‘new program’ (church) until you have the shedding of the ‘the blood of the covenant,’ of He who is the Life and Head of a ‘new and living’ institution? . . . Hebrews 9:14-18 . . . What is the answer which those . . . would give . . . who would hold that Christ established the first Church during His personal ministry upon earth[?] . . . The New Testament Church [was not] ‘of force’ [Hebrews 9:17] until after the Resurrection. Even Christ still went to the temple [during His earthly ministry]. . . . Hebrews nine only states that the covenant of the Levitical ordinances lasted until the true Blood of Christ was shed. . . . The New Testament Church could not be ready for service at its ‘baptism’ at Pentecost unless it was built, or ‘framed,’ prior. Who ever heard of moving into a house [cf. 1 Peter 2:5] (the Holy Spirit moved upon and into the church at Pentecost) without a floor, frame, and more? . . . How then could the church begin before the New Covenant began? By being built [by] the Master Himself during His own personal ministry upon the earth. Then when he died as Testator of the New Covenant, His church of the New Testament (covenant) was ready and waiting to be ‘baptized’ [with] the Holy Spirit and begin [its] ordained service” (*The Door-Step Evangel*, 24:2

---

(March-April 2008) pgs. 1ff. (pub. Empire Baptist Temple/Great Plains Baptist Divinity School, Sioux Falls, SD)).

xx

Christ promised that “the gates of hell shall not prevail” against His congregations (Matthew 16:18), but He would be with them “always, *even* unto the end of the world” (Matthew 28:20, cf. 1 Corinthians 11:26), since God would get “glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages” (Ephesians 3:21; cf. also “The Great Commission in Scripture and History,” Thomas Ross. <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>). Consequently, there has never been a day since Christ started His church in the first century that faithful assemblies of believers have not been upon the earth. Any religious organization or denomination that originated in a period subsequent to the first century consequently cannot be the church that Jesus founded. In addition to the unscriptural practices of Catholicism, history clearly evidences that the Roman Catholic denomination evolved over a period of centuries and has very little resemblance to the church the Lord Jesus started; it therefore cannot be the true church of Jesus Christ. The various Protestant denominations, such as Lutheranism, Anglicanism, Methodism, and Presbyterian and other Reformed groups, came into existence nearly 1,600 years too late to be the church Jesus founded, and the various splinter groups that have emerged since the Reformation, such as the Pentecostal denominations (Assemblies of God, Church of God in Christ, etc.), the followers of Alexander Campbell (Church of Christ, Disciples of Christ, etc.), Mormonism, Seventh Day Adventism, etc., also negate any claim to be Christ’s church by their origin, as they do by their anti-Biblical doctrines. However, assemblies that believed and practiced the Bible, as do good Baptist churches today, have maintained a continual existence under a variety of names (Anabaptists, Waldenses, Donatists, Novatians, Cathari, Christians, etc.) from the first century to the present. They certainly did not originate at the time of the Reformation, as the following quotations demonstrate: 1.) Cardinal Hosius (Catholic, a member of the Council of Trent, A. D. 1560): “If the truth of religion were to be judged by the readiness and boldness of which a man of any sect shows in suffering, then the opinion and persuasion of no sect can be truer and surer than that of the Anabaptists since there have been none for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more generally punished.” This Catholic prelate, living at the time of the Reformation, admitted that the Baptists had been in existence since A. D. 360; of course, allowing them an origin any more ancient would make his position very uncomfortable. 2.) Mosheim (Lutheran, A. D. 1755), said, “The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion . . . is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is consequently extremely difficult to be ascertained.” 3.) Dr. J. J. Durmont & Dr. Ypeig (Reformed writers specifically appointed by the King of Holland to ascertain if the historical claims of the Baptists were valid), concluded in A. D. 1819 that Baptists were “descended from the tolerably pure evangelical Waldenses. . . . They were, therefore, in existence long before the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. . . . We have seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, were the original Waldenses; and who have long in the history of the Church, received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered the only Christian community which has stood since the Apostles; and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages.” 4.) Alexander Campbell (founder of the “Disciples of Christ” and “Church of Christ” denominations, A. D. 1824): “I would engage to show that baptism as viewed and practiced by the Baptists, had its advocates in every century up to the Christian era . . . clouds of witnesses attest the fact, that before the Reformation from popery, and from the apostolic age, to the present time, the sentiments of Baptists, and the practice of baptism have had a continued chain of advocates, and public monuments of their existence in every century can be produced.” See pgs. 83-96, *A History of Baptists*, John T. Christian, vol. 1 (Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1922), and *History of Baptists*, G. H. Orchard (Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1987), pgs. iii-xxiv, for the original sources of the quotations here listed, and for further information. Quotations and other evidence from non-Baptist or anti-Baptist authors of like effect could be greatly multiplied (e. g., the Reformed writer Leonard Verduin stated: “No one is credited with having invented the Anabaptism of the sixteenth century for the simple reason that no one did. . . . There were Anabaptists, called by that name, in the fourth century” (pgs. 189-190, *The Reformers and Their Stepchildren*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1965). Baptist historians naturally affirm their own succession as well. The historical fact that Baptist churches have existed from the first century to the present confirms the truth, established by their Biblical doctrine and practice, that they are the churches founded by the Lord Jesus Christ. Consequently, all other “churches” are guilty of schism and division from the Lord’s true assemblies and have no Divine authority to baptize, carry on the

---

work of God, or exist at all. Nor is it surprising that non-Baptists are mistaken on the doctrine of Spirit baptism, as the doctrine authenticates Christ's true church, a spiritual organism of which they are not a part.

<sup>xxi</sup> The New Testament dispensation began with John, not on the day of Pentecost in the book of Acts (Mark 1:1-4; Matthew 11:13; Luke 16:16; Matthew 11:5; Mark 8:35)—otherwise Jesus Christ did not preach New Testament doctrine, the four gospels are not for Christians, the apostles, who were obviously saved before the book of Acts (Luke 10:20), were not Christians, and other equally absurd conclusions follow. John the Baptist preached about the Deity of Christ (John 1:23; Isaiah 40:3), His substitutionary death (John 1:29), repentance (Matthew 3:2), hell (Matthew 3:10-12), Christ's bride, the church (John 3:29; Ephesians 5:32), etc. He required confession of sin (Matthew 3:6) and evidence of salvation (Matthew 3:8) before he would baptize people, so he baptized only believers, not infants. He immersed, not sprinkled or poured (Mark 1:5, John 3:23, etc.), and his baptism pictured Christ's coming death, burial, and resurrection (John 1:31). He had God's authority to baptize (Matthew 21:24-27), just as the church has that authority today (Matthew 28:18-20). The apostles had John's baptism (Acts 1:22), but they were never "rebaptized" when some supposedly different Christian baptism originated—nor were any other converts ever "rebaptized." When Christ commanded His church to go into all the world, preach, baptize, and disciple converts (Matthew 28:17-20; Mark 16:15-16, etc.), He spoke to those who had received John's baptism and were familiar with no other immersion.

The alleged support for a distinction between John's baptism and Christian baptism in Acts 19:1-7 is invalid. The individuals of Acts 19 were spurious "converts," not real disciples of John the Baptist. They did not believe in the Trinity, and so were unsaved (John 17:3), for they had never even heard of the Holy Spirit (19:2), although John preached about Him (Matthew 3:11). Their spurious discipleship is indicated by the fact that the plural word "disciples," *mathetai*, is nonarticular in 19:1—unlike every single one of the 25 other references in the book of Acts to the word (1:15; 6:1-2, 7; 9:1, 19, 26, 38; 11:26, 29; 14:20, 22, 28; 15:10; 18:23, 27; 19:1, 9, 30; 20:7, 30; 21:4, 16). Paul does not tell these "disciples" that John's baptism has passed away and Christian baptism has now been inaugurated; he tells them what John the Baptist really said (19:4), upon which they believed John's message as expounded by Paul and submitted themselves to baptism (19:5-7). Note that a truly born-again man with John's baptism is not "rebaptized" in the immediately preceding context (18:24-28), simply instructed in the further developments of truth (for the fact that the gospel dispensation began with John does not mean that everything about God's new method of dealing with people was instantly perfectly developed). Acts 18:24-9:7 supports, not undermines, the fact that Christian baptism is John's baptism.

<sup>xxii</sup> In Matthew, the "you" baptized with water are the "you" baptized with the Spirit in Matthew 3:11. Note the connection made by the μέν/δέ clause: ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. While preaching to unconverted Pharisees and Sadducees does appear in the preceding context (3:7ff.), those baptized with water in Matthew are those of the multitudes who repent and confess their sins (Matthew 3:6), not the unconverted. A comparison with the other gospel accounts confirms what can be deduced from the Matthean narrative.

<sup>xxiii</sup> One who would affirm that the preceding context of the verse refers to all the "people," saved and unsaved, rather than to baptized believers alone, and thus does not make an association between the church and Spirit baptism, should consider that the "you" who are to be baptized "with the Holy Ghost" are the "you" who are baptized with water in Luke 3:16, and these are only the ones who bear the fruits of repentance (v. 8). Furthermore, a reference to the "people" does not require that unbelievers in the promised land are included, since 3:21 refers to a time when "all the people were baptized," and clearly Luke does not mean that, contradicting 3:8, John baptized pagans, the immoral, and, indeed, every last person in the whole region, converted or not. The fulfillment of Spirit baptism as recorded in Acts fits the predictions in the gospels—Christ baptized with the Spirit believers who had already been immersed in water. Compare endnote 69.

<sup>xxiv</sup> See pg. 236, *Christology of the Old Testament*, E. W. Hengstenberg, trans. James Martin, vol. 4, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1858, for an argument in favor of fire baptism as hell based on the analogy of Malachi 3:2.

<sup>xxv</sup> It should be noted in relation to this argument, the strongest one for connecting fire baptism and eternal damnation, that the fact that the Lord Jesus will do what is stated in v. 11, and will also do what is stated in v. 12, do not make the two synonymous. Verse twelve refers to the eschatological gathering of the

saints to glory and the related damnation of the lost. Spirit baptism does not denote anything in v. 12. Nor does fire baptism, either in the synonymous or in the eternal torment view, have anything to do with the eschatological gathering of the saints as wheat into the garner at harvest time. Thus, an affirmation that the judgment of v. 12 defines fire baptism as eschatological damnation must explain why the entry of believers into glory is not Spirit baptism, and thus why v. 12 defines the fire baptism of v. 11 but does not define the Spirit baptism of the same verse.

Some have argued that the “garner” of Matthew 3:11 is the universal, invisible church, so that, allegedly, one either is baptized by the Holy Spirit into the invisible church and so enters the garner at the moment of regeneration or receives the baptism of fire and eternal torment. However, the garner is the New Jerusalem or the final phase of the kingdom of God that is entered eschatologically, not the church of the present dispensation to which people are supposedly added day by day through Spirit baptism. The only other instance where ἀποθήκη has a non-literal reference to a garner or barn is Matthew 13:30 (cf. the complete list of references: Matthew 3:12; 6:26; 13:30; Luke 3:17; 12:18, 24) where the reference is not to the church age, but to the “harvest” in the “end of the world” when the lost are cast into the lake of fire and in the New Jerusalem “the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father” (Matthew 13:30; 40-42). The wheat is not gathered into the garner day by day, but at one time at the end of the world; the latter, not the former, first the pattern of farming in first century Judaism: “Only when all the chaff has been separated from the grain is the latter collected (using the ‘winnowing-shovel’ [KJV ‘fan,’ Matthew 3:12]) and stored away for use, while the chaff is burned” (pg. 115, *The Gospel of Matthew*, R. T. France. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007). The gathering of the saints into the “garner” of Matthew 3:12 is not Spirit baptism into the allegedly universal, invisible church in this dispensation, but the final gathering of all the saints into the New Jerusalem when the lost are finally sent into the lake of fire.

<sup>xxvi</sup> In the words of Henry Alford on Matthew 3:11, “To separate off πνεύματι ἁγίῳ as belonging to one set of persons, and πυρί as belonging to another, when both are united by ὑμᾶς, is in the last degree harsh, besides introducing confusion into the whole. The members of comparison in this verse are strictly parallel to one another: the baptism by water . . . and the baptism by the Holy Ghost and fire” (*Alford’s Greek Testament: An Exegetical and Critical Commentary*, Henry Alford, vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980 (reprint of 1874 ed.)). Similarly, the *Expositor’s Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank E. Gaebelen; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990) notes on Matthew 3:11, “Many see this as a double baptism, one in the Holy Spirit for the righteous and one in fire for the unrepentant (cf: the wheat and chaff in v.12). Fire (Mal 4:1) destroys and consumes. There are good reasons, however, for taking ‘fire’ as a purifying agent along with the Holy Spirit. The people John is addressing are being baptized by him; presumably they have repented. More important the preposition *en* (‘with’) is not repeated before fire: the one preposition governs both ‘Holy Spirit’ and ‘fire,’ and this normally suggests a unified concept, Spirit-fire or the like. . . . Fire often has a purifying, not destructive, connotation in the OT (e.g., Isa 1:25; Zech 13:9; Mal 3:2-3). John’s water baptism relates to repentance; but the one whose way he is preparing will administer a Spirit-fire baptism that will purify and refine.” James D. G. Dunn writes, “There are not two baptisms envisaged, one with Spirit and one with fire, only one baptism in Spirit-and-fire. Second, the two baptisms . . . are to be administered to the same people — ὑμᾶς” (pg. 11, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*).

One notes further that when a verb or verbal is associated with ἐν followed by two prepositional objects, as in the αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί of Matthew 3:11, the two objects are in the NT either universally or close to universally temporally simultaneous. For example, in John 4:24’s τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, worship in both spirit and truth takes place at the same time. In Matthew 4:16’s τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, the people sat in both the region and shadow of death at the same time. In Luke 4:36, ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι, Christ commanded the unclean spirits with both authority and power at the same moment. The syntax of Matthew 3:11 is thus in favor of the view that the baptism of the Spirit and of fire takes place at the same time—the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. To make the baptism of the Spirit a Pentecostal phenomenon and the baptism of fire a much later act of casting the lost into the lake of fire does not suit the syntax nearly as well. There is no way that one can make Christ’s baptism with the Spirit happen at the same time as the judgment of the lost in hell. Compare the syntax of Matthew 3:11 to Matthew 4:16; Luke 4:36; 7:25; John 4:24; Acts 2:46; Ephesians 1:8; 4:24; 6:4, 18; Colossians 1:9; 2:18, 23; 1 Thessalonians 4:4; 2 Thessalonians 2:13, 17; 3:8; 1 Timothy 2:2, 7; 2 Timothy 1:13; 4:2; 2 Peter 3:11; Revelation 18:16.

---

The natural association in Matthew 3:11 explains the presence of the view that the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire refers to the single event of Pentecost in the patristic period. “Moreover, Christ is said to baptize with fire: because in the form of flaming tongues He poured forth on His holy disciples the grace of the Spirit: as the Lord Himself says, *John truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit and with fire, not many days hence*” (John of Damascus, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, IV:9). Lampe mentions texts where Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Maximus Confessor, and Didymus of Alexandria interpret as identical the baptism of the Spirit and fire (βάπτισμα, IX, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. Lampe).

Of course, this is not the only view found in the significant doctrinal and practical diversity of extant patristic writers. Basil, *On the Spirit*, 15:36, refers the baptism of fire to the eschatological judgment of believers, alluding to 1 Corinthians 3:13, a view also expressed as a possibility by John of Damascus following the quotation from IV:9 of *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* above. Unfortunately, this patristic view of fire baptism as eschatological instead of Pentecostal may be a reference to the developing doctrine of purgatory; compare Gregory Nazianzen, *Orations* 39:19. Taking a different view, Eusebius, following Origen, refers to martyrdom as baptism by fire (*Church History*, 6:4:3; cf. Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* (New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), Volume 2, *Ante-Nicene Christianity*, 2:27). While a comprehensive analysis of all extant patristic literature was not undertaken, neither the works represented in the *Church Fathers: Translations of The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*, ed. Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson, nor in *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, ed. Philip Schaff, series I & II, (elec. acc. *Accordance Bible Software*; orig. elec. text in the *Christian Classics Ethereal Library*) give any evidence for the view that fire baptism was reserved for those who did not receive Spirit baptism, and thus that the baptism of fire was specifically the damnation of the lost, nor does Lampe indicate the existence of such a view in the patristic period (cf. βάπτισμα, IX, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. Lampe).

As the view that the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost took place at Pentecost is extant in the patristic period, so in the medieval period Anabaptists affirmed that just as water baptism “can pertain to none but the intelligent and believing,” so “the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost . . . was administered to the apostles by God Himself from heaven, [and] this did not at all relate to infants, seeing that all who were thus baptized, spake with tongues and magnified God. Acts 2:3, 4” (pg. 234, *The Martyr’s Mirror*, Thieleman J. Van Braught, 2<sup>nd</sup> Eng. ed. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1999).

<sup>xxvii</sup> Such an affirmation must not be taken to imply that John the Baptist did not truly say the actual words in the different gospels, but rather that the other NT writers, under inspiration, did not record the “and fire” phrase.

<sup>xxviii</sup> As explicated below in the section “Spirit baptism in Acts.”

Consider also the related comments of John Owen, commenting on the descent of the Spirit on Christ in the form of a dove, and on His coming upon the church at Pentecost:

The shape [of the Spirit] that appeared was that of a dove, but the substance itself, I judge, was of a fiery nature, an ethereal substance, shaped into the form or resemblance of a dove. It had the shape of a dove, but not the appearance of feathers, colors, or the like. This also rendered the appearance the more visible, conspicuous, heavenly, and glorious. And the Holy Ghost is often compared to fire, because he was of old typified or represented thereby; for on the first solemn offering of sacrifices there came fire from the Lord for the kindling of them. Hence Theodotion of old rendered ἡὶη, Genesis 4:4, “The LORD had respect unto Abel, and to his offering,” by Ἐνεπύρισεν ὁ θεός, “God fired the offering of Abel;” sent down fire that kindled his sacrifice as a token of his acceptance.

However, it is certain that at the first erection of the altar in the wilderness, upon the first sacrifices, “fire came out from before the LORD, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat; which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces,” Leviticus 9:24. And the fire kindled hereby was to be perpetuated on the altar, so that none was ever to be used in sacrifice but what was traduced from it. For a neglect of this intimation of the mind of God were Nadab and Abihu consumed, Leviticus 10:1, 2. So was it also upon the dedication of the altar in the temple of Solomon: “Fire came down from heaven and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices,” 2 Chronicles 7:1; and a fire thence kindled was always kept burning on the altar. And in like manner God bare testimony to the ministry of Elijah, 1 Kings 18:38, 39. God by all these signified that no sacrifices were accepted with him where faith was not kindled in the heart of the offerer by the Holy Ghost, represented by the fire that kindled the

sacrifices on the altar. And in answer hereunto is our Lord Jesus Christ said to offer himself “through the eternal Spirit,” Hebrews 9:14. It was, therefore, most probably a fiery appearance [of the dove] that was made. And in the next bodily shape which he assumed it is expressly said that it was fiery: Acts 2:3, “There appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire;” which was the visible token of the coming of the Holy Ghost upon them. And he chose, then, that figure of tongues to denote the assistance which, by the miraculous gift of speaking with divers tongues, together with wisdom and utterance, he furnished them withal for the publication of the gospel. And thus, also, the Lord Christ is said to “baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” Matthew 3:11. Not two things are intended, but the latter words, “and with fire,” are added ἐξηγητικῶς, and the expression is ἐν διὰ δυνάμειν, — with the Holy Ghost, who is a spiritual, divine, eternal fire. So God absolutely is said to be a “consuming fire,” Hebrews 12:29, Deuteronomy 4:24. And as in these words, “He shall baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” there is a prospect unto what came to pass afterward, when the apostles received the Holy Ghost with a visible pledge of fiery tongues, so there seems to be a retrospect, by way of allusion unto what is recorded, Isaiah 6:6, 7; for a living or “fiery coal from the altar,” where the fire represented the Holy Ghost, or his work and grace, having touched the lips of his prophet, his sin was taken away, both as to the guilt and filth of it. And this is the work of the Holy Ghost, who not only sanctifieth us, but, by ingenerating faith in us, and the application of the promise unto us, is the cause and means of our justification also, 1 Corinthians 6:11, Titus 3:4-7, whereby our sins on both accounts are taken away. So also his efficacy in other places is compared unto fire and burning: Isaiah 4:4, 5, “When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of judgment, and by the spirit of burning.” He is compared both to fire and water, with respect unto the same cleansing virtue in both. So also Malachi 3:2. Hence, as this is expressed by “the Holy Ghost and fire” in two evangelists, Matthew 3:11, Luke 3:16; so in the other two there is mention only of the “Holy Ghost,” Mark 1:8, John 1:33, the same thing being intended (pgs. 98-100, *Pneumatologia: A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit*, elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 9, John Owen Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software, 2005).

<sup>xxix</sup> Pgs. 162-3, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

<sup>xxx</sup> Pg. 521, A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934.

<sup>xxxi</sup> Cf. pgs. 372ff. of Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, and BDAG definition #5 for ἐν as a “marker introducing means or instrument, *with*, a construction that begins w. Homer [and with] . . . wide currency in [the New Testament and early Christian] lit[erature].” Note that in Revelation 17:14, a verse listed in BDAG under definition #5, the destruction of a city by an army is said to be by “burn[ing the city] with fire” (κατακαύσουσιν ἐν πυρί), a usage very similar to the instrumental ἐν with πυρί for burning cities in Baruch 1:2; 1 Esdras 1:52; 1 Maccabees 5:5.

<sup>xxxii</sup> Pg. 374, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace. Wallace thought that “perhaps” the preposition indicated sphere as well, but that it definitely signified means. He thus translated the passages as “with,” not “in” the Holy Spirit. It should be noted that the affirmation that baptism “with” the Holy Ghost is the correct translation does not exclude the idea that the Spirit is indeed the medium of Christ’s baptism with the third member of the Trinity, as water is the medium in the ordinance of believer’s immersion. Rather, the rendering *with* simply emphasizes the substance in which the baptism takes place; that is, the substance employed in baptism is water, the Spirit, or fire. This fact does not in any way change the fact that a *baptism* is by definition an *immersion*, since *baptidzo* signifies *immersion* without the aid of any preposition.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> It is, however, still present, e. g. Ecclesiastes 7:9: Be not hasty in thy spirit to be angry: for anger will rest in the bosom of fools. μὴ σπεύσης ἐν πνεύματί σου τοῦ θυμοῦσθαι ὅτι θυμὸς ἐν κόλπῳ ἀφρόνων ἀναπαύσεται.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> 1 Chronicles 28:12: And the pattern of all that he had **by the spirit**, of the courts of the house of the LORD, and of all the chambers round about, of the treasures of the house of God, and of the treasures of the dedicated things: καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα ὃ εἶχεν ἐν πνεύματι αὐτοῦ τῶν αὐλῶν οἴκου κυρίου καὶ πάντων τῶν παστοφορίων τῶν κύκλῳ τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας οἴκου κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποθηκῶν τῶν αγίων.

Nehemiah 9:30: Yet thou didst bear long with them many years, and didst testify to them **by thy Spirit** by the hand of thy prophets: but they hearkened not; so thou gavest them into the hand of the nations

of the land. καὶ εἴλκυσας ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔτη πολλὰ καὶ ἐπεμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐν πνεύματί σου ἐν χειρὶ προφητῶν σου καὶ οὐκ ἠγνώρισαντο καὶ ἔδωκας αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ λαῶν τῆς γῆς.

Isaiah 4:4: When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof **by the spirit** of judgment, and **by the spirit** of burning. ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος τὸν ρύπον τῶν υἰῶν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων Σιών καὶ τὸ αἶμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐν πνεύματι κρίσεως καὶ πνεύματι καύσεως.

