

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (1)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

A Texas reader writes that he heard a sermon recently in which the preacher said the gift of the Holy Spirit of Acts 2:38 is something which the Holy Spirit gives the one who repents and is baptized for the remission of his sins. This reader wishes to know what is the meaning of this expression. With the editor's permission I hope to write several articles reviewing positions held by prominent brethren on what is meant by the gift of the Holy Spirit and to whom that promise in Acts 2:38 applies.

That Peter promised the gift of the Holy Spirit to people who would repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins no one can deny. But when he made that promise did he mean that those who obey will receive a gift from the Holy Spirit? Or did Peter mean that those who