Ezekiel 11:24: And the Spirit took me up, and brought me to the land of the Chaldeans, to the captivity, in a vision **by the Spirit of God**: and I went up after the vision which I saw. καὶ ἀνέλαβέν με πνεῦμα καὶ ἤγαγέν με εἰς γῆν Χαλδαίων εἰς τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν ἐν ὁράσει ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ καὶ ἀνέβην ἀπὸ τῆς ὁράσεως ἧς εἶδον.

Ezekiel 37:1: And the hand of the Lord came upon me, and the Lord brought me forth **by the Spirit**, and set me in the midst of the plain, and it was full of human bones. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπ' ἐμὲ χεῖρ κυρίου καὶ ἐξήγαγέν με ἐν πνεύματι κύριος καὶ ἔθηκέν με ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ πεδίου καὶ τοῦτο ἦν μεστὸν ὀστέων ἀνθρωπίνων.

Micah 3:8: But truly I am full of power **by the spirit** of the LORD, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin. ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἰσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ Ἰακώβ ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ αμαρτίας αὐτοῦ.

Zechariah 1:6: But do ye receive my words and mine ordinances, all that I command **by my Spirit** to my servants the prophets, who lived in the days of your fathers; and they answered and said, As the Lord Almighty determined to do to us, according to our ways, and according to our practices, so has he done to us. πλὴν τοὺς λόγους μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου δέχεσθε ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ἐν πνεύματί μου τοῖς δούλοις μου τοῖς προφήταις οἱ κατελάβοσαν τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν καθὼς παρατέτακται κύριος παντοκράτωρ τοῦ ποιῆσαι κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα ὑμῶν οὕτως ἐποίησεν ὑμῖν.

Zechariah 4:6: And he answered and spoke to me, saying, This is the word of the Lord to Zorobabel, saying, not by mighty power, nor by strength, but **by my Spirit**, saith the Lord Almighty. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με λέγων οὗτος ὁ λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ζοροβαβελ λέγων οὐκ ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ οὐδὲ ἐν ἰσχύϊ ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν πνεύματί μου λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

Zechariah 7:12: And they made their heart disobedient, so as not to hearken to my law, and the words which the Lord Almighty sent forth **by his Spirit** by the former prophets: so there was great wrath from the Lord Almighty. καὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἔταξαν ἀπειθῆ τοῦ μὴ εἰσακοῦειν τοῦ νόμου μου καὶ τοὺς λόγους οὓς ἐξαπέστειλεν κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐν πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ἐν χερσίν τῶν προφητῶν τῶν ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ἐγένετο ὀργὴ μεγάλη παρὰ κυρίου παντοκράτορος.

(Note: English renderings above come either from the 1851 translation of the LXX by Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton or from the KJV. Note also Solomon 17:37 in the Apocrypha, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενήσει ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ θεῷ αὐτοῦ ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κατειργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ συνέσεως μετὰ ἰσχύος καὶ δικαιοσύνης).

xxxv

Three examples out of the 110 verses with the phrase are:

Numbers 31:10: And they burnt with fire all their cities in the places of their habitation and they burnt their villages **with fire**. καὶ πάσας τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν τὰς ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἐπαύλεις αὐτῶν ἐνέπρησαν ἐν πυρὶ.

Judges 9:52: And Abimelech drew near to the tower, and they besieged it; and Abimelech drew near to the door of the tower to burn it **with fire**. καὶ ἦλθεν Ἀβιμελεχ ἕως τοῦ πύργου καὶ ἐξεπολέμησαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἤγγισεν Ἀβιμελεχ ἕως τῆς θύρας τοῦ πύργου ἐμπρῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν πυρὶ.

1 Kings 16:18: And it came to pass, when Zimri saw that the city was taken, that he went into the palace of the king's house, and burnt the king's house over him **with fire**, and died. καὶ ἐγενήθη ὡς εἶδεν Ζαμβρι ὅτι προκατεἰλημπτὰ αὐτοῦ ἡ πόλις καὶ εἰσπορεύεται εἰς ἄντρον τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἐνεπύρισε ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν οἶκον τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν πυρὶ καὶ ἀπέθανεν.

The complete list of references is: Exodus 12:10; 19:18; 32:20; 34:13; Leviticus 4:12; 6:23; 7:17; 19; 8:32; 13:52, 55, 57; 16:27; 19:6; 20:14; Numbers 31:10, 23; Deuteronomy 1:33; 9:21; 12:31; 13:17; 18:10; Joshua 7:15; 8:19, 28; 11:6, 9, 11; 16:10; Judges 1:8; 9:49, 52; 12:1; 14:15; 15:6; 20:48; 1 Samuel 30:1, 3, 14; 2 Samuel 14:30-31; 23:7; 1 Kings 16:18; 18:24, 36-37; 2 Kings 8:12; 16:3; 17:17, 31; 21:6; 23:10; 1 Chronicles 14:12; 21:26; 2 Chronicles 33:6; 35:13; 36:19; Nehemiah 1:3; 2:3; Psalm 45:10; 73:7;

---

139:11; Amos 4:10; 7:4; Micah 1:7; Nahum 2:4; Habakkuk 2:13; Zephaniah 1:18; 3:8; Zechariah 9:4; Isaiah 10:17; 44:16, 19; Jeremiah 7:31; 19:5; 21:10; 28:32; 30:18; 36:22; 39:29; 41:2, 22; 44:8, 10; 45:17-18; 50:13; 52:13; Ezekiel 5:2, 4; 21:36-37; 22:21, 31; 36:5; 38:19; 1 Esdras 1:52; 1 Maccabees 1:56; 5:5, 35, 44; 11:61; 16:10; 4 Maccabees 9:22; 18:12 Sirach 2:5; 8:10; 45:19; Solomon 12:4; Baruch 1:2.

xxxvi

Commenting on the connection of the fact that *baptidzo* signifies *immersion* and the baptism of the Spirit, B. H. Carroll wrote:

The baptism in the Spirit was a figurative baptism. I mean the word baptism is used in a figurative and not in a literal sense. . . . If I immerse one in a creek or baptistery, that is a literal baptism; but if I see a friend of mine in distress, in deep anxiety, groaning, sighing, weeping, full of pain, no ease, no peace, no hope, I say he is baptized in suffering. That is figurative. Just as the Lord Jesus Christ said, ‘I have a baptism to be baptized in, and now am I straitened till it be accomplished[!]’ I have suffering to pass through so deep and overwhelming that you may compare the suffering to an immersion in suffering. That is a figurative use of the word. If one dip another in a tank of oil, that is a literal baptism, a literal use of the word. But if it be one whose notes of hand are all over the community, whose property is all mortgaged, who has no realty that is not already encumbered, I say that man is baptized in debt, that is a figurative use of the word. He is overwhelmed in debt.

Now when John the Baptist says, ‘I baptize you in water,’ that is a literal baptism, ‘but Jesus will baptize you in the Holy Ghost,’ that is a figurative use of the word. The Holy Ghost is not a liquid element, but you may use the word figuratively; when they are in the house, and the sound that indicates His presence fills that house, and they themselves are filled with the Spirit, permeated throughout by the indwelling Spirit of God, figuratively you say that is a baptism in the Holy Ghost. That figurative use of the word is one of the commonest known to the Greek classics. I could cite you a hundred instances of it. So that the baptism in water, that is the literal; the other, that is the figurative. And because the literal is a burial, a sinking out of sight, so an overwhelming influence may figuratively be said to be a baptism in that influence.” (pgs. 42-43, *The Three Baptisms*, B. H. Carroll, elec. acc. in the AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006).

Some paedobaptists argue that *baptidzo* can signify *pouring* because the Spirit’s being poured out is allegedly a synonym with Spirit baptism, thus equating *pouring* and *baptism*. This argument has severe problems. If the Holy Ghost’s being “poured out” or “shed forth” on men (ἐκχέω, Acts 2:17-18, 33; 10:45) demonstrates that *baptidzo* means *pour*, then the references, in association with the baptism of the Holy Ghost, to the Spirit “coming upon” (ἐπέρχομαι, Acts 1:8) people, “falling” on them (ἐπιπίπτω, Acts 8:16; 10:44; 11:15-17), “coming” upon them (ἔρχομαι. . . ἐπί, 19:6), and being “received” (λαμβάνω, Acts 10:47; 19:2) by them would prove that *baptidzo* also means come upon, fall, receive, and come—the word would be a veritable nose of wax which could be twisted any which way at will, and would mean so much that it meant nothing at all. The Scriptural distinction in prepositions, where the Spirit falls “upon” (ἐπί) and is poured “out” (ἐκ) while baptism/immersion is *en* (ἐν) water and the Spirit, but one is never “baptized out” or “baptized upon,” for example, would also be neglected. Finally, the Spirit’s being poured out from heaven is synonymous with His being sent by the ascended Christ after He sat down at the right hand of the Father (Acts 2:33; John 15:26; 16:7). The Spirit’s being poured out or sent from heaven had, as its result on earth, the church’s receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost. That is, the result of the heavenly sending or pouring out was the earthly baptism or immersion. The baptism is not a synonym of the sending or pouring, but a consequence of it. To attempt to invalidate the simple fact of the Greek language that *baptidzo* means *immerse*, and never *pour* or *sprinkle*, by confusing the terms that are employed in association with Spirit baptism, is entirely invalid. For conclusive evidence that *to baptize* means *to immerse*, see pgs. 386-444, “Christian Baptism,” in *Principles and Practices for Baptist Churches*, Edward T. Hiscox (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, orig. pub. 1894); pgs. 18-167, *Baptism in its Mode and Subjects*, Alexander Carson, (5<sup>th</sup> rev. ed., Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1860; elec. acc. <http://books.google.com>).

xxxvii

Cf. Matthew 3:11 in the Tyndale Bible, “He shall baptise you with ye holy gost and with fyre.”

xxxviii

The church had a Comforter, a παράκλητος, before the Pentecostal coming of the Spirit—Christ Himself, the Son of God, was their Comforter, for the Holy Ghost was “another Comforter” (John 14:16; cf. 1 John 2:1).

Lewis Sperry Chafer, commenting on John 14:16–17, wrote: “The promise of Christ—‘I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter’ (Παράκλητος)—may well be set over against Christ’s word recorded in Luke 11:13, ‘If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?’ This assurance was uttered early in Christ’s ministry and, being so great an innovation over the relationships provided in Old Testament times to which the disciples were alone accustomed, evidently was never entered into by them. After His ministry is well concluded and before He departs out of this world, He declares that He will pray the Father and for the very presence of the Spirit for which they had failed to pray. The provisions included in Christ’s prayer are more extensive and anticipate at least two age-characterizing realities: (1) That the Spirit should be given as an indwelling Person to each of the eleven men present. They, according to Old Testament usage, had been accustomed to think of the Spirit as bestowed only for very specific purposes by the sovereign will of God. That the Spirit might be given to all men of faith and without exception was wholly new to them. Thus was introduced one of the greatest features of the new dispensation that was then coming into view—a feature too often overlooked by theologians, that the Spirit is given to all believers from the least of them to the greatest of them. Though emphasized constantly in the Epistles, this fact of the indwelling Spirit is here announced by Christ for the first time. (2) The second age-characterizing feature is the truth that the indwelling of the Spirit in the child of God is an unchangeable fact. Christ prayed that the Spirit might abide with believers forever, and that prayer is answered as definitely and certainly as the prayer that the Spirit should come at all. Thus it is assured that the Spirit indwells and that He abides in the heart forever. This same truth John again asserts in his first Epistle, ‘But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you’ (1 John 2:27). This truth, it will be observed, determines much in the doctrine of the security of those who are saved. The Christian may grieve the Spirit, but he will never grieve Him away; he may quench the Spirit (in the sense that the Spirit is suppressed), but the Spirit will never leave the heart into which He has come to abide. (pgs. 117-118, “The Teachings of Christ Incarnate, Part 3: The Upper Room Discourse.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 109:434 (April 1952) 103-136). Elsewhere Chafer insightfully commented on Luke 11:13, “Because [Luke 11:13] is located in the New Testament and because it was spoken by Christ, many have concluded that this passage must be incorporated into the general doctrine of the Spirit’s relation to the Christian. Great error and misunderstanding have thus been engendered. . . . The passage under consideration conditions reception of the Holy Spirit upon asking, whereas the Christian, as has been seen, receives the Holy Spirit without any asking as a part of his salvation and when he believes. The Spirit, consequently, is now given to those who do no more than believe. In the dispensational divisions of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit . . . the period between the baptism of Christ and the day of Pentecost was characterized by transition, and in that period Christ offered the Spirit to those who would ask for Him. This provision of His was so in advance of the relation which the Spirit sustained to the saints in Old Testament times, to which relationship the apostles were in some measure adjusted, that there is no record that they ever ventured on to this new ground; accordingly, at the end of His earth-ministry, Christ said: ‘I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever’ (John 14:16). This introduces an entirely different relationship to the Spirit. The disciples were not now to receive the Holy Spirit in answer to their own petition, but in answer to the petition of Christ. Thus it is indicated that the Holy Spirit has now been given because of Christ’s prayer and to all who believe. As 1 Samuel 16:14 and Psalm 51:11 serve to demonstrate that the experience of the Old Testament saints cannot be made the norm of Christian experience, in like manner Luke 11:13, which was for the disciples between Christ’s baptism and the Day of Pentecost, cannot be made the norm of present experience” (*Systematic Theology: Pneumatology* (pgs. 130-131, vol. 6, chap. 10). Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1976 (reprint ed.).

xi

The nonarticularity of Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον in Luke 11:13 does not by any means establish that a reference to anything less than the Person of the Holy Spirit, the third member of the Godhead, is in view. While Nigel Turner in his *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965) advocated the “generalization with regard to the significance of the article in references to the Holy Spirit in Luke’s writings . . . that ‘as a general rule, and subject to conditions, whenever the Holy Spirit has the definite article the reference is to the third person of the Trinity (expressed either as to *Pneuma to hagion* or as to *hagion Pneuma*), but when the article is absent the reference is to a holy spirit, a divine influence possessing men’ (p. 19) . . . [this] must . . . be called in question. Turner . . . mentions, but does not exhaust, complicating factors, factors so complicating . . . as to leave little room for assurance in pressing his rule.

When one considers the fact also . . . [certain other] clear and indubitable references to the Holy Spirit [that] . . . would dispose the reader . . . to take *hagion Pneuma* . . . in Acts as the Holy Spirit, one's doubt about Turner's rule must increase. In addition to all this, the application of the supposed rule to particular passages will be found to yield very unsatisfactory results" (John H. Skilton, book review of Turner's *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. *Westminster Theological Journal* 29:2 (May 1967) p. 218). Turner was a theological modernist (although not on the most radical wing of liberalism) who believed in "distancing himself from the doctrine of verbal inspiration (a question [he affirmed was] 'beset by innumerable difficulties')" (pg. 104, *Trinity Journal* 3:1 (Spring 1982) p. 104, Book Review by M. Silva of *Christian Words*, by Nigel Turner. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1980.), and "Turner defers to certain critical hypotheses which are unacceptable to conservative students . . . the Pastorals are treated separately from Paul . . . and the Johannine literature is treated in three units" (pg. 273, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 135:539 (Jul 78), Book Review by Zane C. Hodges of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton. Vol. 4: Style, by Nigel Turner. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1976). Nigel Turner's view that nonarticular Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον is something less than the Person of the Holy Ghost is not the product of Spirit-led exegesis, since he was an unsaved, natural man (1 Corinthians 2:14), nor is it required by a correct understanding of Greek grammar. Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον is a monadic noun phrase, referring specifically to the Person of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, and thus, like other monadic nouns, and in a fashion like that of proper names, it is definite without the article. Daniel Wallace wrote: "A one-of-a-kind noun does not, of course, require the article to be definite (e.g., "sun," "earth," "devil," etc.). One might consider πνεῦμα as monadic when it is modified by the adjective ἅγιον. If so, then the expression πνεῦμα ἅγιον is monadic and refers only to the Holy Spirit" (pgs. 248-250, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace). A. T. Robertson stated: "In the N. T. . . it is [very] common to find simply θεός, especially in the Epistles. . . . [T]he word is treated like a proper name and may have [the article] (Ro. 3:5) or not have it (8:9). The same thing holds true about πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα ἅγιον, κύριος, [and] Χριστός. . . . [As the] word θεός, like a proper name, is freely used with and without the article . . . [s]o also πνεῦμα and πνεῦμα ἅγιον may occur with and without the article. . . . Κύριος, like θεός and πνεῦμα, is often practically a proper name in the N. T." (pgs. 761, 795-6, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*). Likewise, James Elder Cumming in his *Through the Eternal Spirit: A Biblical Study on the Holy Ghost* (Chicago, IL: Revell, 1896), elec. acc. <http://books.google.com>, "Appendix II: On the Use of the Greek Article Before the Names of the Spirit of God" pgs. 286-296) discusses and refutes the arbitrary, unsound, and contradictory views of those who build doctrine, often on modernistic assumptions, from an alleged distinction between articular and nonarticular πνεῦμα ἅγιον. After documenting a variety of contradictory theories by proponents of a distinction, Cumming writes, "May I venture now to call attention to the strangely vague, arbitrary, and not very consistent rules laid down? . . . [C]an we find in the use of the Article an indication of the distinction between the Person of the Holy Ghost and His influences[?] . . . [W]e must answer, No. The use is so irregular, and so much at the discretion of the writer, that no such intention can be traced. . . . I venture to submit . . . that there is no such distinctive use of the Article in the New Testament in connection with the mention of the Holy Ghost as to warrant us in finding a theological or spiritual reason for its presence or absence; and that all such pressure of . . . rules . . . as has been attempted, is misleading and unfounded" (pgs. 286, 294-296).

To affirm from the nonarticularity of Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον that power of or works from the Spirit are in view in Luke 11:13, rather than the Person of the Spirit Himself, requires one not only to ignore the syntactical facts of Greek monadic nouns but also the other 49 instances of the phrase Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον in the NT, each of which refers to "the Holy Spirit" and cannot in accordance with sound exegesis be reduced to anything less (Matthew 1:18; 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67; 2:25; 3:16; 4:1; 11:13; John 1:33; 7:39; 20:22; Acts 1:2, 5; 2:4; 4:8, 31; 6:3, 5; 7:55; 8:15, 17, 19; 9:17; 10:38; 11:16, 24; 13:9, 52; 19:2; Romans 5:5; 9:1; 14:17; 15:13, 16; 1 Corinthians 2:13; 12:3; 2 Corinthians 6:6; 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6; 2 Timothy 1:14; Titus 3:5; Hebrews 2:4; 6:4; 1 Peter 1:12; 2 Peter 1:21; Jude 1:20). In some verses, trying to reduce Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον from "the Holy Ghost" to something like "power from the Holy Ghost" is entirely nonsensical (e. g., Romans 15:13; 1 Thessalonians 1:5). Nor is there any reason to conclude that anything less than the Person of the Spirit is in view in nonarticular OT verses that refer to the Holy Spirit, רוּחַ קְדוֹשׁ (Isaiah 63:10-11; Psalm 51:11). Old Testament phrases like "the Spirit of the LORD" (רוּחַ יְהוָה, Judges 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Samuel 10:6; 16:13-14; 19:9 (still definite although here a shorthand meaning רוּחַ יְהוָה מְאֵת הַקֶּטֶף) 2 Samuel 23:2; 1 Kings 18:12; 22:24; 2 Kings 2:16; 2 Chronicles

18:23; 20:14; Isaiah 11:2; 40:7, 13; 59:19; 61:1; 63:14; Ezekiel 11:5; 37:1; Hosea 13:15; Micah 2:7; 3:8) are always definite although always nonarticular because of the nature of the Hebrew construct phrase—this fact holds even when the phrase refers to something besides the Holy Ghost such as the wind (cf. Hosea 13:15). Similarly, the equivalent NT phrases Πνεῦμα Κυρίου “the Spirit of the Lord” (Luke 4:18; Acts 5:9; 8:39; 2 Corinthians 3:17) and Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ, “the Spirit of God” (Romans 8:9; 1 Corinthians 7:40; cf. Matthew 12:28; Rom 8:14; 15:19; 1 Corinthians 12:3; 2 Corinthians 3:3), are monadic and definite even when non-articular.

If nonarticularity for the Holy Spirit refers not to His Person, but merely to power or works from Him, one wonders if nonarticularity in references to the Greek Πατήρ such as “Our Father which art in heaven” (Matthew 6:9), “O Father, Lord of heaven and earth” (Matthew 11:26), “Father, forgive them” (Luke 23:34), “the Father which hath sent me” (John 5:30), “Holy Father” (John 17:11), “one God and Father of all” (Ephesians 4:6), and “the glory of God the Father” (Philippians 2:11) denote not the Person of God the Father, but merely power from or works done by Him; or if the nonarticular υἱός in “O Lord, thou Son of David” (Matthew 15:22), “Jesus Christ, the Son of God” (Mark 1:1), “the Son of the Highest” (Luke 1:32), “the Son of man” (John 5:27), and many similar verses do not refer to the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, but only to power or works from Him.

One should also note the convincing parallels where articularity and nonarticularity for Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον are clearly shown to refer to the same events and actions on pgs. 68-70, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, Dunn. His conclusion is correct: “Where πνεῦμα ἅγιον confronts us in the NT it never designates a charismatic endowment without the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit himself.”

<sup>xli</sup> Thus, the verse indicates that the “heavenly Father [would] give the Holy Spirit *to them that ask him*.” The direct object of the verb *give* is the Holy Spirit. The indirect object, those who receive the Spirit, are *them that ask*. No reference to the Holy Spirit being given to or ministering to people other than those who are doing the asking is contained in the verse. John 16:7-11 is a promise Christians can and should take to the Lord in prayer that the lost will be convicted of their sin by the Spirit—but if they employ Luke 11:13 to that end they are pleading what the text does not say.

<sup>xlii</sup> Thus, Luke 11:13 promises the Holy Spirit to “to them that ask,” τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν, the repeated action being expressed by the present participle.

<sup>xliii</sup> Their action is expressed by διδόναι, a present active infinitive, expressing iterative action.

<sup>xliv</sup> Thus the future active indicative δώσει is employed. The Greek future, “with reference to *aspect*, . . . seems to offer an *external* portrayal, something of a temporal counterpart to the aorist indicative” (pg. 567, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace). Thus, one would expect an aoristic, point-action sort of idea for the future tense of δίδωμι as employed in Luke 11:13. While the future tense presents an action as a whole, it is true that the use of the future on its own does not eliminate the possibility of progressive or durative action within the aoristic presentation (cf. the uses of δίδωμι in Matthew 13:12; 24:24, 29; 25:29; Mark 4:25; 13:22, 24; Luke 8:18; 19:26), but the definite majority of the appearances of the future of δίδωμι indicate one-time action (Matthew 4:9; 7:7, 11; 10:19; 12:39; 16:4, 19, 26; 20:4; 21:43; Mark 6:22-23; 8:12, 37; 12:9; Luke 1:32; 4:6; 6:38; 11:8-9, 13, 29; 16:12; 20:16; 21:15; John 4:14; 6:27, 51; 11:22; 14:16; 16:23; Acts 2:19, 27; 13:34-35; 24:26; Romans 14:12; James 1:5; 1 John 5:16; Revelation 2:7, 10, 17, 23, 26, 28; 3:21; 4:9; 11:3; 21:6). Thus, while the promise of Luke 11:13 could have partial fulfillment in anyone who so asked and sought for Him in the gospels, the ultimate fulfillment of the verse took place on Pentecost, for before then “the Holy Ghost was not yet *given*; because that Jesus was not yet glorified” (John 7:39. It should be also noted that “an example [of πνεῦμα such as] οὐπω ἦν πνεῦμα (Jo. 7:39) merely illustrates the use of πνεῦμα like θεός as substantially a proper name” (pg. 795, A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934).). Compare also the Appendix, sermon #2, “The Church, The Habitat of the Holy Spirit” on John 7:39.

While the background NT usage of δίδωμι would weight one in favor of one-time action as he approaches Luke 11:13, the immediate context provides very strong corroboration. The Spirit is affirmed to be a one-time gift given in response to repeated prayer (Acts 1:14), just as four verses earlier in 11:9, the central affirmation of the pericope containing 11:13, “ask . . . seek . . . [and] knock” are repeated actions, but “shall be given . . . shall find . . . shall be opened” refer to one-time future events in response to the continued asking, seeking, and knocking. The iterative present tense verbs and one-time future tense

---

responses in verses 9 and 13 are parallel (cf. also 11:26, ἐπιζητεῖ and δοθήσεται; James 1:5, αἰτείτω . . . καὶ δοθήσεται).

<sup>xlv</sup> Subsequent to this transitional action referenced in Luke 11:13, where the Holy Spirit was initially bestowed in the baptism of Acts 2 in response to continued prayer, the Holy Spirit would be, for the course of the age of grace, given permanently and unchangeably at the moment of regeneration (1 John 4:13; note the perfect tense, δέδωκεν, in “he hath given us of his Spirit”). However, this fact does not relate the promise of Luke 11:13 to those living today, because Spirit indwelling is temporally simultaneous with faith in Christ (cf. Romans 8:9); the Spirit is not today a gift given subsequent to regeneration as a response to continued prayer.

<sup>xlvi</sup> Ephesians 1:17 is not listed (although it also has an aorist of δίδωμι, albeit an aorist optative), because the verse is not about the Holy Spirit. The Received Text δόντα in 1 Thessalonians 4:8 is the inspired and preserved reading, found in 97% of Greek MSS including Codex A. The reading διδόντα is a textual corruption.

Attempting to support a type of Reformed revivalistic PCP doctrine, Iain Murray argued, “On Ephesians 1:17 Bishop Moule wrote: ‘We are not to think of the ‘giving’ of the Spirit as of an isolated deposit of what, once given, is now locally in possession. The first ‘gift’ is, as it were, the first point in a series of actions, of which each one may be expressed also as a gift.’” Were it not for this truth, prayer for the Spirit (Luke 11:13) would be meaningless” (pg. 19, *Revival and Revivalism: The Making and Marring of American Evangelicalism, 1750-1858*, Iain H. Murray. Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 1994). The Greek tenses employed in Scripture for the giving of the Spirit contradict the position of Moule and Murray that the Spirit’s bestowal as a gift is not once and for all at regeneration. Consequently, in the dispensation of grace after the completion of the event of Spirit baptism, Murray’s statement of the consequence of invalid premises on his part is correct—prayer for the Spirit is indeed meaningless.

<sup>xlvii</sup> Acts 8:18-19 (And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost; θεασάμενος δὲ ὁ Σίμων ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα, λέγων, Δότε καὶ μοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην. ἵνα ὃ ἂν ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας, λαμβάνη Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον.) does not constitute an exception. The present passive δίδεται in v. 18 is distributive, “the use of the present tense for individual acts distributed to more than one object” (pg. 520, Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*). Each person upon whom the Apostles laid hands received the Holy Ghost, but each person received Him, the “gift of God” (8:20), only once. Simon was also in spiritual darkness in this matter (v. 19; cf. v. 20-24).

<sup>xlviii</sup> See Acts 2:4, ἐδίδου, imperfect tense; the Spirit was continuing to give utterance; 1 Corinthians 12:7, δίδεται, present tense, the manifestation of the Spirit is being given; 1 Corinthians 12:8, the word of wisdom is being given (δίδεται, present tense) by the Spirit. Note also Christ, fulfilling His Mediatorial office, was continually given boundless measures of the Spirit from the Father (οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ Πνεῦμα), John 3:34.

<sup>xlix</sup> While writers are far from unanimous on Luke 11:13 (cf. the views and their advocates delineated on pgs. 96-97, “Rethinking The Role Of The Holy Spirit In The Lives Of Old Testament Believers,” Gary Fredricks. *Trinity Journal* 9:1 (Spring 1988) 81-104), the conclusions advanced above are also made by others. For example, Merrill F. Unger wrote, “Christ while on earth taught that the Father, in answer to prayer, would ‘give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him’ (Luke 11:13). This promise, of course, was pre-Pentecost and was spoken under the old economy, when the Spirit of God came upon men and departed, according to divine sovereign will. For a man to ask for, much less receive, the Spirit was a staggering new thing to a Jew, in advance of the fulfillment of Joel 2:28, 29, and there is no evidence that any asked for the Spirit, claiming this promise. To apply this teaching to this present age is to forget Pentecost and the fact that every believer now has the indwelling Spirit. It was the ascended Christ who asked the Father for the Spirit as the ascension Gift (John 14:16), and no believer now . . . indwelt with the Spirit as he is, need ever ask for Him. He possesses Him, and never because he has prayed or asked for Him, but because he has Him as a free gift by virtue of simple faith in the crucified and risen Savior” (pg. 363, “The Baptism with the Holy Spirit,” part 2. *Bibliotheca Sacra* 101:403 (Jul 44), 357-374. It should be noted that agreement on Luke 11:13 does not mean that Unger, or others cited, agreed with the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism presented in this composition). Charles Ryrie wrote, “Luke 11:13 . . . might seem to indicate that

---

the Spirit may be given and taken away repeatedly[.] . . . However, it must be recognized that [this verse, as with 1 Samuel 16:14 and Psalm 51:11, is] pre-Pentecostal. And that is very important, for it is not until Pentecost that we can expect any normalcy in the operation of the Spirit in this age. After all, the Lord Himself recognized the pre- and post-Pentecostal difference as late as the upper room discourse where the majority of the promises concerning the coming and ministry of the Spirit were given. Therefore, even if the Spirit was removed from the lives of people before Pentecost, the fact that this happened before Pentecost rules out carrying over such experience into the post-Pentecostal era” (*The Holy Spirit* (Chicago: Moody, 1965) pgs. 70–71). “Luke 11:11–13 stresses that the Father will give the Holy Spirit (cf. Matt 7:11 “good things”). This link between the Holy Spirit and prayer is seen also in Acts 1:14 where Luke portrays the disciples praying before they receive the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit in Acts 2. Thus, Talbert states: ‘Indeed, the evangelist would see this promise of Jesus in Luke 11:13 as the basis for Pentecost.’ The gift of the Spirit represents the coming of the kingdom of God” (pg. 690, “Theology Of Prayer In The Gospel Of Luke,” Kyu Sam Hana, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 43:4 (Dec 00) 675-695). Strong notes that “The Plymouth Brethren . . . object to praying for the Holy Spirit, because he was given on Pentecost” (*Systematic Theology*, Augustus Strong, part 7 (Ecclesiology) 1:2, elec. acc. Systematic Theologies, vol. 17, Rio, WI: AGES Digital Software library, 2006). Reformed, non-dispensational writers (e. g. Thomas Boston, Stephen Charnock, Robert Dabney, Jonathan Edwards, Thomas Manton, Matthew Poole, etc.) seem to almost universally affirm that Luke 11:13 indicates that the Spirit should be prayed for today, while dispensationalists (e. g. Lewis Sperry Chafer, cited above in endnote 38, Ryrie and Unger as cited in this endnote, etc.) often affirm that He has now come to permanently indwell saints and that Luke 11:13 is a pre-Pentecost promise.

<sup>i</sup> It is important to mention that this fact does not mean Christians should refrain from asking for blessings from the Spirit, a greater work of the Spirit upon them to strengthen them spiritually, for greater measures of conviction of sin from Him, or similar sorts of requests. What is affirmed is that none of these requests relate to Luke 11:13, a verse that refers to Spirit baptism and the now completed dispensational transition connected to the Pentecostal gift of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, no prohibition for prayer for powerful works from the Spirit is argued for by an affirmation that the prayer of Luke 11:13 was dispensational and fulfilled in the book of Acts. Such works from the Spirit are good things, and the believer’s “Father which is in heaven give[s] good things to them that ask him” (Matthew 7:11; a parallel passage, to be sure, but a different occasion—note the differences specified in Luke 11:1 and Matthew 4:23-5:1; in the words of John Gill, commenting on Luke 11:1, “The following directions concerning prayer, though they agree with those in Mt 6:9, etc. yet were delivered at another time, and in another place, and upon another occasion: Christ was then in Galilee, now in Judea: he gave the former directions unasked for, these at the request of one of his disciples; the other were given as he was preaching, these immediately after he had been praying; as soon as he had done a work he was often employed in, as man and mediator, on account of himself, his disciples, cause, and interest: and this was done). Indeed, the Father will the more freely give glorious blessings by His Spirit when the people of God employ the promises of the Word that actually relate to what they are praying about—thus, recognizing what Luke 11:13 truly teaches should lead to more answers to prayer for mighty works from the Holy Spirit as verses that actually promise such (cf. John 16:8-11) are pleaded. Sound exegesis of the work of the Spirit will contribute to, not hinder, genuine blessings from on high and revival; poor exegesis contributes to spiritual confusion instead of revival.

<sup>ii</sup> The “not many days hence” (οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας, 1:5) was fulfilled at the conclusion of the “in those days” (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, 1:15) period when “the day of Pentecost was fully come” (ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, 2:1).

<sup>iii</sup> Note the anaphoric article in τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4), referring back to the specific promise of Luke 11:13.

<sup>iiii</sup> See the section “Spirit Baptism in the Old Testament” and endnote 13. Out of 25 appearances of δύναμις in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14, 36; 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13, 19; 19:37; 21:26, 27; 22:69; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 2:22; 3:12; 4:7, 33; 6:8; 8:10, 13; 10:38; 19:11), only one clearly refers to non-miraculous power in preaching and evangelism (Luke 1:17; cf. John 10:41), where miraculous regeneration is nonetheless in view. Every clear reference to δύναμις in Acts is connected with miracles, as are the large majority of uses in Luke.

---

Even if one wished to affirm that Acts 1:8 refers to power for Christian service universally received by believers today at the moment of regeneration rather than to ability to perform signs and wonders, throughout the course of the church age when a saint has received “the gift of the Holy Ghost” by possessing His indwelling Person at the moment of regeneration, he already has all power to perform spiritual service within him. The Christian possesses “all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ” (Eph 1:3); therefore, no “second blessing” of the PCP sort is possible because of the glorious gifts given believers at the great “first blessing” when they became children of God. Believers certainly should, for greater effectiveness in Christian service, yield more fully to God, but they cannot get a PCP sort of “second blessing” as a consequence. While Acts 1:8 refers to first century miraculous power, not to power given to saints at regeneration, even if reference were to the latter, the verse would provide no support whatever to PCP theology.

<sup>liv</sup> See endnote 19. It is clear that the entire church, not the apostles alone, received the tongues of fire and the miraculous gift of speaking in unlearned languages on Pentecost, not only from the syntax of Acts 2:3-4, but also from the fact that more than twelve language groups were represented (2:9-11) yet each group heard in its own native tongue (2:5-11).

<sup>lv</sup> Alvah Hovey, president of the Newton Theological Institution in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a Baptist college, thought that the “tongues of fire . . . could only symbolize a supernatural utterance of truth from God. This interpretation is established by the words that follow: ‘And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance.’ Moreover, it appears that the subject of their communication was ‘the wonderful works of God’” (pg. 36, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, by Alvah Hovey). Dr. Hovey’s idea is thought-provoking.

<sup>lvi</sup> The corruption that removes the final words of the Greek text of the chapter, “to the church” (τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ, v. 47) rejects the testimony of over 97% of Greek MSS evidence.

<sup>lvii</sup> The glory of the postexilic temple rebuilt under the leadership of Ezra was greater than that built by Solomon, although the *shekinah* never entered it, because the incarnate Son of God did (Haggai 2:9; Luke 2:27). Likewise, the glory of the church, because of Christ’s presence in her midst in his human body during His earthly ministry (cf. Hebrews 2:12; Matthew 26:30), and because of His presence as omnipresent God (Matthew 28:20; Revelation 1:13; 2:1) after His resurrection (John 20:22) and ascension (Acts 2), is a greater glory than that of the tabernacle and the temple. Indeed, if the coming of the Son into the postexilic temple for a short time made that edifice greater than Solomon’s temple, how much more does His permanent dwelling in the church exceed all that came before in glory? Christ, who possesses the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, tabernacles in the literal human body He has united to Himself (John 1:14), but in similar manner does He tabernacle in “his body,” the church, “the fulness of him that filleth all in all” (Ephesians 1:23; cf. 1 Corinthians 3:16-17; 1 Timothy 3:15). How should the people of God treasure their membership and worship in their particular Baptist congregations! *Jehovah shammah*, Ezekiel 48:35. In them they can see the closest earthly parallel to the ineffable and eternal glory that is their portion in the antitypical Holy of Holies, the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:11, 23). The reverent love that the saints have for their Holy One and Redeemer should lead to like passionate love for His church.

Similarly, as the saints’ individual bodies are temples of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 6:19-20) and the dwelling places of the Trinity (John 14:23; Colossians 1:27)—believers must keep their bodies holy.

<sup>lviii</sup> “On the day of Pentecost the Lord demonstrated beyond any question that He was publicly inaugurating His new institution of divine presence (Mt. 18:20, 28:19-20; Rev. 1:13-20), worship and service—the local church. The Jews needed to be convinced through divine accreditation with signs and wonders (Mt. 12:38; I Cor. 1:22) that the Lord was done with the Zerubbabel-Herod Temple (Mt. 23:38), and that His new institution would be the Lord’s ekklesia (cf. Mt. 16:18; Rev. 3:1 ff.). As the glory of the Spirit of the Lord filled the Tabernacle, the Solomon Temple, and will fill the Millennial Temple, so too His Spirit ‘filled all the house where they were sitting’ (Acts 2:2)” (“Ye Are The Body of Christ,” Dr. Thomas M. Strouse. Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, Newington, CT. elec. acc. [http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body\\_of\\_christ.html](http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body_of_christ.html)).

Franz Delitzsch notes: “[T]he head is, according to Scripture, evidently the noblest part of man; standing in the closest relation as well to soul and spirit in the man, as to all psychic-spiritual influences which arise to the man. Because in the head, the human organism culminates, Christ is called the κεφαλή

of the church His body, (see especially Ephesians 5:23; Colossians 2:19; comp. 1 Corinthians 11:3); and for the same reason, שׂוֹמֵר is the general metaphorical appellation of him who is most exalted, the most excellent, the chief. He who blesses lays his hand upon the head of the person to be blessed (Genesis 48:14; comp. 49:26; Proverbs 10:6), and he who consecrates, on the head of the person to be consecrated (Jeremiah 8:10); so that from thence, blessing and consecration, like the anointing oil (Psalm 133:2, comp. Leviticus 8:12), should flow down upon the whole natural condition, and pervade it. Precisely for the same reason, tongues of fire are distributed on the heads of the apostles, and they became thus full of the Holy Ghost (Acts 2:3): it was their heavenly laying on of hands (הַיָּמִינִים) (pgs. 300-301, *A System of Biblical Psychology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> English ed., trans. Robert Ernest Wallis. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1885).

<sup>lix</sup> Note the emphasis placed upon prophesying in Acts 2:18 in comparison with the source of Joel 2:29. Furthermore, Luke-Acts employs the verb προφητεύω uniformly for a miraculous gift of inspired speech (Luke 1:67; 22:64; Acts 2:17, 18; 19:6; 21:9). For that matter, the verb προφητεύω appears 28 times in 27 verses in the New Testament, but none of these texts clearly refers to uninspired discourse (Matthew 7:22; 11:13; 15:7; 26:68; Mark 7:6; 14:65; Luke 1:67; 22:64; John 11:51; Acts 2:17-18; 19:6; 21:9; 1 Corinthians 11:4-5; 13:9; 14:1, 3-5, 24, 31, 39; 1 Peter 1:10; Jude 1:14; Revelation 10:11; 11:3). The related noun προφητεία is found 19 times in the New Testament (Matthew 13:14; Romans 12:6; 1 Corinthians 12:10; 13:2, 8; 14:6, 22; 1 Thessalonians 5:20; 1 Timothy 1:18; 4:14; 2 Peter 1:20-21; Revelation 1:3; 11:6; 19:10; 22:7, 10, 18-19). None of these texts clearly designate anything less than speech given by inspiration. The final relevant word in the New Testament is the adjective προφητικός, which appears in 2 verses (Romans 16:26; 2 Peter 1:19). Both of these texts clearly refer to inspired Scripture. Furthermore, there are no references in the Old Testament that employ the *prophecy* word group for anything less than something that is inspired by God (or false prophecy by false prophets that claimed inspiration, 1 Kings 22:12; Jeremiah 2:8, etc.)—simple uninspired preaching is never clearly designated *prophecy*. The 16 instances of προφητεία in the LXX, both in the canonical books and the Apocrypha (2 Chronicles 15:8; 32:32; Ezra 5:1; 6:14; Nehemiah 6:12; Tobit 2:6; Sirach 0:20; 24:33; 36:14; 39:1; 44:3; 46:1, 20; Jeremiah 23:31; Daniel 11:14; 14:1), are consistent with this view. Likewise, the 117 instances of the verb προφητεύω in 103 verses in the LXX (canon + Apocrypha: Numbers 11:25-27; 1 Samuel 10:5-6, 10, 13; 19:20-21, 23-24; 1 Kings 18:29; 22:10, 12, 18; 2 Chronicles 18:7, 9, 11, 17; 20:37; 1 Esdras 6:1; 7:3; Ezra 5:1; Judith 6:2; Wisdom 14:28; Sirach 46:20-47:1; 48:13; Amos 2:12; 3:8; 7:12-13, 15-16; Joel 3:1; Zechariah 13:3-4; Jeremiah 2:8; 5:31; 11:21; 14:13-16; 19:14; 20:1, 6; 23:13, 21, 25-26, 32; 25:14; 32:13, 30; 33:9, 11-12, 20; 34:10, 14-16; 35:6, 8-9; 36:9, 26-27, 31; 39:3; 44:19; Ezekiel 4:7; 6:2; 11:4, 13; 12:27; 13:2-3, 16-17; 21:2, 7, 14, 19, 33; 25:2; 28:21; 29:2; 30:2; 34:2; 35:2; 36:1, 3, 6; 37:4, 7, 9-10, 12; 38:2, 14; 39:1) provide no clear instances of anything less than references to inspired speech. While powerful preaching should follow the pattern of inspired prophetic preaching, uninspired speech is not Biblical prophecy, except in the sense that, as it correctly interprets and applies the Word, it is “as the oracles of God” (1 Peter 4:11).

Thus, the *prophecy* spoken of by Peter in Acts 2 as a fulfillment of Joel 2 refers to a miraculous spiritual gift, not simply to non-miraculous though Spirit-empowered preaching.

<sup>lx</sup> “Cornelius the centurion [was] a just man, and one that feare[d] God, and of good report among all the nation of the Jews . . . a devout *man*, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always” (Acts 10:22, 2). Both he and his entire household (cf. also 10:7) were “God-fearers,” (cf. also 13:16, 26). “Proselytes in the NT were called ‘Godfearing’ or those who ‘fear God,’ . . . In [the] synagogues were also men who were ‘devout converts to Judaism’ (Acts 13:43) and people described as ‘men who fear God,’ Gentiles who were ‘proselytes of the gate’ and not fully converted to Judaism or involved in the synagogue, but who liked its high moral character and monotheism. . . . It is undoubtedly true that for every full convert to Judaism there were many partial converts who accepted almost all of Judaism in the realm of belief and practice with the exception of circumcision. They were referred to in the 1st century as ‘those who fear (worship) God’ (*The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, gen. ed. Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1963, elec. acc.; Articles *Fear*, *Galatians*, *Epistle to*; *Proselyte*). Thus, although Gentiles, Cornelius and his household had strong connections to Judaism and were therefore different from those in Acts 19, who were simply Gentiles without any kind of previous Jewish connection. Note also that before Acts 10 (and some continued to act so even after that time) the church was “preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only” (Acts 11:19), while between Acts 10 and 19, Paul preached, “children of the stock of Abraham, and

---

whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent” (Acts 13:26). After Acts 19, the church freely offered the gospel to “whosoever will” (cf. Revelation 22:17) without any kind of Jewish, Samaritan, God-fearer, or normal Gentile distinction.

<sup>lxi</sup> “*And when Simon saw, &c.* Whence it appears, that the Holy Ghost, or his gifts, which were received by imposition of hands, were something visible and discernible; and so something external, and not internal; otherwise they would have been out of Simon’s reach, and would not have fallen under his notice; but he saw, *that through laying on of the apostles’ hands, the Holy Ghost was given:* he saw, that upon this men began to prophesy, and to speak with divers tongues they had never learned, and to work miracles, cure men of their diseases, and the like” (Comment on Acts 8:18, John Gill, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament*, elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*). “*That they might receive the Holy Ghost.* The main question here is, what was meant by the Holy Ghost? In Ac 8:20, it is called ‘the gift of God.’ The following remarks may make this plain: (1.) It was not that gift of the Holy Ghost by which the soul is converted, or renewed, for they had this when they believed, Ac 8:6. Everywhere the conversion of the sinner is traced to his influence. Comp. Joh 1:13. (2.) It was not the ordinary influences of the Spirit by which the soul is sanctified; for sanctification is a progressive work, and this was sudden: sanctification is shown by the general tenor of the life; this was sudden and striking. (3.) It was something that was discernible by external effects; for Simon saw [Ac 8:18] that this was done by the laying on of hands. (4.) The phrase, ‘the gift of the Holy Ghost,’ and ‘the descent of the Holy Ghost,’ signified not merely his ordinary influences in converting sinners, but those extraordinary influences that attended the first preaching of the gospel—the power of speaking with new tongues, Ac 2, the power of working miracles, etc., Ac 19:6. (5.) This is further clear from the fact that Simon wished to purchase this power, evidently to keep up his influence among the people, and to retain his ascendancy as a juggler and sorcerer. But surely Simon would not wish to purchase the converting and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; it was the power of working miracles. These things make it clear that by the gift of the Holy Spirit here is meant the power of speaking with new tongues, (comp. 1 Cor 14) and the power of miracles . . . *Simon saw*, etc. That is, he witnessed the extraordinary effects, the power of speaking in a miraculous manner” (*Notes on the New Testament*, Albert Barnes, comments on Acts 8:15, 18 elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*).

<sup>lxii</sup> It is noteworthy that Peter, explaining Christ’s gift of the Spirit to the Gentiles in Acts 11:1-18, did not appeal to the OT to prove Gentiles were to receive the Spirit in the church age, as he appealed to Joel 2 for the Jews at Pentecost.

<sup>lxiii</sup> Compare the analysis of Acts 19:1-7 above in endnote 21. It is also worthy of note that, contrary to the Oneness Pentecostal twist on the PCP doctrine of Spirit baptism, Acts 19:1-7 demonstrates that the formula given in Matthew 28:19 was employed by the apostolic churches, and that Trinitarian baptism is actually baptism in Christ’s “name,” that is, with His authority (Acts 19:5). When Paul found people who claimed to be “disciples” (v. 1) who had “not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost” (v. 2), the apostle, in shock, asked “Unto what then were ye baptized?” Since the churches were “baptizing . . . in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 28:19), employing the Trinitarian formula in their baptismal ceremony, Paul asks these alleged “disciples” how they could have been baptized and never have heard of the Holy Ghost, when He is mentioned in the baptismal ritual itself. Paul’s question would not make any sense if the baptismal ceremony employed a formula such as “I baptize you in the name of Jesus.” How would that formula be a guarantee that all baptized disciples had heard of the Holy Ghost? Trinitarians correctly explain Paul’s mental process as, “How could these people be disciples in Christian churches—they have not even heard of the Holy Ghost, but He is mentioned even in the act of baptism! ‘Unto what then were ye baptized?’” Oneness Pentecostals would have to imagine Paul thinking, “How could these people be disciples in Christian churches—they have not even heard of the Holy Ghost—now He isn’t mentioned in the act of baptism, since only the word “Jesus” is used in the formula. However, I’ll ask them what they were baptized unto anyway, as if that related to what they had just said somehow.”

<sup>lxiv</sup> It is the opinion of this writer that there are indeed distinctions in the different terms employed for the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2, 8, 10, 19, as explicated in the following paragraphs. Some distinctions are more evident (as that *receive* refers to simply the coming of the Spirit for the purpose of indwelling, whether through Spirit baptism of one already converted before Pentecost or at the moment of regeneration after the post-Pentecost transition, in contrast to words, such as *pour out*, specifically used for the coming of the Spirit associated with miraculous phenomena) than others. However, even if one wished to maintain

---

that the various terms analyzed below are essentially synonymous, it would not alter the fundamental nature of Spirit baptism as a historical event accompanied with signs and wonders that was completed in the first century and was synonymous with Christ's sending of the Comforter.

Note endnote 35 for the technical distinction between the Spirit's being *poured out* and Spirit *baptism*, and the comments on some of the other terms discussed in the following paragraphs.

<sup>lxv</sup> There is no exegetical basis in the New Testament for praying for the Spirit to be repeatedly poured out in the church age to send revival or for any other reason. No durative, progressive verb tense is employed with the verb ἐκχέω in the New Testament for the Spirit being poured out; the future tense, which is aspectually like the aorist, is employed for the prediction of the pouring out which took place once for all at Pentecost (Acts 2:17-18; Joel 3:1-2, LXX), and the aorist is employed for the actual pouring out that took place on that day (Acts 2:33). The indwelling and renewing of the Spirit that takes place at regeneration is possibly also connected with ἐκχέω in the aorist (Titus 3:5-6). The "pour out" language is not employed in the New Testament for a work from the Spirit of deepening the saint's spiritual life, reviving a congregation, or anything of the sort. Although God may mercifully do great things for misguided saints of His, praying for the Spirit to be poured out again in the church age and similar instances of errant Pneumatology do not contribute to genuine revival. Believers should not grieve the Holy Ghost and disregard or deny the sufficiency of the glorious work God has already done in pouring out the Spirit by asking for Him to be again outpoured. Compare endnote 64.

<sup>lxvi</sup> Titus 3:5-6 speaks of "the Holy Ghost; which [the Father] shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour" (Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, οὗ ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν). Here an allusion back to Pentecost is likely, since the *historia salutis* is in view in the sentence (3:4). Consider, in light of the significance of ἡμεῖς as a massive outpouring and the NT rendering of the verb with ἐκχέω, that Titus 3:6 specifies that the Holy Ghost was "shed on us abundantly" (ἐξέχεεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς πλουσίως). The text contains a "clear allusion to the tradition of Pentecost (ἐκχέω is used with the Spirit in the NT only here and in Acts 2:17, 18, 33) . . . [to] the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit" (pg. 166, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, James Dunn).

Even if one affirms that there is no Pentecostal allusion in Titus 3:5-6, and that Paul connects the moment of personal regeneration with the verb ἐκχέω in the text, it would not follow that there is not a distinction made in Luke-Acts between Spirit baptism and regeneration. Rather, the employment of ἐκχέω for both the historical, completed event of the sending of the Comforter—that is, Spirit baptism (Acts 2:17-18, 33)—and for the indwelling of the Spirit (Romans 8:9) associated with regeneration (Titus 3:5-6) would manifest that the Spirit baptism event constituted the transition from the Old Testament "with you" to the church age "in you" ministry of the Holy Spirit (John 14:17). After the already saved and baptized church members in Acts 2 received Spirit baptism, they were henceforward permanently indwelt by the Spirit, and this ministry of permanent indwelling is the inheritance of all believers after the conclusion of the dispensational transition associated with Spirit baptism. While Spirit baptism marked the point of dispensational transition to the permanent indwelling ministry of the Holy Ghost in the first century, the use of ἐκχέω in both Acts and Titus (where an allusion back to the events of Pentecost is most likely, in which case nowhere does the New Testament connect ἐκχέω and anything that continues throughout the dispensation of grace) certainly cannot legitimately be used to affirm that Spirit baptism is a synonym throughout the church age for the commencement of indwelling connected with regeneration.

<sup>lxvii</sup> BDAG, defining ἐκχέω, indicates that "beside it [is] the Hellenistic Greek form ἐκχύω(ν)ω." Luke was perfectly able to use exactly the same forms he did in Acts 2 to express the idea of *pour out*, but he chose not to do so. While in Acts 10:45 ἐκχύνω is in the perfect tense (as it is, interestingly, in Romans 5:5), and ἐκχέω is not found in the NT in the perfect, ἐκχύνω is employed by Luke in the tenses employed for ἐκχέω in Acts 2, so the possibility that in Luke's vocabulary some tenses simply employed the one verb form or the other is unlikely, and a deliberate choice remains the preferred explanation.

<sup>lxviii</sup> Charles Ryrie comments, "The best explanation of this delay [of the coming of the Spirit as recorded in Acts 8 until the imposition of hands by Peter and John] seems to lie in the schismatic nature of the Samaritan religion. Because the Samaritans had their own worship, which was a rival to the Jewish worship in Jerusalem, it was necessary to prove to [the Jews] that [the Samaritans'] new faith was not to be set up as a rival to the new faith that had taken root in Jerusalem. And the best way for God to show the Samaritan believers that they belonged to the same faith and group as Jerusalem believers (and contrariwise, the best way to show the Jerusalem leaders that the Samaritans were genuinely saved) was to

delay giving of the Spirit until Peter and John came from Jerusalem to Samaria. There could be no doubt then that this was one and the same faith and that they all belonged together in the Body of Christ. This delay in the giving of the Spirit saved the early church from having two mother churches—one in Jerusalem and one in Samaria—early in her history. It preserved the unity of the church[es] in this early stage” (pg. 71, *The Holy Spirit*).

<sup>lxi</sup> ἦν [ἐπ’ . . . αὐτῶν] . . . ἐπιπεπωκός, a pluperfect periphrastic. “It is easy to see how in the present, and especially in the future, periphrastic forms were felt to be needed to emphasize durative action. But that was the real function of the imperfect tense. The demand for this stressing of the durative idea by ἦν and the present participle was certainly not so great. And yet it is just in the imperfect in the N. T. that this idiom is most frequent” (pgs. 887-888, A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934).

<sup>lxx</sup> The perfect tense of ἐκχύνω in Acts 10:45 likewise suggests a one-time coming of the Spirit with continuing results.

<sup>lxxi</sup> While in Acts 8 the Spirit appears to have fallen upon each particular saved and baptized Samaritan when hands were laid on him (note the imperfect tenses in ἐπετίθουν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ’ αὐτούς, καὶ ἐλάβανον Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον in Acts 8:17), a group idea is still present. Likewise, in Acts 10:44, the Spirit fell upon the entire group at one particular moment, so unless each member of the entire group had placed his faith in the Lord Jesus at exactly the same moment, the Spirit fell upon them all not only in logical but also in temporal subsequence to their conversion. Temporal subsequence also fits the comparison of this event to the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2 made in Acts 11:15-17, for faith certainly preceded Spirit baptism in Acts 2. One notes also the aorist tense participle πιστεύσασιν in 11:17, which would be consistent with temporal subsequence to the verb ἔδωκεν, thus demonstrating that the Gentiles believed before the gift of the Spirit was given, although it is true enough that aorist participles when dependent upon aorist verbs are at times temporally simultaneous.

The fact that the Spirit fell upon the groups in Acts 2, 8, and 10 and 19 subsequent to faith, and upon the groups of Acts 2, 8, and 19 after their baptism as well (Acts 10, the only exception, is present only because the apostles would never have baptized the Gentiles at all without the miraculous validation), demolishes the UCD claim that “[n]ever in Scripture is baptism by the Spirit recorded as occurring subsequent to salvation. It is rather an inseparable part of it, so essential that it is impossible to be saved without it” (pg. 140, *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study*, Walvoord). Rather, the truth is that never in Scripture is baptism by the Spirit recorded as occurring at the same moment as saving faith, so that everyone who has been saved has been saved without it. Spirit baptism was promised to already immersed believers in the gospels (compare endnote 23), and the fulfillment in Acts fit the prediction. To support his assertion of the necessity of Spirit baptism for salvation, UCD advocate John Wavoor even affirms that “the converts on the Day of Pentecost . . . include[d] the apostles” (pg. 144, *ibid.*)! Rather, as the Head of the church was immersed in water before the Spirit descended upon and authenticated Him in connection with the beginning of His ministry (Matthew 3:13-17), so the church, Christ’s body, was first immersed in water and then baptized with the Spirit on Pentecost (Acts 2) to authenticate her as God’s new institution for the age.

<sup>lxxii</sup> The grammatical structure of Acts 2:38 connects the receipt of the Holy Spirit (and thus the new birth “of the Spirit,” John 3, and its associated receipt of eternal life) with repentance, not baptism. The section of the verse in question could be diagrammed as follows:

Repent (2nd person plural aorist imperative)  
 be baptized (3rd person singular aorist imperative)  
 every one (nominative singular adjective)  
 in (*epi*) the name of Jesus Christ  
 for/on account of (cf. Matthew 3:11) (*eis*) the remission of sins  
 ye shall receive (2nd person future indicative) . . . the Holy Ghost

Both the command to repent and the promise of receipt of the Holy Spirit are in the second person (i.e. e, “Repent [ye]” and “ye shall receive”). The command to be baptized is third person singular, as is the adjective “every one” (*hekastos*, a partitive genitive, indicating the group from which each person was derived.). Peter commands the whole crowd to repent and promises those who turn from sin to Christ the gift of the Holy Ghost. While the call to baptism was only for the “every one of you” that had already repented, the “be baptized every one of you” section of the verse is parenthetical to the command to repent

---

and its associated promise of the Spirit. Parenthetical statements, including those parallel in structure to Acts 2:38, are found throughout Scripture. Ephesians 4:26-27 is an example:

Be ye angry (2nd person plural imperative)

and sin not (2nd person plural imperative)

[do] not . . . let go down (3rd person singular imperative)

the sun (nominative singular noun)

upon your wrath

neither give place (2nd person plural imperative)

to the devil

The connection in Acts 2:38 between the receipt of the Holy Spirit and repentance, rather than baptism, overthrows attempts to find baptismal regeneration in the verse.

<sup>lxxiii</sup>

One could view the speaking about the wondrous works of God in different tongues in Acts two as a reversal of the Tower of Babel. It is very possible that the “Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven” (Ἰουδαῖοι, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς, ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν, Acts 2:5) included at least one descendent from each of the approximately seventy “nations” into which the earth was divided after the Flood and the tower of Babel (Genesis 10:32); if so, every ethnic “nation” under heaven truly was represented at Pentecost.

<sup>lxxiv</sup>

But cf. also Isaiah 32:15, LXX: ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἔσται ἔρημος ὁ Χερμελ καὶ ὁ Χερμελ εἰς δρυμὸν λογισθήσεται.

<sup>lxxv</sup>

See “1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts,” R. Bruce Compton (*Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* 9 (2004) 97-144) for an excellent exposition of 1 Corinthians 13 that proves the Biblical cessation of tongues by the time of the completion of the canon of Scripture. Since tongues are universally conjoined with Spirit baptism, as evidenced in Acts, and since tongues have ceased, Spirit baptism must also have ceased. Could it be that miraculous gifts were limited to those who either received Spirit baptism or were alive and converted by the time of the events of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, and that the miraculous gifts ceased with the passing away of that generation (cf. Hebrews 2:3-4; Mark 16:17, 20)?

<sup>lxxvi</sup>

No modern PCP advocate speaks in Biblical tongues because tongues have ceased (cf. the article referenced in the last endnote). Modern PCPs who claim to possess the apostolic gift of healing do not instantly heal everyone of every disease without fail (Acts 5:16), do not raise the dead (Acts 9:40; 20:9-10), and do not perform other truly apostolic signs and wonders.

<sup>lxxvii</sup>

In the words of the UCD John F. Walvoord: “[T]he Scriptures make it plain that every Christian is baptized by the Holy Spirit at the moment of salvation. Salvation and baptism are therefore coextensive, and it is impossible to be saved without this work of the Holy Spirit. This is expressly stated in the central passage on the doctrine, ‘For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit’” (pg. 423, “The Person of the Holy Spirit Part 7: The Work of the Holy Spirit in Salvation.” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 98:392 (Oct 41) 421-447. Indeed, “1 Corinthians 12:13 . . . [is] [t]he major passage, which may be taken as the basis of interpretation of the other passages . . . [namely, the] eleven specific references to spiritual baptism . . . Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16; Romans 6:1-4; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 4:5; Colossians 2:12” (pg. 139, *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*, John F. Walvoord).

While 1 Corinthians 12:13 is important to the PCP advocate as well, it is only so as an allegedly supportive element of the PCP position, not as the central verse for the entire theological construction.

<sup>lxxviii</sup>

καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δούλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι καὶ πάντες εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

<sup>lxxix</sup>

pgs. 193-194, “Does Progressive Dispensationalism Teach A Posttribulational Rapture?—Part I,” John Brumett. *Conservative Theological Journal*, 2:5 (June 1998).

<sup>lxxx</sup>

Note on Acts 2:4, *Scofield Reference Bible*, ed. C. I. Scofield. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1945.

<sup>lxxx</sup>

Interestingly, UCD John Walvoord wrote, “The principle cause of disagreement . . . on the doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit . . . is found in the common failure to apprehend the distinctive nature of the church” (pg. 138, *The Holy Spirit: A Comprehensive Study of the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*). The false doctrine of a universal, invisible church is indeed a tremendous barrier to a

recognition of the correct view of Spirit baptism, the historic Baptist position, and an unsound prop of the UCD and PCP positions. For representative refutations of the universal church dogma, see *Ecclesia*, B. H. Carroll (Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, n. d. reprint ed.; also available at <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>), *The Myth of the Universal, Invisible Church Theory Exploded*, Roy Mason (Emmaus, PA: Challenge Press, 2003), and *Landmarks of Baptist Doctrine*, Robert Sargent, vol. 4 (Oak Harbor, WA: Bible Baptist Church Publications, 1990), pgs. 481-542. One notes that even non-evangelical scholars such as “James Dunn[,] [who] needs no introduction, for his prolific scholarship ensures that he is one of the most well known NT scholars in the world . . . [believes that] particular and local assemblies are the church of God in Paul, and any idea of the universal church is absent” (pg. 99, book review of *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998, by Thomas R. Schreiner. *Trinity Journal* 20:1 (Spring 1999)).

<sup>lxxxii</sup> The word appears in Matthew 16:18; 18:17; Acts 2:47; 5:11; 7:38; 8:1,3; 9:31; 11:22, 26; 12:1, 5; 13:1; 14:23, 27; 15:3-4, 22, 41; 16:5; 18:22; 19:32, 39, 41; 20:17, 28; Romans 16:1, 4-5, 16, 23; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 4:17; 6:4; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16, 18, 22; 12:28; 14:4-5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 33-35; 15:9; 16:1, 19; 2 Corinthians 1:1; 8:1, 18-19, 23-24; 11:8, 28; 12:13; Galatians 1:2, 13, 22; Ephesians 1:22; 3:10, 21; 5:23-25, 27, 29, 32; Philippians 3:6; 4:15; Colossians 1:18, 24; 4:15-16; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2:14; 2 Thessalonians 1:1, 4; 1 Timothy 3:5, 15; 5:16; Philemon 2; Hebrews 2:12; 12:23; James 5:14; 3 John 6, 9-10; Revelation 1:4, 11, 20; 2:1, 7-8, 11-12, 17-18, 23, 29; 3:1, 6-7, 13-14, 22; 22:16. The small minority of uses where an individual congregation in a particular location is not in view (cf. “Christ is the head of the church,” Ephesians 5:23; Colossians 1:18) do not prove the existence of a universal, invisible church any more than “the husband is the head of the wife” or “the head of the woman is the man” (Ephesians 5:23; 1 Corinthians 11:3; see below) establish that there is a single universal, invisible husband or a universal, invisible man made up of all individual husbands or men scattered all over world. Rather, these verses employ the word *church* as a generic noun, as a reference to any or every particular church (or husband, man, etc.) in the class *church* (husband, man, etc.). The common category of the “generic noun . . . focuses on the kind. . . emphasizes class traits . . . [and] has in view . . . the class as a whole” (pg. 244, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Daniel B. Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).

Examining Ephesians 5:23 somewhat more deeply, the phrase “Christ is the head of the church” is one of the very few passages that advocates of a universal church employ support their doctrine. Apart from the fact that the verse uses the noun *church* in a generic sense, one should compare the following New Testament texts:

Ephesians 5:23: ὅτι ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναικός, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος. For **the husband is the head of the wife**, even as **Christ is the head of the church**: and he is the saviour of the body,

1 Corinthians 11:3: θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι, ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικός, ὁ ἀνὴρ· κεφαλὴ δὲ Χριστοῦ, ὁ Θεός. But I would have you know, that **the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man**; and the head of Christ *is* God.

The singular nouns “the husband” “the wife” “the woman” “the man” imply zero about a universal, invisible husband, wife, woman, or man. Absolutely nothing affirms the existence of a universal church in the phrase “Christ is the head of the church.” The Lord Jesus is the head of every particular local, visible congregation.

Note also 2 Kings 10:6, LXX:

καὶ ἔγραψεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς βιβλίον δεύτερον λέγων εἰ ἐμοὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ὑμεῖς εἰσακούετε λάβετε **τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνδρῶν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ κυρίου ὑμῶν** καὶ ἐνέγκατε πρὸς με ὡς ἡ ὥρα αὐρίου εἰς Ἰεζραὲλ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως ἦσαν ἐβδομήκοντα ἄνδρες οὗτοι ἄδρῳ τῆς πόλεως ἐξέτρεφον αὐτούς And Ju wrote them a second letter, saying, If ye *are* for me, and hearken to my voice, **take the heads [Gk. singular, “head”] of the men your master’s sons**, and bring *them* to me at this time to-morrow in Jezrael. Now the sons of the king were seventy men; these great men of the city brought them up. (Brenton’s LXX translation—also below).

Nothing at all is implied about anything universal or invisible with the singular. Each son had his own particular head (until he lost it!). “the head of the sons” is teaches nothing other than that each son had his own head. So “Christ is the head of the church” teaches that Christ is the head of each particular church. Compare 2 Kings 10:8, where the plural is used:

καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν λέγων ἦνεγκαν τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ εἶπεν θέτε αὐτὰς βουνοὺς δύο παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πύλης εἰς πρωί. And a messenger came and told *him*, saying, They have brought **the heads of the king's sons**. And he said, Lay them *in* two heaps by the door of the gate until the morning.

Psalm 139:10, LXX (Eng. 140:9):

**ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ κυκλώματος** αὐτῶν κόπος τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν καλύψει αὐτούς. *As for the head of them that compass me*, the mischief of their lips shall cover them.

Note that both the Greek translated “them that compass” and “the head” are both singular nouns, just as in “Christ is the head of the church.” Each particular head of each particular enemy surrounding David would be judged.

Lamentations 2:15, LXX:

ἐκρότησαν ἐπὶ σὲ χεῖρας πάντες οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ὁδὸν ἐσύρισαν καὶ ἐκίνησαν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα Ἱερουσαλημ ἢ αὕτη ἢ πόλις ἦν ἐροῦσιν στέφανος δόξης εὐφροσύνη πάσης τῆς γῆς. All that go by the way have clapped their hands at thee; **they have hissed and shaken their head** at the daughter of Jerusalem. Is this the city, they say, the crown of joy of all the earth?

Note that the plurality, the “all” shake the singular “head.” There was no universal, invisible head or universal, invisible person opposing Jerusalem. Each person shook his own particular head at Jerusalem.

Ezekiel 1:22, LXX:

καὶ ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτοῖς τῶν ζῴων ὡσεὶ στερέωμα ὡς ὄρασις κρυστάλλου ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν. And **the likeness over the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures” meant that each particular living creature had its own particular head.

Ezekiel 10:1, LXX:

καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπάνω τοῦ στερεώματος τοῦ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς τῶν χερουβιν ὡς λίθος σαφείρου ὁμοίωμα θρόνου ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. And the likeness over **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the living creatures** was as a firmament, as the appearance of crystal, spread out over their wings above.

“The head of the living creatures,” again, means each living creature had its own particular head.

Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:112 (4.6.4.112)

Καὶ ὁ μὲν ταῦτα τοῦ θεοῦ κελεύσαντος ἤκει πρὸς Βάλακον δεξαμένου δὲ αὐτὸν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐκπρεπῶς ἡξίου προαχθεὶς ἐπὶ τι τῶν ὄρων σκέψασθαι πῶς τὸ τῶν Ἑβραίων ἔχοι στρατόπεδον Βάλακος δ’ αὐτὸς ἀφικνεῖται τὸν μάντιν σὺν βασιλικῇ θεραπείᾳ φιλοτίμως ἀγόμενος εἰς ὄρος ὅπερ ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν ἔκειτο τοῦ στρατοπέδου σταδίου ἀπέχον ἐξήκοντα. When God had given him this charge, he came to Balak; and when the king had entertained him in a magnificent manner, he desired him to go to one of the mountains to take a view of the state of the camp of the Hebrews. Balak himself also came to the mountain, and brought the prophet along with him, with a royal attendance. **This mountain lay over their heads** [Gk. singular], and was distant sixty furlongs from the camp.

The singular mountain was over each person, each of whom had his own particular head.

*Gospel of Peter* 10:40:

καὶ τῶν μὲν δύο τὴν κεφαλὴν χωροῦσαν μέχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοῦ δὲ χειραγωγουμένου ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ὑπερβαίνουσιν τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. [A]nd **the heads** [Gk. singular] **of the two reaching to heaven**, but that of him who was led by them by the hand overpassing the heavens.

Each particular individual here had his own particular head.

Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* 1:71:

ὡσπερ οὖν κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον τοῦ ζῴου καὶ ἀνωτάτω μέρος ἐστί, For as **the head is the principle and uppermost part of the animal**,

Each singular animal had its own singular head. There was no universal head of a universal, invisible animal.

Philo, *On The Life of Moses* 2:290:

θαυμάσια μὲν οὖν ταῦτα θαυμασιώτατον δὲ καὶ τὸ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὁ καθάπερ ἐν τῷ ζῴῳ κεφαλὴ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐστί. These things, therefore, are wonderful;

---

and most wonderful of all is the end of his sacred writings, which is to the whole book of the law what **the head is to an animal**.

Likewise here, each animal had its own head.

Philo, *On Rewards and Punishments* 125:

ταῦτα δ' ἀλληγορεῖται τροπικῶς ἐξενεχθέντα· καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ζῳῷ κεφαλὴ μὲν πρῶτον καὶ ἀριστον, οὐρά δ' ὕστατον καὶ φαυλότατον, οὐ μέρος συνεκπληροῦν τὸν τῶν μελῶν ἀριθμὸν, ἀλλὰ σόβησις τῶν ἐπιποτωμένων, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον κεφαλὴν μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρωπειοῦ γένους ἔσσεσθαι φησι τὸν σπουδαῖον εἴτε ἄνδρα εἴτε λαόν, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἅπαντας οἷον μέρη σώματος ψυχούμενα ταῖς ἐν κεφαλῇ καὶ ὑπεράνω δυνάμεσιν. But all these statements are uttered in a metaphorical form, and contain an allegorical meaning. For **as in an animal the head** is the first and best part, and the tail the last and worst part, or rather no part at all, inasmuch as it does not complete the number of the limbs, being only a broom to sweep away what flies against it; so in the same manner what is said here is that **the virtuous man shall be the head of the human race whether he be a single man or a whole people**. And that all others, being as it were parts of the body, are only vivified by the powers existing in the head and superior portions of the body.

This very interesting reference by Philo shows that, as in a single animal there is a single head, so “the virtuous man,” a generic noun, not one particular man named X, is “the head of the human race,” and this is whether he “be a single man or the whole people.” The others are as “parts of the body,” are only “vivified” because of “the head” that is “the virtuous man.” The parallel to Christ as the head of the church is very clear. Nobody would think of saying that there is literally one universal, invisible virtuous man, nor that there is one universal, invisible body of people, since Philo’s point is that whether one speaks of a single man, or a group of any size, in both situations the [generic] virtuous man is the [generic] head.

Ephesians 5:23 is the capstone of the very small number of New Testament texts that advocates of a universal church position believe provide support for their doctrine. However, the passage teaches nothing of the kind. It simply affirms that Christ is the head of every particular church, just as each particular husband is the head of his particular wife. There are no verses in the Bible where the noun *ekklesia*, church/assembly/congregation, refers to all believers as an already existing group.

<sup>lxxxiii</sup> cf. the verb ἐκκλησιάζω, “to hold an assembly, convene, assemble.” (BDAG); “summon to an assembly” (Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. *Greek-English Lexicon*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996); “attend an assembly; attend a church service” (*Patristic Greek Lexicon* ed. G. W. Lampe (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007, 20<sup>th</sup> ed). The verb is always employed in the LXX and related *Koiné* literature (at least until after the time of the post-NT development of the concept of a catholic church) for a visible and local assembly, not some sort of invisible and unassembled “assembly.” See Leviticus 8:3; Numbers 20:8; Deuteronomy 4:10; 31:12, 28; Esther 4:16 (LXX); Josephus, *Antiquities* 4:302; 6:56; 8:277; 10:93; 12:316; 17:161; 19:158; *War* 2:490; 7:47; Philo, *On the Migration of Abraham* 1:69; *On Joseph* 1:73; *On the Decalogue* 1:39; *Freedom* 1:6.

<sup>lxxxiv</sup> Deuteronomy 4:10; 9:10; 18:16; 23:2-4, 9; 31:30; Joshua 8:35; Judges 20:2; 21:5, 8; 1 Samuel 17:47; 19:20; 1 Kings 8:14, 22, 55, 65; 1 Chronicles 13:2, 4; 28:2, 8; 29:1, 10, 20; 2 Chronicles 1:3, 5; 6:3, 12-13; 7:8; 10:3; 20:5, 14; 23:3; 28:14; 29:23, 28, 31-32; 30:2, 4, 13, 17, 23-25; Ezra 2:64; 10:1, 8, 12, 14; Nehemiah 5:7, 13; 7:66; 8:2, 17; 13:1; Judith 6:16, 21; 7:29; 14:6; 1 Maccabees 2:56; 3:13; 4:59; 5:16; 14:19; Psalms 21:23, 26; 25:5, 12; 34:18; 39:10; 67:27; 88:6; 106:32; 149:1; Proverbs 5:14; Job 30:28; Sirach 15:5; 21:17; 23:24; 24:2; 26:5; 31:11; 33:19; 38:33; 39:10; 44:15; 46:7; 50:13, 20; Solomon 10:6; Micah 2:5; Joel 2:16; Lamentations 1:10.

B. H. Carroll’s book *Ecclesia* provides a number of helpful instances of the classical use of ἐκκλησία [transliterating the word as *ecclesia*], documenting that the word, in classical Greek, signified “an organized assembly of citizens, regularly summoned, as opposed to other meetings.” Note:

Thucydides 2:22: - “Pericles, seeing them angry at the present state of things... did not call them to an assembly (ecclesia) or any other meeting.”

Demosthenes 378, 24: - “When after this the assembly (ecclesia) adjourned, they came together and planned ... For the future still being uncertain, meetings and speeches of all sorts took place in the marketplace. They were afraid that an assembly (ecclesia) would be summoned suddenly, etc.” Compare the distinction here between a lawfully assembled business body and a mere gathering together of the people in unofficial capacity, with the town-clerk’s statement in Acts 19:35, 40.

Now some instances of the particular ecclesia of the several Greek states -

---

Thucydides 1,87: - “Having said such things, he himself, since he was ephor, put the question to vote in the assembly (ecclesia) of the Spartans.”

Thucydides 1,139: - “And the Athenians having made a house (or called an assembly, ecclesia) freely exchanged their sentiments.”

Aristophanes Act 169: - “But I forbid you calling an assembly (ecclesia) for the Thracians about pay.”

Thucydides 6,8: - “And the Athenians having convened an assembly (ecclesia) . . . voted, etc.”

Thucydides 6,2: - “And the Syracusans having buried their dead, summoned an assembly (ecclesia).”

This historical reading concerning the business assemblies of the several petty but independent, self-governing Greek states, with their lawful conference, their free speech. Their decision by vote, whether of Spartans, Thracians, Syracusans or Athenians, sounds much like the proceedings of particular and independent Baptist churches today (*Ecclesia*, B. H. Carroll, pgs. 35-36).

Thus, the uses of the word in the LXX and other pre-Christian works supports the evidence from the instances of ἐκκλησία in New Testament itself that the word always signifies a particular, visible assembly. “[A]n inductive study of all the *ecclesia* passages [in the LXX demonstrates] that in the Septuagint it never means ‘all Israel whether assembled or unassembled, but that *in every instance* it means a gathering together, and assembly. . . . [T]he New Testament writers neither coined this word nor employed it in an unusual sense. The apostles and early Christians . . . wrote in Greek to a Greek-speaking world, and used Greek words as a Greek-speaking people would understand them. . . . [I]t is a fiction that *ecclesia* was used in [the New Testament in] any new, special sense. The object of Christ’s *ecclesia*, and terms of membership in it, were indeed different from those of the classic or Septuagint *ecclesia*. But the word itself retains its ordinary meaning. . . . [In contrast to *ecclesia*], the word *panegyros* [was employed to designate] a general, festive assembly of all the Greek states. This general assembly was not for war but peace . . . not for business but pleasure—a time of peace, and joy, and glory. In the happy Greek conceit all the heavenly beings were supposed to be present [at the *panegyros*]. How felicitously does [Paul] adapt himself to the Greek use of the word [in Hebrews 12:23], and glorify it by application to the final heavenly state. . . . [Thus, there] is a general assembly . . . [in heaven where] warfare is over and rest has come [designated by *panegyros*, but never by *ecclesia*].” (pgs. 34-36, *Ecclesia*, Carroll).

lxxxv

It is true that the bride metaphor is employed for the New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:2-3) as a synecdoche for all the people of God who will inhabit it. However, at that time they will all be present in the future heavenly festive assembly (Hebrews 12:23). There will indeed be this coming gathering of all the saints to the eternal heavenly City, but it will still be quite local and visible, it does not yet exist. Such a future assembly certainly does not prove that saved people on earth in the United States, Colombia, Vietnam, and the Central African Republic are somehow currently members of the same, never-assembling and invisible congregation, assembly, church, or *ekklesia*.

lxxxvi

There are many other practical impossibilities and ecclesiological errors that come from the universal church view. Dr. Thomas Strouse has well explained a number of them:

The ramifications of the biblical teaching that the local church is the body of Christ, that Spirit Baptism was a temporary phenomenon, and that the mystical body of Christ does not exist are broad and serious. If there is no con-current Spirit Baptism and no mystical body then there is no divine authority for organizations or efforts outside of the local church to practice the Great Commission. Since the Great Commission (Mt. 28:19-20) requires evangelism, baptism, and instruction in the Word of God, para-church organizations have no divine authority for their existence. If there is no divine authority for para-church organizations then there is no divine authority for para-church Bible colleges/seminaries, mission boards, or structured church fellowships, associations or conventions. These so-called “handmaidens” to the local church have no authority “to help” the Lord’s candlesticks because the latter have His presence (Rev. 1:13) as their respective Head (Eph. 1:22-23) and all power to accomplish His Great Commission (Mt. 28:19-20). The impact of these para-church “handmaidens” on the Lord’s candlesticks has been biblically and theologically disastrous. Scholars operating in the realm of the “big” universal church offer unbiblical and therefore confusing theological restatements of the Scriptures. Their weak ecclesiology impacts other doctrines such as bibliology, soteriology, and eschatology. They foster notions such as “God has preserved His Word in all the extant manuscripts through the scholars of the mystical body of Christ,” “all the saved are in the universal Church,” and “Christ will rapture the Church.” To them “true” scholarship occurs in the para-church university or seminary where theologians, trained by other para-church theologians, postulate the “truth” of Scripture. The local church is ill equipped and the pastor is ill prepared to do the real work of the ministry in the realm of scholarship, they maintain. These scholars, whether they have any affiliation with a local church or not, have earned doctorates from accredited para-church academic institutions, and therefore think that they have the last word on theology. Their condescending attitude toward the Lord’s assemblies is supposedly justified because they are the “doctors” of theology since they are in “the big church.” This

disastrous impact undermines the authority of the Bible and usurps the ministry of the Lord's *ekklesia*. Scripture states that the church is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (I Tim. 3:15), that the *ekklesia* is to "commit [theological training] to faithful men" (II Tim. 2:2), that the church member "is to study to shew [himself] approved unto God" (II Tim. 2:15), and that the assembly has been given Christ's gift of "pastors and teachers" (Eph. 4:11). The local church as the divinely ordained doctrinal training institution is the Lord's "college." College comes from the Latin *collegium* that means a group of colleagues who have banded together around a particular guild or trade. The particular "guild" in which the local church is engaged is the scholarly pursuit of studying the Scriptures (cf. Acts 17:11). Para-church organizations not only produce disastrous results in theological academia, but also in the area of missions. Para-church mission boards usurp the privilege and responsibility of local church missions. The Great Commission is the divine mandate to plant immersionist assemblies both locally and worldwide. Only the Lord's candlesticks can produce NT churches. Para-church mission boards cannot baptize converts and cannot commission missionary candidates. Nevertheless, these same boards develop a hierarchy of unbiblical offices, such as "missions president/director," and dictate to "their" missionaries and to the pastors of supporting churches, their policies, practices, and doctrines. The NT teaches, in contradistinction, that the church at Antioch acted as Paul's "mission board" and sent out Barnabas and the Apostle (Acts 13:1 ff.). To be sure, other churches such as the Philippian church helped support Paul's missionary endeavors on his second journey (Phil. 4:15-16). Much of the same criticism could be leveled toward highly structured Baptist fellowships. The unbiblical mindset of the universal church produces the necessity for organized hierarchy outside of the local church. Fellowships, associations, and conventions, which develop organizational structure beyond the local church, end up usurping the autonomy of each of the Lord's assemblies. The presidents, regional directors, etc., of these non-authorized structures tend to dictate to the churches resolutions which in turn become "suggested" tenets for orthodoxy and fundamentalism. Some pastors feel intimidated and hesitate to reject these suggestions, ultimately embracing the "traditions" of men (Mk. 7:7) and incorporating these tenets in their particular *ekklesia*. The NT does teach that there is a place for churches to fellowship around "the faith once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). Furthermore, the churches of Galatia were united in biblical doctrine around the Lord Jesus Christ, while retaining their respective autonomy (Gal. 1:2; 3:27-28). Once the Lord's churches recognize that the unproved assumptions of Spirit Baptism and the mystical body of Christ have no biblically exegetical defense, then they may realize the authority, importance, and dignity the Lord gives exclusively to His candlesticks. The Scriptures teach that the church at Jerusalem had the divine authority in precept and set the precedent to practice the Great Commission. Christ gave the precept of the Great Commission to the apostles who were representatives of the 120 disciples who made up the Lord's *ekklesia* on the day of Pentecost (Acts 1:20). This *ekklesia* began to evangelize, baptize and instruct Jews and Gentiles as the Book of Acts gives ample precedent. The Scriptures make some amazing and outstanding claims for the Lord's churches. For instance, Paul taught that Christ, Who is Head over all His creation, completely fills His body, the local church (Eph. 1:23). He revealed that the saints in the local churches teach the angelic realm redemptive truths (Eph. 3:10). He averred that local churches, like the Ephesian church, grow up in Christ to become mature bodies through doctrinal teaching (Eph. 4:11-16). He proclaimed that the Lord Jesus Christ both loved and died for individual church members (Eph. 5:25) and that He will cleanse the church members through the washing of the word to present each *ekklesia* as glorious (Eph. 5:26-27). Elsewhere, the Apostle taught that the local church, the one with a bishop and deacons, was the pillar and ground of the truth (I Tim. 3:1-15). The Lord spoke through the Apostle John and gave His apocalyptic revelation to seven local churches (Rev. 1-3). When one realizes that the Scriptures teach the local church is the Lord's sole institution for His presence, worship, and service, then one recognizes the glory, dignity, and honor that should be attributed to each and every one of Christ's assemblies. ("Ye Are The Body of Christ," Dr. Thomas M. Strouse. Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, Newington, CT. elec. acc. [http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body\\_of\\_christ.html](http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body_of_christ.html))

lxxxvii

For example, Romans 1:5: "By whom **we** have received grace and apostleship [*ἀποστολή*; cf. Acts 1:25; 1 Corinthians 9:2; Galatians 2:8]." The church at Rome was not composed of apostles. 1 Corinthians 10:22: "Do **we** provoke the Lord to jealousy? are **we** stronger than he?" Paul was not having fellowship with devils and provoking the Lord to jealousy (v. 20-21)—only segments of his audience were. 1 Corinthians 11:31: "For if **we** would judge ourselves, **we** should not be judged." This seems to be something his audience was doing; Paul was not sickly and dying from taking the Lord's Supper unworthily. Hebrews 2:1: "Therefore **we** ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which **we** have heard, lest at any time **we** should let *them* slip." Paul was not going to let slip what he had heard about the gospel and go back to Judaism. Hebrews 2:3: "How shall **we** escape, if **we** neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him*;" Paul was not including himself in the "we" who would be damned for neglecting the great salvation. Other examples in the rest of Scripture are found of a similar use of *we*; e. g., in Acts 2:8, "And how hear we

every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?” (Acts 2:8), the people hearing the preaching at Pentecost did not all have the same native tongue, nor were they all from the same country. Daniel Wallace supports the possibility of the Greek first person pronoun being “used in an exclusive way . . . [meaning] ‘others, but not myself’” (pg. 391, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*).

The understanding of the “we” and “one body” in Romans 12:4-5 is dependent upon the analogy of 12:4. Paul wrote, “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office: 5 So we, *being* many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another” (καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλά ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πράξιν· 5 οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἐν σώμα ἔσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ καθ’ εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη.). In Romans 12:4, Paul speaks of the physical body of the human organism. Each particular member of the church at Rome had his own particular physical body with its many body parts. Nobody would conclude from Romans 12:4 that every single member of the Roman church, and the Apostle himself, together constituted one big human body because of Paul’s use of “we” and “one body.” Nor should the second half of the analogy in Romans 12:5 be pressed to make Paul and the Roman church part of one allegedly universal, invisible body.

An influence from the common comparison of the polis with the human body (the body politic. . . is hard to dispute. . . . In view of 1 Cor 10:16–17, an allusion to the community as expressing the corporate unity in the Lord’s Supper can hardly be excluded. . . . [T]he actual *experience* of community, of common participation (κοινωνία) [is emphasized]. This again is used of the Eucharist in 1 Cor 10:16, but the more typically Pauline thought is of the shared experience of the Spirit (2 Cor 13:13/14; Phil 2:1) as effecting the unity of the church, the oneness of the body (1 Cor 12:12–13; Eph 4:3, 7–13). . . . [This] fits fully into the strongly charismatic emphasis of the immediate context: the simple fact is that Paul uses the body of Christ as an ecclesiological concept only in connection with charisms (Rom 12; 1 Cor 12; also Eph 4); the Christian community as the body of Christ exists for him only as the charismatic community[; that is,] . . . [o]nly in this context of the effects and gifts of grace does the apostle utilize the ancient world’s figure of the one body and the variety of its members[.] . . . [T]he body imagery is actually an expression of the consciousness of community and oneness experienced by the first Christians as they met “in Christ.” . . . οἱ πολλοὶ is the same Semitism as in 5:19, meaning “all.” Here it refers to all the recipients, “all you” (v 3), with whom Paul identifies—the all of any worshiping community. That is to say, as explicitly in 1 Cor 12 (Rom 12:5 is closely parallel to 1 Cor 12:27), so here, “the body” has in view the local Christian congregation[.] (Comment on Romans 12:4-5, pgs. 723-724, *Romans 9-16*, James D. G. Dunn, vol. 38B, *Word Biblical Commentary*. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988; elec. acc. *Accordance Bible Software*.)

The use of “we” for Paul alone in Romans 1:5, in the context of grace and spiritual gifts, specifically apostleship, should also be taken into consideration in the analysis of the “we” concerning grace and spiritual gifts in Romans 12:4-8. Romans 12:4-5, interpreted with classical grammatical-historical exegesis, provides no support whatever to the doctrine of a universal, invisible body of Christ.

<sup>lxxxviii</sup> τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα, οἱ πολλοὶ ἔσμεν· οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.

<sup>lxxxix</sup> 10:16, ποτήριον.

<sup>xc</sup> 12:13, ποτίζω.

<sup>xc i</sup> 10:17; 12:12-13; εἷς.

<sup>xc ii</sup> 10:16; 12:13; σῶμα.

<sup>xc iii</sup> οἱ . . . πάντες + 1cp verb; ἡμεῖς πάντες + 1cp verb, 12:13; cf. πάντα, 12:12.

<sup>xc iv</sup> “we *being* many are one bread, *and* one body; ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα, οἱ πολλοὶ ἔσμεν 10:17; [we] being many, are one body; πολλά ὄντα. ἐν ἐστὶ σῶμα 12:12; cf. “the body of Christ,” τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ 10:16; “the body of Christ,” σῶμα Χριστοῦ, 12:27.

<sup>xc v</sup> cf. pgs. 227-231, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Daniel B. Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

<sup>xc vi</sup> cf. pgs. 521-523, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace.

<sup>xc vii</sup> εὐλογοῦμεν; κλῶμεν; μετέχομεν.

<sup>xc viii</sup> The use of a generic sense for the word *church* or the body metaphor in Ephesians 4:4 by no means indicates the existence of one universal, invisible church. See the discussion of the generic noun in endnote 80.

The church is never called *universal* or *catholic* in Scripture. The designation first appears in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrneans 8:2, among a number of other unbiblical statements: “Wherever the bishop appears, there let the congregation be; just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the catholic church. It is not permissible either to baptize or to hold a love feast without the bishop. But whatever he approves is also pleasing to God, in order that everything you do may be trustworthy and valid” (ὅπου ἂν φανῆ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὡσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾦ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. οὐκ ἔξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν ἀλλ’ ὁ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ, τοῦτο καὶ τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾦ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε). It is quite likely that this affirmation of the existence of a catholic church was a later interpolation into Ignatius’ epistle, if Ignatius actually wrote to the Smyrneans at all. There are three different recensions of Ignatius’ letters—a long, a middle, and a short version. The long version is generally recognized as a spurious fourth century forgery which projects later hierarchicalism and other developing Roman Catholic heresies into earlier centuries—indeed, it was the product of semi-Arianism that denied both the true equality of the Son to the Father and the true and complete humanity of Christ, and consequently destroyed the Biblical doctrine of redemption (pgs. 306-307, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, Aloys Grillmeier, trans. John Bowden). The short recension exists only in Syriac and contains only the letters to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp, these letters themselves having omissions that make them shorter than their partners in either the long or middle recensions. The middle recension, the version quoted above, is found in Greek in only one manuscript—the eleventh century Codex Mediceo-Laurentianus. Scholarship is divided about the genuineness of either the middle or the short recensions, with some maintaining that all the letters are extremely heavily interpolated and others arguing that “Ignatius bishop of Antioch did not exist” (pg. 66, “Ignatian Problems,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, C. P. Hammond Bammel, 33:1 (April 1982); see the article, pgs. 62-97, for a discussion of various theories on the authenticity or forging of the allegedly Ignatian epistles.). Even if one assumes that Ignatius actually wrote something similar to the middle recension, and that his writings were then corrupted and falsified into the long and short recensions, there is no reason to conclude that the eleventh century Greek codex of the middle recension referring to a “catholic church” does not itself have numerous dogmatic interpolations designed to support later Roman Catholic dogmas—such as Smyrneans 8:2, the verse in question, and its reference to the catholic church—ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.

“There are, in all, fifteen Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the Virgin Mary, two to the Apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelae, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians, one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnaeans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin; all the rest are extant also in Greek. It is now the universal opinion of critics that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated Bishop of Antioch . . . [among the other epistles, a spurious long form, a middle recension, and a short recension exist, and] there was . . . a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars, that [no form] could . . . be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. . . . This expression of uncertainty was repeated in substance by Jortin (1751), Mosheim (1755), Griesbach (1768), Rosenmüller (1795), Neander (1826), and many others; some going so far as to deny that we have any authentic remains of Ignatius at all, while others, though admitting the seven [middle recension] letters as being probably his, yet strongly suspected that they were not free from interpolation. . . . [T]he question [was reignited] by the discovery of a Syriac version [the short recension, first published in 1845] of three of these Epistles among the mss. procured from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara, in the desert of Nitria, in Egypt. . . . some accepted the [view that only these three short letters] represented more accurately than any formerly published what Ignatius had actually written . . . [while] others very strenuously opposed [this position in favor of the middle recension]. . . . [T]he Ignatian controversy is not yet settled” (*Church Fathers—The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, “Introductory Note to the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians,” ed. Alexander Roberts & James Donaldson). While the reference to a catholic church by Ignatius is dubious, Pope Cornelius, writing against the Anabaptist Novatian, and developing a proto-Roman Catholic principle not found clearly before

the third century, affirmed that there “should be but one bishop in a catholic church” (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6:43:11).

Let it also be briefly mentioned that it is indisputable that the so-called “Apostles’ Creed” was not written by the apostles, and its present form, with its profession of faith in a “catholic church,” is a development of the era after the union of proto-Popery with the Roman state. The “Apostles’ Creed” developed from the Old Roman Creed, which simply affirmed faith in the “holy church.” It was “in the late fourth century that *catholic* began to appear in [various] Western creeds” (pg. 385, *Early Christian Creeds*, J. N. D. Kelly. London: Longman, 1972. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.), in large part to contrast the Roman church with dissident movements including the “heretical” Anabaptists of the age among the Donatists and Novatians. The earliest physical evidence for the Apostles’ Creed itself is contained in the tract *De singulis libris canonicis* written by the monk Priminus between A. D. 710-724. Both Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) and Gregory the Great (d. 604) appear to have been ignorant of the Creed, and among scholars “very few will be likely to deny that [the received version of the Apostles’ Creed] is to be sought somewhere north of the Alps at some date in the late sixth or seventh century” (pg. 398, 410, 421, *Early Christian Creeds*, *ibid.*).

<sup>c</sup> Augustine of Hippo, to combat the Donatists, among whom it appears the Baptists of his era were to be numbered and who contended for a regenerate church membership, held to the idea of an invisible catholic church before the era of the Reformation. He held that the invisible church was a smaller remnant of true believers entirely contained within the visible Catholic church, developing this concept in order to justify the Catholic practice of allowing obviously ungodly, immoral, and unregenerate members within the Catholic fold. However, Augustine held that the members of this invisible church were entirely contained within the bounds of the visible Catholic denomination. Following Cyprian, Augustine held that outside the visible church there is no salvation. When Protestantism adopted Augustine’s invisible church conception, it was adjusted—at least among the more evangelical wing of the reform movement—so that one could be part of the invisible church without absolutely having to be a member in the visible church.

<sup>ci</sup> See “Pauline Images of the Church in 1 Clement,” by Thomas Ross (available at <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7>).

<sup>cii</sup> cf. the section “Spirit Baptism in the Gospels,” where the fact that Christ baptizes *with* the Holy Ghost, rather than *in* Him, is defended.

<sup>ciii</sup> : אֶשְׁפָּא אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־כָּל־בָּשָׂר . . . אֶשְׁפָּא אֶת־רוּחִי

<sup>civ</sup> The reference in Hebrews 6:2 to “baptisms” does not in any way undermine the teaching of Ephesians 4:5, since the doctrines in Hebrews 6:1-2 are Old Testament beliefs that Paul calls the Hebrews to go on from, and the Greek word βαπτισμός in Hebrews 6:2 speaks of Old Testament ceremonial immersions, not Christian baptism, as it does in Hebrews 9:10 and in every other reference in the New Testament (Mark 7:4, 8).

<sup>cv</sup> 1 Corinthians appears to have been written in the time period described in Acts 19:22-23, when Paul “stayed in Asia for a season,” and thus after the final event of Spirit baptism in Acts 19:1-7. Perhaps Paul’s recognition of the conclusion of Spirit baptism explains his employment of the middle voice παύσσονται for the glossolalia, in contrast to the passive καταργηθήσονται for the revelatory gifts of prophecy and knowledge that ended (cf. “1 Corinthians 13:8-13 and the Cessation of Miraculous Gifts,” R. Bruce Compton, *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal* (2004) 97-144) with the completion of the canon.

It would be invalid to argue for a continuing action of Spirit baptism throughout the dispensation of grace based on the fact that Christ is called in ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ John 1:33, employing a present participle. The declaration is a statement of God the Father recorded within the speech of John. The phrase, within its context, is: κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν ἀλλ’ ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ’ ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ’ αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. One could make a case for the participle fitting within the category of the futuristic present (pgs. 535-537, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace). Alternatively, one could say that the present participle is actually a simple gnomic present. The phrase οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ fits all the distinguishing marks of the gnomic category, which makes “a statement of a general, timeless fact. . . . in . . . general maxims about what occurs at *all* times. . . . [It] is generally *atemporal*” (pg. 523, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace). However, it appears most likely that the present participle is employed as a vivid description of the future action of the Messiah. Note that God had said, Ἐφ’ ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον, employing an aorist for the action of

John seeing the Spirit descend, although at the time God spoke to John the action of the Spirit's descent on Christ was yet future. In any case, no temporal idea of Christ repeatedly or once-for-all baptizing is the force of the text. Rather, the articular present participle simply indicates that the Messiah, rather than someone else, is the One who is to perform Spirit baptism. The use is similar to the only other instance of ὁ βαπτίζων in Scripture, where the phrase describes John as "the Baptist," Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων. John's disciples did not baptize—John alone had authority from heaven (Matthew 21:25) to do so, and he was consequently the unique one who performed his baptism. Similarly, the Lord Jesus is the only One who has the power to perform Spirit baptism.

Note that the only reference to ὁ βαπτίζων in the apostolic patristic writings is impossible to interpret as a repeated or continuing action—the articular participle refers to an individual who is going to baptize one other person. (Didache 7:4: "And before the baptism, let the one baptizing [ὁ βαπτίζων, present participle] and the one who is to be baptized [ὁ βαπτιζόμενος, present participle] fast, as well as any others who are able. Also, you must instruct the one who is to be baptized [τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, present participle] to fast for one or two days beforehand." Both the one baptizing and the one being baptized only act one time, not repeatedly. Compare the present infinitive τὸ βαπτίζεσθαι in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypo* 46 for the single act of ritual bathing after ritual defilement.

Even if one wished to dispute the classification of ὁ βαπτίζων in John 1:33 as employed for vividness, and likewise rejected a classification of the present as gnomic, since it is obvious on the historic Baptist, UCD, and PCP positions that Spirit baptism did not take place before Pentecost, an argument built upon the present tense in John 1:33 would prove too much—it would lead to the conclusion that Christ, before Pentecost, was already baptizing with the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the fact that Christ will baptize believing Israel with the Holy Ghost in the Tribulation period, as recorded in Joel 2:28-32, could have been excluded from the verse had an aorist been employed, not to mention the several records of the Spirit's coming in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19. Certainly no ground against the historic Baptist view, or in favor of either the UCD or PCP position, is gained by the ὁ βαπτίζων of John 1:33.

<sup>cvi</sup> Indeed, that there was but one baptism would also suggest that fire baptism was not occurring at the time the book of Ephesians was written, supporting the view that the baptism of fire is synonymous with the historically completed act of Spirit baptism. If the baptism of fire took place daily as men were cast into hell, then it would certainly appear that there was more than one baptism at the time the book of Ephesians was written. While it is true that an advocate of equating fire baptism with eternal damnation could argue that the baptism of fire did not pertain to the church at Ephesus, as it was composed of regenerated individuals, the fact that there were false professors in the membership of the Ephesian church (cf. Acts 20:29-31) who would, if fire baptism is hell fire, certainly experience it, demonstrates (as do other considerations) that Ephesians 4:5 provides at least some additional support for equating Spirit and fire baptism and viewing them both as a completed event fulfilled in Acts 2.

<sup>cvii</sup> Interestingly, Orthodox Quakerism, on the assumption that Spirit baptism is to continue throughout this age, argues based on Ephesians 4:5 that baptism in water must have passed away: "We reverently believe that, as there is one Lord and one faith, so there is, under the Christian dispensation, but one baptism, (Eph 4:4,5) even that whereby all believers are baptized in the one Spirit into the one body. (1 Cor 12:13 RV) This is not an outward baptism with water, but a spiritual experience; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, (1 Pet 3:21) but that inward work which, by transforming the heart and settling the soul upon Christ, brings forth the answer of a good conscience towards God, but the resurrection of Jesus Christ, in the experience of His love and power, as the risen and ascended Savior. No baptism in outward water can satisfy the description of the apostle, of being buried with Christ by baptism unto death. (Rom 6:4) It is with the Spirit alone that any can thus be baptized" (*Declaration of Faith Issued by the Richmond Conference in 1887* <http://www.quakerinfo.com/rdf.shtml>).

<sup>cviii</sup> Titus 3:6, alluding to the outpouring on Pentecost, is the solitary reference of any kind whatever to Spirit baptism in the epistles. All other alleged references (as demonstrated below) refer to immersion in water. Compare endnote 64.

<sup>cix</sup> καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνας, εἴτε δούλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι καὶ πάντες εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

<sup>cx</sup> Believers with a strong view of God's providential working in the translation of the King James Bible often also consider that the use of a capital "S" in the King James Bibles from which they read and study from should be considered hermeneutically. While this providential argument should not be ignored

or belittled, because as modern capitalization practices became standardized an upper-case “S” in 1 Corinthians 12:13 indeed became the capitalization practice found in the Authorized Version, in the original 1611 KJV the “s” was lower case in 1 Corinthians 12:13, as it was in a great number of other verses referring to the Holy Spirit. For example, note 1 Corinthians 12:3, “spirit of God,” v. 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, “spirit,” 2 Corinthians 3:3, “spirit of the living God,” 3:18, “spirit of the Lord,” etc. This is not to say that the Holy Spirit universally lacks capitalization in the 1611 edition; e. g., 1 Corinthians 2:14 & 7:40 read “Spirit of God.” See *The Holy Bible: 1611 edition*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson 2003 (reprint ed).

<sup>cx<sup>i</sup></sup> “Ye Are The Body of Christ,” Dr. Thomas M. Strouse. Emmanuel Baptist Theological Seminary, Newington, CT. elec. acc. [http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body\\_of\\_christ.html](http://www.faithonfire.org/articles/body_of_christ.html).

<sup>cx<sup>ii</sup></sup> 12:3 διὸ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 4 Διαίρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσὶ, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα. 5 καὶ διαίρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶ, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος, 6 καὶ διαίρέσεις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσὶν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἐστὶ Θεός, ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. 7 ἐκάστῳ δὲ δίδεται ἢ φανερώσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. 8 ᾧ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δίδεται λόγος σοφίας, ἄλλῳ δὲ λόγος γνώσεως, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· 9 ἑτέρῳ δὲ πίστις, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι· ἄλλῳ δὲ χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι· 10 ἄλλῳ δὲ ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων, ἄλλῳ δὲ προφητεία, ἄλλῳ δὲ διακρίσεις πνευμάτων, ἑτέρῳ δὲ γένη γλωσσῶν, ἄλλῳ δὲ ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν· 11 πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. 12 Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἐστὶ, καὶ μέλη ἔχει πολλά, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἑνός, πολλά ὄντα, ἐν ἐστὶ σῶμα· οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός. 13 καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἐνὶ Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι· καὶ πάντες εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

<sup>cx<sup>iii</sup></sup> However, an advocate of the “spirit of unity” position would likely also wish to deny that the second half of 1 Corinthians 12:13 is a reference to the Holy Ghost. Note the further comments below on the “drink into one Spirit” clause.

<sup>cx<sup>iv</sup></sup> ἀκούσω τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθροῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου.

<sup>cx<sup>v</sup></sup> Τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία· καὶ οὐδ’ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά.

<sup>cx<sup>vi</sup></sup> While Strouse appears to have stopped counting at an earlier point, probably verse four, there are nine, not seven, references to the Holy Spirit from 12:3-12:12. There are indeed seven in 12:4-12. It is not clear why one would stop references to *pneuma* at v. 4 when two additional references to the word occur in v. 3.

<sup>cx<sup>vii</sup></sup> Pgs. 210, 243, 245, 248, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*, Daniel B. Wallace. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

<sup>cx<sup>viii</sup></sup> It is true that the phrase *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* is not found in the instances where *πνεῦμα* is found in 1 Corinthians 12:4-13, but the references in v. 4-13 are controlled by v. 3, where the Spirit is specifically designated with His monadic title of *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, as well as His unique status as *πνεῦμα Θεοῦ*.

<sup>cx<sup>ix</sup></sup> οὐδεὶς ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ.

<sup>cx<sup>x</sup></sup> The complete list of ἐν εἷς references in the NT is as follows: Luke 5:12, 17; 8:22; 13:10; 20:1; Romans 12:4; 15:6; 1 Corinthians 10:8; 12:13; Galatians 5:14; Ephesians 2:16, 18; 4:4; Philippians 1:27; Colossians 3:15; James 2:10; Revelation 18:8, 10. Note that all thirteen of the references outside of Luke are not followed by the article, while Luke uniformly employs one.

<sup>cx<sup>xi</sup></sup> “Does First Corinthians 12 Mean the Universal Church or a Local New Testament Church?” Arthur W. Pink (<http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Miscellaneous/universal-or-local.htm>). It should be noted that Pink did not always hold his (correct) local-only ecclesiological view that led him to his (incorrect) view of this specific clause of 1 Corinthians 12:13, but, in his own words from his article, “For almost ten years after his regeneration the writer [Arthur Pink] never doubted that the ‘body’ spoken of in 1 Corinthians 12 had reference to ‘the Church Universal.’ This was taught him by those known as ‘Plymouth Brethren,’ which is found in the notes of the Scofield Reference Bible, and is widely accepted by evangelicals and prophetic students. Not until God brought him among Southern Baptists (a high privilege for which he will ever be deeply thankful) did he first hear the above view challenged. But it was difficult

---

for him to weigh impartially an exposition which meant the refutation of a teaching received from men highly respected, to say nothing of confessing he had held an altogether erroneous concept so long, and had allowed himself to read 1 Corinthians 12 (and similar passages) through other men's spectacles. However, of late, the writer has been led to make a prayerful and independent study of the subject for himself, with the result that he is obliged to renounce his former view as utterly untenable and unscriptural."

<sup>cxxii</sup> The exact numbers cited by Pink may not be exactly accurate—Thayer's Greek lexicon (elec. acc. *Online Bible* software) affirms ἐν is rendered as *in* 1902 times, *by* 163 times, *with* 140 times, *among* 117 times, *on* 62 times, *through* 39 times, and in other ways 265 times, for a total of 2801 references.

<sup>cxxiii</sup> pg. 372, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Daniel Wallace.

<sup>cxxiv</sup> 1Chronicles 28:12, καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα ὃ εἶχεν ἐν πνεύματι αὐτοῦ τῶν αὐλῶν οἴκου κυρίου καὶ πάντων τῶν παστοφορίων τῶν κύκλω τῶν εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας οἴκου κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποθηκῶν τῶν ἁγίων. Nehemiah 9:30, καὶ εἴκυσας ἐπ' αὐτούς ἔτη πολλὰ καὶ ἐπεμαρτύρω αὐτοῖς ἐν πνεύματί σου ἐν χειρὶ προφητῶν σου καὶ οὐκ ἠνωτίσαντο καὶ ἔδωκας αὐτούς ἐν χειρὶ λαῶν τῆς γῆς. Micah 3:8 ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἰσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ Ἰακωβ ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ αμαρτίας αὐτοῦ. Zechariah 4:6 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς με λέγων οὗτος ὁ λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ζοροβαβελ λέγων οὐκ ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλη οὐδὲ ἐν ἰσχύι ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν πνεύματί μου λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

<sup>cxxv</sup> Romans 8:9; 9:1; 14:17; Ephesians 6:18; Colossians 1:8; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 1 Timothy 3:16; Jude 20; Revelation 1:10.

<sup>cxxvi</sup> Matthew 3:11; 12:28; Mark 1:8; 12:36; Luke 2:27; 3:16; 4:1; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16; Romans 15:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11; 12:3, 9, 13; 2 Corinthians 6:6; Ephesians 2:18, 22; 3:5; 5:18; 1Pet 1:12;

<sup>cxxvii</sup> "But if I cast out devils **by the Spirit** of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you" (Matthew 12:28).

"For David himself said **by the Holy Ghost**, The LORD said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Mark 12:36). "And he came **by the Spirit** into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law" (Luke 2:27). "And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led **by the Spirit** into the wilderness" (Luke 4:1). "That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified **by the Holy Ghost**" (Romans 15:16). "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and **by the Spirit** of our God" (1 Corinthians 6:11). "Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking **by the Spirit** of God calleth Jesus accursed: and *that* no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but **by the Holy Ghost**" (1Corinthians 12:3). "To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing **by the same Spirit**" (1Corinthians 12:9) "For **by one Spirit** are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Corinthians 12:13). "By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, **by the Holy Ghost**, by love unfeigned" (2 Corinthians 6:6). "For through him we both have access **by one Spirit** unto the Father" (Ephesians 2:18). "Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets **by the Spirit**" (Ephesians 3:5).

<sup>cxxviii</sup> That is, no verse in Paul's epistles employs the word *baptism* in connection with the work of the Spirit in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19. Titus 3:6 does allude back to this action in the *historia salutis* (compare endnote 64). A discussion of verses in other parts of the New Testament sometimes alleged to be references to Spirit baptism is found in the section "Spirit Baptism: Other Alleged References in the Epistles: Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21" below. Concerning these latter texts, "It is sometimes argued that certain passages that refer to baptism, without any further qualification, also teach about Spirit-baptism (e. g., Romans 6:4; Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; 1 Peter 3:21). This interpretation is usually designed to protect these texts against a view that takes them to teach baptismal regeneration. But, in fact, the early church consistently used 'baptism' without any qualifiers to refer to water-baptism. None of these passages, even when taken to refer to immersion in water, implies baptismal regeneration" (pg. 50, "Baptism of the Holy Spirit," Craig Blomberg, in *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, ed. Walter A. Elwell. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1996).

cxxix

Note that these verses cannot refer to becoming “in Christ” at the moment of conversion. Those who had *already* become believers were subsequently “added to the Lord” by means of baptism into His body, the local, visible congregation.

cxxx

Isaiah 14:1, καὶ ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ἰακωβ καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ γιῶρας προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτούς καὶ προστεθήσεται πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ἰακωβ, “And the Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and they shall rest on their land: and the stranger shall be added to them, yea, shall be added to the house of Jacob.” Zechariah 14:17, καὶ ἔσται ὅσοι ἐὰν μὴ ἀναβῶσιν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν τῆς γῆς εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοῦ προσκυνῆσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι καὶ οὗτοι ἐκείνοις προστεθήσονται, “And it shall come to pass, *that* whosoever of all the families of the earth shall not come up to Jerusalem to worship the king, the Lord Almighty, even these shall be added to the others.”

cxxxii

The fifteen New Testament references are Matthew 10:42; 25:35, 37, 42; 27:48; Mark 9:41; 15:36; Luke 13:15; Romans 12:20; 1 Corinthians 3:2, 6-8; 12:13; Revelation 14:8.

cxxxiii

πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν  
πάντες εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν

One notes as well the naturalness of the aorist tense for the verbs ἐβαπτίσθημεν and ἐποτίσθημεν as references in the text to baptism and the Supper (contra, e. g., *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelen (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990), which argues in its note on 1 Corinthians 12:13 that present tense verbs would be expected if baptism and the Supper were under consideration). Each member of the church at Corinth had only been baptized once, so the use of tenses common for durative action, such as the present or the imperfect, would not well fit the verse. The parallelism between the two ordinances makes the use of the same tense for both verbs expected, so a requisite requirement of an aorist ἐβαπτίσθημεν would lead one to expect the aorist for ἐποτίσθημεν. Furthermore, the summary nature of the presentation of 1 Corinthians 12:13 expects aorist tense verbs. The emphasis is not upon the repetition (or lack thereof) of the acts of baptism and communion, but upon the simple fact that the members of the church shared in unifying fellowship around these ordinances derived from the Holy Spirit.

cxxxiiii

The variant reading πόμα ἐποτίσθημεν, making the phrase “we have been all made to drink into one drink,” found in around 15% of the MSS of 1 Corinthians 12:13 (while the TR reading has 85% of MSS, including those preferred by the CT, such as  $\aleph$  and B), although certainly not original, indicates that scribes copying 1 Corinthians 12:13 thought its latter portion referred to the Lord’s Supper.

cxxxv

The more common verb πίνω appears 75 times in the NT and is simply “to drink” in contrast to ποτίζω, which appears 15 times and is “to cause/give to drink.” The “give to drink,” rather than a simple “drink” sense for ποτίζω is very clear in Matthew 25:35, 42. Πίνω is used elsewhere for the Lord’s Supper (Matthew 26:67; Mark 14:23; Luke 22:18), including six references in 1 Corinthians (11:25-29), while no other ποτίζω reference specifically refers to communion. This is a formidable argument against a reference to the Lord’s Supper in 1 Corinthians 12:13. However, there are considerable counterarguments to this linguistic challenge.

First, as mentioned in the text, the related noun ποτήριον is used in connection with the Supper—indeed, it is used exclusively in connection with the Supper in 1 Corinthians, where it appears eight times.

Second, in 1 Corinthians 12:13 ποτίζω is an aorist passive indicative verb. There are no passive forms of πίνω in the New Testament—the verb appears in the active voice 71 times, and in the middle 4 times (Matthew 20:23; Mark 10:39; Luke 17:8; Revelation 14:10), and the middle possesses a genuine middle sense, not a passive one (while some might argue that some or all of the middle references are deponent, that would, in any case, make the sense equivalent to the active, not to the passive). The NT middle voice references are also universally in the future tense. One notices a similar extreme paucity of passive πίνω forms in the LXX—the verb appears there in the active 206 times, 61 times in the middle (all future again and at least some deponent), and only three times in the passive voice (Leviticus 11:34; Sirach 31:28, 29), in each case a present passive. The apostolic patristic writers employed πίνω seven times in the active, once in the (future) middle, and never in the passive. Various works of the Apologists Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch (as found in the respective modules for *Accordance Bible* software; so for all the studies in this endnote; it should be noted that the classifications in *Accordance* have been accepted, so that middle/passive forms recorded as middles or as passives have here

---

been reckoned as such) contain thirteen uses πίνω of in the active, four uses in the middle, and no uses in the passive.

Various Apocryphal Gospel texts (as found in *Accordance*) employ the verb in the active nine times, and never in the middle or passive. Josephus employs πίνω in the active voice thirty-seven times, never in the middle, and only once in the passive, a present infinitive. Philo employs the verb forty-nine times in the active voice, six times in the middle (always a future middle), and only once in the passive (an aorist passive participle). The pseudepigrapha employ πίνω forty-five times in the active, fifteen times in the middle, and never in the passive. Thus, the passive voice of πίνω is absent from the inspired Greek text and extremely rare in related *Koiné* Greek literature, while the aorist passive, as employed for ποτίζω in 1 Corinthians 12:13, is not found in any range of literature examined, excluding a single participial text in Philo. No aorist passive indicatives were found in any text. Thus, one could conclude that the constraints of the *Koiné* usage impelled Paul to employ ποτίζω to express the aorist passive idea he wished, since such a tense and voice for πίνω were not a live option.

While ποτίζω occurs in the passive voice only in 1 Corinthians 12:13 in the New Testament (the other fourteen references possessing the active voice) the verb is found in the LXX in the passive twice, in the present and future tenses (Genesis 13:10; Ezekiel 32:6), and sixty-three times in the active voice. In the apostolic patristic writers, two active voice forms, four middle, and one passive, an aorist, (Shepherd 68:9) are found. The Apologists examined above employ ποτίζω in the active seven times, the middle once, and the passive not at all. Nor does Josephus employ the verb at all. Philo uses it in the active thirty-three times, the middle seven times, and the passive twice, both aorists (Alleg 2:86; Post (Cain) 151). The pseudepigrapha employ the word in the active six times and the passive (an aorist) once (Abraham 19:16).

A consideration of these data points toward the idea that the passive voice of ποτίζω was much more in live play than the passive of πίνω in the *Koiné* milieu. Thus, it appears possible that ποτίζω would have been the verb of choice for Paul when he wanted to express a passive concept, and especially an aorist passive idea.

A third and considerably simpler further consideration lies in the parallel with the aorist passive ἐβαπτίσθημεν. As passivity, not active agency, is expressed in the verb for the church ordinance of baptism, so it is reasonable to see Paul maintain parallel passive, rather than active agency in the reference to the second church ordinance. In the same way that the Corinthians, led by the Holy Spirit, “were baptized,” so they “were given to drink” of the cup in the Supper. An active voice reference to the church members drinking would violate the parallelism, and once one was shut up to the passive voice, the sense of “were made to drink” expressed by ποτίζω would be more natural than a use of πίνω as simply “drink.” Furthermore, as discussed in the text, since He who “made [the Corinthians] to drink” in the Supper was that same Spirit who led them to the waters of baptism, the use of ποτίζω to emphasize the unifying Spirit’s active work in the Supper provided Paul another argument to exhort the church, divided as it was specifically over the practice of the Supper (11:17-34) while it boasted in its pneumatic gifts, to unity.

These considerations eliminate the force of the objection to viewing the second half of 1 Corinthians 12:13 as a reference to something other than the Supper from the use of πίνω, rather than ποτίζω, in the passage.

<sup>cxxxv</sup> Note also the repeated (though not exclusive; cf. 9:7, 13; 11:24-34) connection in the previous context of the verb *to eat* in association with meat offered to idols (8:7, 8, 10, 13; 10:7, 18, 25, 27, 28, 31). Such an association also could contribute to Paul’s choice of *drinking* as the verb of choice to refer to the Supper rather than *eating*. Contextually, drinking would more certainly reference the church ordinance, rather than meat eaten to glorify false gods.

<sup>cxxxvi</sup> *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, A.T. Robertson, comment on 1 Corinthians 12:13. Elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*, Ken Hamel. Oakhurst, NJ: Online Bible Software, 1996.

<sup>cxxxvii</sup> *Notes on the New Testament*, Albert Barnes. Elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*.

<sup>cxxxviii</sup> *Notes on the Old and New Testaments*, John Wesley (orig. pub. 1767). Elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*. Comment on 1 Corinthians 12:13.

<sup>cxxxix</sup> *The Seal of the Spirit: A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers*, G. W. H. Lampe, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: S. P. C. K., 1967, pgs. 56-7, 137.

- 
- cxl Alford, Henry, *Alford's Greek Testament* (rev. ed). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1980 (reprint ed). Comment on 1 Corinthians 12:13. Alford uses abbreviations for the names of other commentators; full names have been supplied above.
- cxli Nicoll, W. Robertson (ed.), *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002 (reprint ed.), comment on 1 Corinthians 12:13. Abbreviated names are, again, written out in full.
- cxlii The related verb *potidzo* is used for “to drink” in 1 Corinthians 12:13.
- cxliii John Calvin, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, elec. acc. Christian Library Series, vol. 7, John Calvin Collection. Rio, WI: AGES Software, 1998.
- cxliv R. Jamieson, A. R. Faussett, and D. Brown, *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments* (1871), elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*.
- cxlv *Annotations upon the Holy Bible*, Matthew Poole (1700), elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*.
- cxlvi *Notes on the New Testament*, Albert Barnes. Elec. acc. *Online Bible for Mac*. The view that 1 Corinthians 12:13 refers to baptism in water and the Lord's supper is, naturally, also advocated in other theological works outside of commentaries. For example, “[In] 1 Corinthians 12:13 . . . distinctions of Jew and Gentile, bond and free, are abolished. By the grace of the same Spirit (or perhaps ‘in one spirit’ of Christian love and fellowship) . . . all are joined in baptism to the one body of Christ[.] . . . Possibly there is an allusion to both sacraments. . . . Both our baptism and our partaking of the cup in the communion are tokens and pledges of Christian unity. They mark our union with the one body of Christ” (“Baptism,” in the *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, John McClintock & James Strong. Elec. acc. Christian Library Series vol. 2. Albany, OR: AGES Software, 2006. The author of the article in the encyclopedia, in common with all the Protestant commentators cited above, believes in universal ecclesiology, not the historic Baptist local-only position.).
- cxlvii pg. 129, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, James Dunn. Unfortunately, many of those who advocate this position, confusing ecclesiology and soteriology, follow Cyprian and affirm that the body of Christ is the universal realm of salvation, rather than the local assembly of those previously born again. The wider world of Christendom is filled with heresy.
- cxlviii Of course, this does not mean that all Baptists, or all Baptist churches in all ages, believed exactly the position proposed above. Such doctrinal harmony will only be achieved when all the saints are gathered, free from sin and in resurrected, glorified bodies, into the future heavenly assembly.
- One should also consider that the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism was very prominent during times of Spirit-led revival among Baptists. Holding the Biblical, Baptist view of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, rather than a PCP or UCD position, contributes to the cause of revival.
- cxlix The letter by T. B. Montanye, from the minutes of the October 5-7 meeting of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, is found on pgs. 415-420 of the *Minutes of the Philadelphia Baptist Association*, A. D. Gillette. elec. acc. Baptist History Collection, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- cl In the omitted section, the letter argues that “whatever any Christian may have gained in the experience of grace, he has no right to the term, baptized by the Spirit, unless such a person professing this miraculous attainment, for no other is called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, prove it by signs and wonders, as did the primitive Christians.”
- cli Pg. 481, *Texas Historical and Biographical Magazine*, vol. 1, ed. John B. Link (1825-1894), elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD ver. 1.0. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.
- clii See pgs. 29-51, *Doctrine of the Higher Christian Life Compared With the Teaching of the Holy Scriptures*, by Alvah Hovey. Boston, MA: Henry A. Young, 1885.
- cliii Pgs. 535-536, *A History of the Baptists*, vol. 2, Thomas Armitage, quoting the *Confession of 1527*, by (prob.) Michael Sattler. elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD.
- cliv John Clarke appears to have established a real Baptist church in America the year before Roger Williams did. Williams, adopted Baptist sentiments for less than a year, practiced se-baptism before going off into the “seeker” heresy of the day, and created a “Baptist” church that never started any other churches in America and from which American Baptists by no means are derived. See *The First Baptist Church in America Not Founded by Roger Williams*, J. R. Graves & S. Adlam. Texarkana, TX: Bogard Press, 1995. (reprint of 1928 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

---

clv pg. 103, Chapter 11, “A Baptist Theology and Church Way,” in *John Clarke (1609-1676): Pioneer in American Medicine, Democratic Ideals, and Champion of Religions Liberty*, Louis Franklin Asher. Pittsburg, PA: Dorrance Publishing, 1997. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD.

clvi pgs. 175-181, *History of the Georgia Baptist Association*, Jesse Mercer. Washington, GA, pub. 1838. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection CD.

It would be invalid to conclude that these Georgian Baptists did not believe that 1 Corinthians 12:13a referred to the Holy Spirit because of the lack of capitalization in this document. Capitalization conventions of the present time are notably different in past centuries. One notes, for example, in this same book, sentences such as the following: “We believe that all those who were chosen in Christ, will be effectually called, regenerated, converted, sanctified, and supported by the spirit and power of God, so that they shall persevere in grace, and not one of them be finally lost” (pg. 25). “Their hope of success was founded upon the promise and spirit of the Lord” (pg. 30). “It is not assuming to much to say, that a large proportion of the Mission ardour which is felt by thousands, may be traced to the influences of the spirit of our GOD on the heart of our excellent brother Dr. WILLIAM CAREY” (pg. 44). “Consider, we beseech you, *if there be any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the spirit, if any bowels and mercies*, the situation, of many parts of our land” (pg. 106). “[A]n inspired Apostle, who had been himself, the happy subject, in a special manner, of the gracious influence of the spirit of God, and thereby made a true convert” (pg. 135). Sometimes references to the Holy Spirit received capitalization, and sometimes they did not, but this did not make references in sentences such as those above concerning the “spirit . . . of God” or “the spirit of the Lord” or “the spirit of our God” speech about anyone or anything less than the Holy Ghost of God.

clvii pg. 13, “Preface.” *A Concise History of the Kehukee Baptist Association*, Lemuel Burkitt & Jesse Read, rev. Henry L. Burkitt, pub. 1850. Elec. acc. Baptist History Collection, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.

Note also that the Anabaptist “Confession of Faith, According to the Holy Word of God,” c. A. D. 1600, Article XXII, stated, with evident allusion to 1 Corinthians 12:13, that “[B]aptism is an ordinance and institution of the Lord, by which believers are united with each other by one Spirit in fellowship with Christ” (pg. 398, *Martyr’s Mirror*, Thieleman J. Van Braght, trans. Joseph Sohm).

clviii Note that Ephesians 4:5 has been evaluated earlier in the section “Was Spirit baptism a completed historical phenomenon at the time Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, or is it a event that takes place regularly throughout the entire dispensation of grace?”

clix Since the author of this paper has demolished the doctrine of baptismal regeneration in the book *Heaven Only For the Baptized? The Gospel of Christ versus Baptismal Regeneration*, currently available at <http://sites.google.com/site/thross7> and in an e-book version for the Kindle, he sees no reason to rewrite what he has already composed. The exposition of the passages below is heavily dependent upon what was written in this earlier volume.

clx *apethanomen te hamartiai*, second aorist active of *apothnesko*, “to die.”

clxi Romans 6:2, *apethanomen te hamartia*, “are dead to sin” or “died [with reference to] sin,” provides contextual support for a rendering of *eis* as “with reference to” in Romans 6:3-4, as it is a “dative of reference/respect [with reference to] . . . instead of the word *to*, supply the phrase *with reference to* before the dative . . . illustrations [of this use include] . . . Romans 6:2 [and] Romans 6:11” (Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, pgs. 144-146).

clxii It is noteworthy that the baptismal regenerationists who so vehemently insist upon *eis* signifying “in order to obtain” in Acts 2:38 (“*eis* the remission of sins”) cry out for a sense of penetration or literal entry into Christ in Romans 6:3-4. Obviously one is not baptized “in order to obtain” Jesus Christ’s death in Romans 6:3-4, for Christ died nearly two thousand years ago and His death is a historical fact that is in no way contingent upon anyone submitting to baptism. Therefore the advocates of salvation by baptism argue *eis* signifies “penetration into” in this passage. However, in Acts 2:38 one cannot possibly penetrate into the remission of sins, so a meaning of “in order to obtain” remission of sins is insisted upon for *eis*. If, in either Acts 2:38 or Romans 6:3-4, *eis* conveys any other of the twenty-nine subheadings with different ideas listed in the Greek lexicon BDAG for its 1,767 appearances in the New Testament, the case for remission of sins through baptism in these passages is obliterated. Happily, the defender of justification by faith can appeal to vast numbers of clear, unambiguous passages to support his view, rather than hanging

---

his hope for eternity upon a particular sense of a preposition with a very broad range of meaning in a handful of texts, as the baptismal regenerationist must do. Note that *eis* signifying “on account of” or “with reference to” in Acts 2:38 and Romans 6:3-4 makes sense in both passages (Acts 2:38, “be baptized . . . with reference to/on account of the remission of sins,” and Romans 6:3-4, “baptized with reference to/on account of Jesus Christ . . . baptized with reference to/on account of his death . . . buried with him by baptism with reference to/on account of his death”). It certainly fits better with the other passages where the verb *baptize* is used with *eis*. For example, in 1 Corinthians 10:2, “baptized unto (*eis*) Moses” can hardly mean “baptized in order to obtain Moses” or “baptized in order to penetrate into Moses,” but “baptized with reference to Moses.”

clxiii Note that only immersion pictures death, burial, and resurrection. If sprinkling and pouring are acceptable pictures of burial, one wonders why the graveyards for denominations that practice “baptism” in these modes are not filled with bodies with a little dirt sprinkled or poured on their heads, rather than completely covered with earth. It seems that at funerals all know that burial requires immersion, but at baptisms many find a way to deny it.

clxiv *Dedikaiotai*, Perfect passive indicative, third person singular of *dikaioo*. The implication, supported clearly elsewhere in Scripture, is that this “freeing,” this judicial or legal freedom from sin, took place at a particular time in the past but possesses abiding results; once justified and freed from sin, one remains so and will certainly enter eternal glory (Romans 8:30). “The perfect . . . unites in itself as it were present and aorist, since it expresses the continuance of completed action . . . the perfect is both punctiliar and durative” (A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934, pg. 893).

clxv The nineteen references are: Acts 19:4: “Believe on (*eis*) him . . . on (*eis*) Christ Jesus”; Acts 20:21, “repentance toward (*eis*) God, and faith toward (*eis*) our Lord Jesus Christ”; Acts 24:24, “the faith in (*eis*) Christ,” Romans 6:3, “baptized into (*eis*) Christ”; Romans 16:5, “firstfruits of Achaia unto (*eis*) Christ”; 1 Corinthians 1:9, “called unto (*eis*) the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ”; 1 Corinthians 8:12, “ye sin (*eis*) against Christ”; 2 Corinthians 1:21, “he which stablisheth us with you in (*eis*) Christ”; 2 Corinthians 11:3, “the simplicity that is in (*eis*) Christ”; Galatians 2:16, “even we have believed in (*eis*) Jesus Christ”; Galatians 3:17, “the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in (*eis*) Christ”; Galatians 3:24, “the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto (*eis*) Christ”; Galatians 3:27, “baptized into (*eis*) Christ”; Ephesians 5:32, “I speak concerning (*eis*) Christ and (*eis*) the church”; Philippians 1:10, “ye may be sincere and without offence till (*eis*) the day of Christ”; Colossians 2:5, “steadfastness of your faith in (*eis*) Christ”; Philemon 6, “every good thing which is in you in (*eis*) Christ Jesus”; 1 Peter 1:11, “it testified beforehand the sufferings of (*eis*) Christ”; and 2 Peter 1:8, “neither be barren nor unfruitful in (*eis*) the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

clxvi Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:42; John 1:12; 2:11, 23; 3:15-16, 18, 36; 4:39; 6:29, 35, 40, 47; 7:5, 31, 38-39, 48; 8:30; 9:35-36; 10:42; 11:25-26, 45, 48; 12:11, 36-37, 42, 44, 46; 14:1, 12; 16:9; 17:20; Acts 10:43; 19:4; Romans 10:10; 1 Timothy 1:16; James 2:19; 1 Peter 1:21; 1 John 5:10, 13.

clxvii The verses are as follows: Romans 3:24; 6:11, 23; 8:1-2, 39-9:1; 12:5; 15:17; 16:3, 7, 9-10; 1 Corinthians 1:2, 4, 30; 3:1; 4:10, 15, 17; 15:18-19, 22, 31; 16:24; 2 Corinthians 2:14, 17; 3:14; 5:17, 19; 12:2, 19; Galatians 1:22; 2:4, 17; 3:14, 26, 28; 5:6; 6:15; Ephesians 1:1, 3, 10, 12, 20; 2:6-7, 10, 13; 3:6, 11, 21; 4:32; Philippians 1:1, 13, 26; 2:1, 5; 3:3, 14; 4:7, 19, 21; Colossians 1:2, 4, 28; 1 Thessalonians 2:14; 4:16; 5:18; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 Timothy 1:14; 2:7; 3:13; 2 Timothy 1:1, 9, 13; 2:10; 3:12, 15; Philemon 1:8, 23; 1 Peter 3:16; 5:10, 14; 1 John 5:20.

clxviii Romans 14:14; 16:2, 8, 11-13, 22; 1 Corinthians 1:31; 4:17; 7:22, 39; 9:1-2; 11:11; 15:58; 16:19; 2 Corinthians 2:12; 10:17; Galatians 5:10; Ephesians 1:15; 2:21; 4:1, 17; 5:8; 6:1, 10, 21; Philippians 1:14; 2:19, 24, 29; 3:1; 4:1-2, 4, 10; Colossians 3:18; 4:7, 17; 1 Thessalonians 3:8; 4:1; 5:12; 2 Thessalonians 3:4; Philemon 1:16, 20; Revelation 14:13.

clxix Matthew 10:32; 13:57; Mark 6:3; Luke 12:8; 23:22; John 1:4; 6:56; 7:18; 10:38; 13:31-32; 15:5; 18:38; 19:4, 6; Acts 17:28; Romans 1:17; 1 Corinthians 1:5; 2:11; 12:9; 2 Corinthians 1:19-20; 5:21; 13:4; Ephesians 1:4, 9, 11; 2:16; 4:21; Philippians 3:9; Colossians 1:16-17, 19; 2:6-7, 9-10, 15; 2 Thessalonians 1:12; 1 John 1:5; 2:5-6, 8, 27-28; 3:5-6, 9, 24; 4:13, 15-16.

- clxx Matthew 10:32; 11:6; 26:31; Mark 14:27; Luke 7:23; 12:8; 22:37; John 6:56; 10:38; 14:10-11, 20, 30; 15:2, 4-7; 16:33; 17:21, 23; 2 Corinthians 11:10; Galatians 2:20.
- clxxi Matthew 26:33; Luke 3:22; John 17:21, three references.
- clxxii John 3:21; Romans 2:17; 5:11; Ephesians 3:9; Colossians 3:3; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2:2; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 Timothy 6:17; 1 John 4:15-16; Jude 1:1.
- clxxiii John 14:10-11, 20; 1 Thessalonians 1:1; 2 Thessalonians 1:1; 1 John 2:24; Jude 1:1—seven references.
- clxxiv John 14:13; Hebrews 1:2; 1 John 2:24; 5:11, 20—five references.
- clxxv Matthew 3:11; 12:28; 22:43; Mark 1:8, 23; 5:2; 12:36; Luke 1:17; 2:27; 3:16; 4:1; John 1:33; 4:23-24; Acts 1:5; 11:16; 19:21; Romans 1:9; 2:29; 8:9; 9:1; 14:17; 15:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11, 20; 12:3, 9, 13; 2 Corinthians 6:6; Galatians 6:1; Ephesians 2:18, 22; 3:5; 5:18; 6:18; Philippians 1:27; Colossians 1:8; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; 1 Timothy 3:16; 4:12; 1 Peter 1:12; Jude 1:20; Revelation 1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10—forty-six references.
- clxxvi Compare the “bookends” of being “in Christ” which are found in Romans 8:1 and 8:39; the chapter contrasts those in Christ with those who are not.
- clxxvii Some might assert that since the church is metaphorically referred to as the “body of Christ,” (1 Corinthians 12:27), and one is baptized to join the church, one must be baptized to be “in Christ.” However, the Bible never connects the saving relationship of being “in Christ” and the metaphor of unified service in the church (note 1 Corinthians 12:13-27; Romans 12:4-6ff.) as the “body of Christ” in this fashion. Therefore, this argument is unsupported by Scripture and invalid.
- clxxviii *Pepoithamen*, the perfect active indicative first person of the verb *peitho*, translated “trust” in Matthew 27:43; Mark 10:24; Luke 18:9; 2 Corinthians 1:9; Philippians 2:24; Hebrews 2:13; 13:18.
- clxxix It should be specifically pointed out as well that while the New Testament never says one is baptized *en* Christ, men do believe *en* Christ. Note the following texts: “And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe (*pisteuete en*) the gospel” (Mark 1:15); “Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in (*pisteos en*) his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God” (Romans 3:25); “For ye are all the children of God by faith in (*pisteos en*) Christ Jesus” (Galatians 3:26); “Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in (*pistin en*) the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints” (Ephesians 1:15); “Since we heard of your faith in (*pistin . . . en*) Christ Jesus, and of the love *which ye have* to all the saints,” (Colossians 1:4); etc.
- clxxx A refutation of the argument that one is baptized “into” (*eis*) Christ to get “in” (*en*) Christ is found in the analysis of Romans 6:3-4 above.
- clxxxi Matthew 6:25; 22:11; 27:31; Mark 1:6; 6:9; 15:17, 20; Luke 12:22; 15:22; 24:49; Acts 12:21; Romans 13:12, 14; 1 Corinthians 15:53-54; 2 Corinthians 5:3; Galatians 3:27; Ephesians 4:24; 6:11,14; Colossians 3:10, 12; 1 Thessalonians 5:8; Revelation 1:13; 15:6; 19:14. Note as well that out of thirty-two instances of *enduo* in the earliest patristic writings, not one refers to the legal act of justification, even in writers with very poor theology. The verb is almost always used metaphorically for various aspects of righteous living (for example, 1 Clement 30:3 states, “Let us clothe ourselves in concord, being humble and self-controlled.”), while a few instances refer to literally putting on clothing. See 1 Clement 30:3; Ignatius to Polycarp 1:2; Epistle of Barnabas 3:2; Shepherd of Hermas 20:2; 22:8; 26:2; 27:4; 34:8; 39:7, 10; 42:1, 4; 43:4; 44:1; 45:4; 61:2, 4-5; 65:3; 75:1; 79:4; 86:5; 90:2-4, 8; 92:1; 101:2; 106:3. Furthermore, the pre-Christian use of “put off the man” by the skeptic philosopher Pyrrho of Elis relates to a change of life—when Pyrrho failed to act in accordance with his convictions, “In shame Pyrrho admit[ed that those who pointed out his inconsistency were] right, but by way of excuse he sa[id]: *clalepon estin ton anthropon ekunai*, ‘it is difficult to put off the man.’” (pg. 185, “Observations on a Pauline Expression,” P. W. Van Der Horst. *New Testament Studies* 19:181-187). Neither Scripture nor the documents of the earliest patristic writings nor the relevant records of pre-Christian philosophy connect the legal act of justification with the terminology of “put on” and “put off.”
- clxxxii Compare the metaphor of the *toga virilis* ceremony discussed in endnote #182.
- clxxxiii Some baptismal regenerationists affirm that one is “saved by faith” at the moment of baptism and that none but such as are baptized are saved by faith. This is a perversion of language—“saved by faith”

---

obviously does not mean “saved by baptism.” Furthermore, this argument is only utilized when convenient for misinterpreting a passage such as this one; discussing Mark 16:16, such baptismal regenerationists argue in a contradictory fashion that faith does not equal baptism but must precede it, and that faith really does not save. Discussing Galatians 3:26-27, however, where it is convenient to equate the two, “children of God by faith” really is said to signify “children of God by baptism.” One can prove anything if he handles the Bible with this sort of carelessness.

Some justify equating salvation by faith with baptism in Galatians 3:26-27 by mentioning that the Greek word *gar* (English “for”) is found between the two verses. Either ignorant of or deliberately misrepresenting the Greek language, they argue that *gar* necessarily introduces a cause or reason, so that Paul tells the church at Corinth “ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” only because “as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ,” despite the fact that “put on” is not justification terminology. This argument from *gar* misrepresents the Greek conjunction. 1.) *Gar* appears 1,067 times in the New Testament and signifies a great variety of things, many of which do not suit baptismal regenerationists’ allegations here at all. One cannot simply assume a significance of *gar* that supports one’s doctrinal position and then use the assumption to prove that very doctrine. Furthermore, when *gar* is causal, the cause can relate to the greater context rather than to the immediately preceding statement (e. g. Romans 2:24). Stating that the Greek word *gar* in Galatians 3:27 provides definitive evidence that one does not have saving faith until baptized distorts the range of meaning for the word. 2.) This argument ignores the fact that more than one *gar* appears in the context. Galatians 3:24-28 reads:

Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For (*gar*) ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For (*gar*) as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for (*gar*) ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

*Gar* appears three times in v. 26-28. Henry Thayer’s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978, reprint ed.) states as a use of the word, “When in successive statements *gar* is repeated twice or thrice, or even four or five times . . . one and the same thought is confirmed by as many arguments, each having its own force, as there are repetitions of the particle” (cf. BDAG, “[*G*]ar . . . is sometimes repeated . . . to introduce several arguments for the same assertion”). Thus, when *gar* is found in consecutive verses, the word does not have to indicate that successive arguments each give the reason for their immediate predecessor. If *gar* in the passage fits the quoted use, then “ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus” confirms that “after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster,” and “as many of you as have been baptized” also confirms that believers are no longer under the schoolmaster, rather than proving that they are somehow only saved by faith after baptism.

A Pauline allusion to the *toga virilis* ceremony—which is suggested by Paul’s references to the *paidagogos* (“schoolmaster,” 3:24) and to “tutors and governors” (4:2) in the section from 3:19-4:7—is consistent with this view of the successive *gar* particles in 3:24ff. At “the time appointed of the father” (4:2), which at different periods of Greco-Roman culture and in accordance with the view of the father varied from fourteen to twenty, a youth would pass from his state as a child to a new position as an adult, at which point he would be free from the *paidagogos* or “schoolmaster.” This change was represented by a ceremony in which the dress of the adult, the *toga virilis*, was assumed by the youth as a representation of his new position. Although one reached the accepted age of adulthood before the *toga virilis* ceremony took place, it formally and outwardly represented the transition. Paul teaches that one must first be adopted as a son of God by faith (v. 26) and then publicly announce this new state through baptism (v. 27). Similarly, “youths with the [newly acquired] toga of manhood [the *toga virilis*] were introduced publicly as citizens . . . [although the] rite itself did not confer Roman citizenship but only proclaimed and registered the Roman citizenship into which the boy had already been born” (pg. 258, “Coming of Age and Putting on Christ: The *Toga Virilis* Ceremony, Its Paraenesis, and Paul’s Interpretation of Baptism in Galatians,” J. Albert Harrill. *Novum Testamentum* XLIV, 252-277). When “justified by faith” one is free from the “schoolmaster” of the law (v. 24-26), but this transition is formally and outwardly represented by baptism. Both the *gar* of v. 26 and of v. 27 illustrate that “after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster” (v. 25). Believers are free from the schoolmaster because they are the children of God by faith (v. 26), and they are free from the schoolmaster because, as the *toga virilis* ceremony represented the

---

transition from immaturity under a schoolmaster to maturity, they have put on Christ in baptism (v. 27). Since both the *gar* of v. 26 and of v. 27 prove the point made in v. 25, the assertion by advocates of baptismal regeneration that “for” in v. 27 gives the cause of v. 26, so that one is only a child of God upon being baptized, is incorrect. For more on the *toga virilis* and related issues, in addition to the work by Harrill already cited, see *The Significance of Clothing Imagery in the Pauline Corpus*, Chong-hun Kim (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2004), pgs. 92-95; “Coming of Age in Rome: The History and Social Significance of Assuming the *Toga Virilis*,” F. Dolansky (M. A. thesis, University of Victoria, Canada, 1999); *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary*, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990) on Galatians 3-4; “The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19-4:7,” Richard N. Longenecker, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 25:1 (Mark 1982), pgs. 53-61. Tertullian alludes to the *toga virilis* ceremony as acceptable and non-idolatrous in his *On Idolatry*, chapter 16 (Note also Augustine, *City of God* 4:11). In any case, the idea of Galatians 3:27 as a “metaphor . . . of putting on a uniform . . . [is accepted by various writers and is] an early instance of an idea common in later baptismal theology” (pg. 56, *The Seal of the Spirit*, G. W. H. Lampe (London: S. P. C. K., 1967, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

clxxxiv One may note again the incongruity that baptismal regenerationists bury a living man in order to kill him. How much better to bury a man in baptism who is already dead to sin!

clxxxv The verse certainly makes it clear that dipping or immersion, not sprinkling or pouring, is the proper mode of baptism. The fact that those who submit to it are spiritually circumcised (already justified, v.11) and can exercise faith (v. 12) also demonstrates the unscriptural nature of infant “baptism.” See endnotes 11, 128.

clxxxvi Proponents of infant baptism have often argued for their position by equating their rite with the Old Testament ceremony of circumcision. However, neither Christ nor the apostles ever stated that the one replaced the other. The literal act of Old Testament circumcision is by no means paralleled to baptism, or to the new birth and spiritual circumcision, in the Bible. Nor does the fact that literal Old Testament circumcision was a picture of regeneration, while baptism also pictures regeneration, mean that the two are identical. Both Abraham’s offering of Isaac in Genesis 22 and the Passover ceremony of Exodus 12 picture the saving work of Christ (Hebrews 11:17-19; 1 Corinthians 5:7), but Abraham’s act of faith in Genesis 22 was hardly the first Passover. The many Jewish Christians (and others, Acts 16:3) after the cross and Pentecost who received both literal circumcision and baptism obviously did not think that the one ceremony replaced the other, nor did the multitudes of circumcised Jews who were baptized by John or by Christ’s disciples in the time before the cross when both literal circumcision (Colossians 2:14) and baptism (Luke 7:30) were ordinances ordained by God. The true “circumcision . . . [are those who] worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh” (Philippians 3:3), not all infants that have had water poured on them or sprinkled on their heads. One also wonders why, since only male babies were circumcised, baby girls also receive infant baptism in the denominations that practice it. Furthermore, the church is never said to be the equivalent of the nation of Israel, nor do any of the seventy references in the New Testament to the word *Israel* speak of believing Gentiles or Gentile church members, while a variety of texts specifically contrast the two groups (cf. 1 Corinthians 10:32; Galatians 6:16 distinguishes Christian Gentiles, “as many as walk according to this rule,” from Christian Jews, “the Israel of God.”). Baptism adds a believer to the membership of the church authorizing the ordinance (1 Corinthians 12:13; Acts 2:41, 47), but Jewish children were considered part of the nation of Israel and were nationally in covenant with God even before their circumcision (Deuteronomy 29:11-12; Joshua 5:5 evidences that the infants or “little ones” of that text were uncircumcised). Most advocates of infant baptism do not affirm that babies are church members in the New Testament era simply by being born, even before the application of water in infant baptism (some Reformed paedobaptists, however, do argue in this way), but if a parallel to membership in the nation of Israel is to be sustained, they would have to argue so.

Colossians 2:11-12 is sometimes alleged to equate baptism and spiritual circumcision, but there is no proof that it does so—the spiritual circumcision “without hands” of v. 11 is specifically contrasted with the literal circumcision of the body, not to baptism (compare Ephesians 2:11). As indicated above, baptism is very much an act performed with one’s hands, while spiritual circumcision or regeneration is “without hands.”

---

The only potentially reasonable attempt at proof in the entirety of Scripture for the affirmation that spiritual circumcision is baptism would be the assertion that the participle “buried with” (*suntaphentes*) in Colossians 2:12 is dependent upon the verb “ye are circumcised” (*perietmethete*) in Colossians 2:11. However, the passage does not definitively equate the two actions or make them identical. The fact that two things are related—as are receiving a new heart in spiritual circumcision and the outward testimony or picture of regeneration in baptism—does not establish an identify between the two. *Suntaphentes* could be an example of an aorist participle of subsequent action (cf. 132, 142-146, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Earnest Burton. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1923-1925; pg. 614 n. 2, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, Wallace), or Paul could be viewing the *perietmethete* and *suntaphentes* as simple snapshot actions that took place in the past and are closely associated, so that, although the (possibly telic) participle could be considered as loosely temporally simultaneous with the verb gramatically, none the less the simple snapshot nature of the aorist tense could allow for an earlier spiritual circumcision followed by an outward testimony to that fact in baptism (cf. Acts 25:13 and the relationship of the participle “salute/greet,” *aspasamenoī*, to the verb “came,” *katentesan*, or 1 Peter 3:18 and the relation of the participle “made alive,” *zoapoiethes*, to the verb “suffered,” *epathe*; also 1 Timothy 1:12; Acts 10:3; 11:13). In context, Paul proves that believers are complete in Christ (2:10). They are spiritually circumcized (2:11) and baptized as the outward evidence of regeneration (2:12), forgiven (2:13-14) and free from legal ordinances (2:14-15). Since they are complete in Christ and are identified with Him (2:10-15), they are not to return to Jewish ceremonialism (2:16ff.). Believers are spiritually united to Christ and spiritually circumcized before they are symbolically buried and raised with Christ in baptism. Paul’s argument does not require either baptismal regeneration or the equation of spiritual circumcision and baptism in Colossians 2.

Furthermore, those who are buried with Christ in baptism in Colossians 2:12 are believers, people who have already had their sins forgiven, not infants who are supposedly baptized as an alleged counterpart to circumcision in Israel. They are people who have already have faith, as Colossians 2:12 itself affirms. They had received Christ (v. 6) and had all their trespasses forgiven (v. 13), and Paul rejoiced in their steadfast faith (v. 5). Paul longed to see them “that their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding” (v. 2). Infants would not have their hearts knit together in love and have the riches of the full assurance of understanding if Paul came to see them. They do not even know their right hands from their left (Jonah 4:11)—how could they have “the full assurance of understanding” concerning the deep truths of the gospel? Those baptized in Colossians 2:12 were old enough to choose to celebrate Jewish holy days and feast days or to refrain from doing so. They were not to allow anyone to judge them based on their choice (v. 16). They were also to refuse to listen to the beguiling words of false teachers (v. 4, 18). The commands of Colossians chapter two are ridiculous if applied to infants. Colossians 2:12 speaks of those who have already been spiritually circumcised, who have already become believers, being immersed in baptism. It gives no support at all to infant baptism, nor does it establish any equivalence between the Jewish ceremony of circumcision and the church ordinance of believer’s immersion.

Furthermore, history does not support an argument for infant baptism from circumcision. “There is a silence in the early patristic references to infant baptism concerning the analogy between circumcision and baptism. . . . [N]ot until the mid-third century that this analogy first occurs as an argument for infant baptism. Furthermore, the citing of Colossians 2:11-12 does not occur in this connection until the mid-fourth century” (“Colossians 2:11-12: The Circumcision/Baptism Analogy, and Infant Baptism,” J. P. T. Hunt. *Tyndale Bulletin* 41.2 (1990) 227-244).

The New Testament, using Abraham as the Christian’s pattern (Romans 4:23-25), also states that circumcision was a “seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised” (4:11). Thus, even if circumcision were equivalent to baptism, faith would be a prerequisite, and baptism would not be the means of attaining justification, but only a token of a previously received “righteousness of faith.” (See Romans 4:1-25.) A parallel between circumcision given to all the physical seed of Abraham and baptism given to the spiritual seed of Abraham would restrict baptism to believers, since “they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham” (Galatians 3:7).

The use of the word “seal” (*sphragis*) in Romans 4:11—for the already justified and already believing Abraham—by no means supports the Reformed sacramental notion that infant baptism is a vehicle conveying saving grace and that through baptism grace is “conferred by the Holy Ghost” upon the elect (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, Article 28). Since Romans 4:11 is the only verse in Scripture that could with any plausibility be used to support the Reformed view, its advocates argue from this text that circumcision is a “seal” of grace, that their sacrament of infant baptism is equivalent to circumcision, and that, therefore, infant baptism seals or conveys grace to their infants. This argument breaks down at many points. First, the verse does not say that circumcision was a seal of grace to Jewish male infants. While circumcision was a “sign” by nature, it is not affirmed to have been a “seal” to all, but only personally to believing Abraham, who received it when he had already been justified by faith. A recognition of this distinction in Romans 4:11 explains the Old Testament use of the word *sign* or *token* (Hebrew *’oth*) in connection with circumcision (Genesis 17:11) but the complete absence of references in the Old Testament to the ceremony as a “seal.” Second, the New Testament does not equate circumcision with baptism or state that the latter replaces the former. Third, the Biblical immersion of believers has nothing to do with the ceremonial application of water to infants that Catholics and Protestants claim is baptism. Fourth, a seal is a visible mark or impression evidencing the authority of the one who authorizes the seal to the genuineness or correctness of whatever is witnessed to by its presence. However, baptism does not leave a visible mark upon those who receive it, and it is not administered to single individuals by Divine authority—the authority given the church to administer baptism is general (Matthew 28:18-20). No man can put marks upon the elect of God which shall authoritatively certify that they are His, and neither baptism nor the Lord’s Supper authenticate one’s personal election to himself or to others; such authentication is given to the regenerate individual himself by the presence of true faith and the manifestation of that faith in a changed life, as taught in 1 John (cf. 5:13). Unlike the ordinance of baptism, the “seal” of circumcision given to Abraham was indeed a visible mark and was applied to the individual man Abraham by direct Divine authority. Circumcision was a seal to Abraham, but to nobody else. Finally, when advocates of Reformed theology and other Protestants speak of baptism as a “seal” or vehicle of grace, they use the word in a sense entirely absent in Scripture. None of the appearances of the word “seal” (*sphragis*) in the New Testament indicate that grace is conveyed through a “seal” (Romans 4:11; 1 Corinthians 9:2; 2 Timothy 2:19; Revelation 5:1-2, 5, 9; 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 7:2; 8:1; 9:4). Those who think that infant baptism was the instrument of their receiving forgiveness, those who think that they received the sacrament as confirmation and evidence that they were already regenerated in the womb, and those who think they had water applied to them in infancy as evidence that they were certain to be regenerated in the future unless they consciously rejected the “sacrament” and its efficacy are underneath a terrible spiritual delusion. They will certainly be damned unless they recognize that their unbiblical religious ceremony did nothing beneficial for them, admit they are still lost, and then repent and believe the gospel.

Indeed, baptism is not even a “sign” in the sense regularly employed in Reformed theology. The ordinance is indeed a sign of what Christ did and suffered, but it is not a “sign” promising that any saving work will be done in the one who receives it—yet it is in this latter sense that the Reformed generally speak of the ordinance as a “sign.”

clxxxvii See the analysis of Romans 6:3-4 as a proof-text for baptismal regeneration above.

clxxxviii The verb is *sunthapto*.

clxxxix Some attempt to avoid the fact that baptism is not the “putting away of the filth of the flesh” by affirming that Peter simply means that baptism does not remove physical dirt upon the body, rather than signifying that baptism does not save from spiritual uncleanness. This attempt to avoid the meaning of the passage fails for the following reasons: 1.) Peter said “filth of the flesh,” (an attributive genitive) identifying the filth with the ungodly, fleshly nature that controls the lost (cf. Romans 8:8), not “filth upon the flesh,” which would suit an equation of “filth” with physical dirt and “flesh” simply with the body. 2.) The word “filth,” *hrupos*, although not used elsewhere in the New Testament, is always used in the Greek Old Testament of spiritual filthiness (Job 9:31 (cf. v. 29-30); 11:15; 14:4; Isaiah 4:4). 3.) The word is used in the apostolic patristic writers for spiritual filthiness (1 Clement 17:4; Epistle of Barnabas 11:11) but never of simple dirt on one’s body. Philo (*On the Change of Names (Mutatione)* 48, ref. Job 14:4) only uses the word for spiritual filthiness. 4.) The noun *hrupos* in 1 Peter 3:21 shares an etymological root with

---

the verb *hrupoo*, found only in Revelation 22:11 in the New Testament, where it refers to spiritual filthiness. Josephus uses the closely related verb *hupaino* (found in the Byzantine and modern critical text in Revelation 22:11 instead of the inspired *Textus Receptus* reading) only of spiritual filthiness (*Contra Apion* 1:24:220). The very closely related noun *huparia* is only used in the New Testament of spiritual filthiness (James 1:21). None of these nouns or verbs are used in either the New Testament or the closely related sets of *Koiné* literature examined above for simple dirt on the body. Compare the definition of *hrupos* as “moral and intellectual pollution” and of *hrupoo* as “[to] defile, be filthy” in Lampe’s *Patristic Greek Lexicon*. No literal references to the removal of dirt are listed in Lampe for *hrupoo*—it is only defined as spiritual filthiness. The metaphorical use of *hrupos* is dominant in Lampe, while a sense of physical dirt particles being removed is not in view in any of the examples written out in the definition. (The definition in BDAG for *hrupoo* as a “dark viscous juice” (cf. the example in Barnabas 8:6, which is appropriately placed under this category in BDAG, and is listed in definition #1 in Lampe) is, of course, relevant to neither the proponent or opponent of the view that 1 Peter 3:21 refers to physical dirt instead of spiritual defilement.)

<sup>exc</sup> Some might dispute the KJV rendering of *eperotema* as “answer.” The word can have more than one sense, and since 1 Peter 3:21 is the only place in the New Testament where this noun appears, an analysis of other Biblical passages that employ the word is not possible. However, in extrabiblical Greek the word could mean an “answer to inquiry put to higher authority” (*Greek-English Lexicon*, Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996, 9th ed.). “The papyri show that the noun *eperotema* was at times used in a technical sense to denote the question-and-answer process . . . in usage this term . . . came to include the response. . . . In view of this question-and-answer usage of the noun, the rendering in the Authorized Version, ‘the answer of a good conscience toward God,’ is quite acceptable. The believer’s acceptance of baptism is his answer to the Spirit’s questions stirring his conscience and resulting in his conversion. His answer is given out of ‘a good conscience,’ a conscience purified by the blood of Christ and assured of personal acceptance with God. His baptism is his answer to the work of God in his heart, bearing witness before the world to what God has done for him.” (“Selected Studies from 1 Peter, Part 2: The Suffering and Triumphant Christ: An Exposition of 1 Peter 3:18-22,” D. Edmond Hiebert, *Bibliotheca Sacra* 139:554 (April 1982) pg. 156-157). Compare the use of *eperotesis* in the *Letter of Aristeas* 122.

<sup>excii</sup> Note that this clause demonstrates the fallacy of infant baptism. Infants can hardly be baptized as the answer of their good conscience toward God. See also endnotes #11, 128.

<sup>exciii</sup> See the analysis of Romans 6:3-4 as an alleged proof-text for baptismal regeneration and its discussion of 1 John.

<sup>exciv</sup> Consider that this verse demonstrates that one who has his conscience purged by the blood of Christ has it cleansed once and for all. Once saved, always saved.

<sup>exciv</sup> “Answer of a good conscience,” *suneideseos agathes eperotema*, is a subjective genitive construction that could be rendered “a good conscience’s answer” (see pgs. 113-116, Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*). It is clear that the good conscience is possessed before baptism. Even if one wished to dispute the rendering of the KJV of *eperotema* as “answer,” and argue for “inquiry” or “appeal” as the sense of the word, it would still be “a good conscience’s inquiry/appeal” and so affirm that the good conscience was possessed prior to the administration of the ordinance.

<sup>exciv</sup> *Diasodzo* appears eight times in Scripture: Matthew 14:36, “made perfectly whole” (physical healing); Luke 7:3, “heal” (physical healing); Acts 23:24, “bring . . . safe” (Paul’s physical safety escaping Jerusalem to get to Felix the governor); Acts 27:43, “the centurion, willing to save Paul” (a Roman soldier saving Paul from slaughter by the other soldiers); Acts 27:44, “escaped . . . safe to land,” (surviving a shipwreck); Acts 28:1, “they were escaped” (likewise a reference to the shipwreck); Acts 28:4, “escaped the sea” (a final reference to the shipwreck—note that these last four uses of the word occur in a six verse section, and they all deal with escape from drowning in water—as does the next and final reference); 1 Peter 3:20, “eight souls were saved by water” (surviving Noah’s flood in the ark). The verb appears 69 times in the LXX (in both the canonical books and the Apocrypha) and it likewise never once signifies salvation from sin (Genesis 19:19; 35:3; Numbers 10:9; 21:29; Deuteronomy 20:4; Joshua 6:26; 9:15; 10:20, 28, 30, 37, 39; 11:8; Judges 3:26, 29; 12:4-5; 21:17; 1 Samuel 19:10, 17-18; 20:29; 22:1, 20; 23:13;

---

2 Samuel 1:3; 2 Kings 10:24; 19:30; Ezra 9:14-15; Job 21:10, 20; 22:30; 29:12; 36:12; Proverbs 10:5; Ecclesiastes 8:8; 9:15; Isaiah 37:38; Jeremiah 8:20; Ezekiel 17:15; Daniel 11:42; Hosea 13:10; Amos 2:15; 9:1; Micah 6:14; Jonah 1:6; Zechariah 8:13; 1 Maccabees 4:26; 9:46; 2 Maccabees 1:25; 3:38; 8:27; 11:12; 4 Maccabees 2:14; 4:14; 17:22; Wisdom 14:5; 16:11; Sirach 34:12; 46:8; Baruch 6:10, 54, 57-58).

<sup>cxv</sup> *Diasodzo*, BDAG.

<sup>cxvii</sup> This is a far more common word, appearing 110 times in the New Testament. BDAG classifies the great majority of the verses where it appears under either “to preserve or rescue from natural dangers and afflictions, save, keep from harm, preserve, rescue,” the first meaning listed, or “to save or preserve from transcendent danger or destruction, save/preserve from eternal death” (*sodzo*, BDAG).

<sup>cxviii</sup> It appears that Peter’s only other use of *sodzo* in his epistles, 1 Peter 4:18, refers to non-spiritual salvation as well. One could paraphrase the verse, with its present passive indicative (“are being saved/delivered”) verb form, as “if the righteous are barely delivered [*sodzo*] from the fiery trials they endure on earth to purify and purge them, how will the ungodly expect to escape the eternal judgment of God?” Compare Peter’s use of *sodzo* for physical healing in Acts 4:9 (cf. John 11:12; Acts 27:20, 31).

<sup>cxix</sup> See the analysis of Galatians 3:27 in the section “‘Proof-texts’ for Baptismal Regeneration Examined” above.

<sup>cc</sup> The word “figure” is *antitupon*, “antitype,” which means “pertaining to that which corresponds to something else, corresponding to” or “copy, antitype, representation” (BDAG, *antitupos*). The only other verse in Scripture that contains this word is Hebrews 9:24, where the objects in the earthly “holy places made with hands” are “the figures (*antitupa*) of the true [heavenly reality].”

<sup>cci</sup> A refutation of the notion that one is “in Christ” by means of baptism is found in the analysis of Romans 6:3-4 as a “proof-text” for baptismal regeneration above.

<sup>ccii</sup> Baptismal regenerationists would do well to substitute the word “baptism” for “believe” and “faith” in verses that predicate salvation upon the latter and see how unlike anything actually in Scripture the verses then sound. Where does the Word of God speak of “precious baptism,” or of being “kept by the power of God through baptism unto salvation,” or of “receiving the end of your baptism, even the salvation of your souls”?

<sup>cciii</sup> Peter also affirmed forgiveness before baptism in Acts 2:38. See the analysis of the verse as a supposed proof-text for baptismal regeneration above.

<sup>cciv</sup> In addition to the historical documents mentioned above, one notes, as a sampling, that the Baptist *Confession of 1689*, agreed to by over one hundred Baptist churches in England and Wales and signed by such men of God as Hanserd Knollys and William Kiffin, affirms in Article 29, “Baptism is an Ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party Baptized, a sign of fellowship with him, in his death (Romans 6:3, 4, 5; Colossians 2:12; Galatians 3:27) and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of (Mark 1:4; Acts 26:16) remission of sins; and of his (Romans 6:2, 4) giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to live and walk in newness of life.” The same language and passages were employed in the Baptist *Orthodox Creed of 1679*, the famous American Baptist *Philadelphia Confession of Faith of 1720*, and the *Second London Confession of Faith of 1677*. Among Baptists outside the English-speaking world, the 1879 *French Baptist Confession*, “received by all the Baptist churches of France, Belgium, and Switzerland,” affirms in Article 9, “We believe that baptism is, for Christians voluntarily dead to the world and to sin, the striking and solemn emblem of burial and of resurrection with Christ, to whom they are united by faith, to live in Him a new and holy life. We believe, after the order of Christ, His example and that of the apostles, that the immersion of believers must precede admission into the local church and participation in the communion . . . Romans 6:3, 4; . . . Galatians 3:27; Colossians 2:12; . . . 1 Peter 3:21). The German *Confession of Faith and Constitution of the Churches of Baptized Christians commonly called Baptists* originally composed in 1847 and commonly received into the twentieth century, affirms in Article 8 that “Baptism is a first-fruit of faith and love to Christ, the entrance into obedience toward the Lord . . . and his church (1 Corinthians 12:13; Acts 2:47). It is the solemn declaration, the confession of the sinner (1 Peter 3:21) . . . who has recognized the frightfulness of his sin and the damnability of his whole being . . . that he sets all his hope solely on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ his Saviour (Acts 2:38; Romans 6:3, 8) . . . and believes on him as the Redeemer from the curse and wages of sin[,] . . . that he consecrates himself with body and soul to Christ and puts him on (Galatians 3:26-27), as his righteousness and strength[,] . . . that he gives his old man to death and wishes to walk with

---

Christ in a new life (Romans 6:4-6).” Indeed, it is questionable if there is any Baptist confessional support at all, anywhere, for the view that the texts in question refer to Spirit baptism rather than to immersion. (All confessions and documentation above was accessed on the Baptist History Collection CD, ver. 1. Paris, AK: Baptist Standard Bearer, 2005.)

<sup>ccv</sup> *The Holy Spirit: Comprising a Discussion of the Paraclete, the Other Self of Jesus, and Other Phases of the Work of the Spirit of God*, pgs. 19-44. Elec. acc. in the AGES Christian Library Series, Vol. 11, B. H. Carroll Collection. Rio, WI: 2006. Compiled by J. W. Crowder, ed. J. B. Cranfill. While Carroll was a prominent advocate of the historic Baptist view of Spirit baptism, his conclusions are not in perfect agreement with every aspects of the exegesis above (For example, he took a different view of 1 Corinthians 12:13, preferred to speak of “baptism in the Spirit” rather than “baptism with the Spirit,” and traced the founding of the church to Matthew 10, when the Lord ordained the apostles, which, while correctly concluding that the Lord founded the church during His earthly ministry and before Pentecost, misses the fact that He had baptized believers following Him, and thus a church, somewhat earlier in John 1:35ff. However, Carroll makes many excellent points, and he is a fine exponent of the historic Baptist view.). Portions of the sermons that were irrelevant to the topic of Spirit baptism and sections where his exposition of the historic Baptist position differ in details from those explicated in the body of the paper above have been removed.

<sup>ccvi</sup> Of course, Christ Himself was in His pre-Pentecost church, so a member of the Godhead dwelt in her, although the Holy Spirit had not made the church His special temple as yet.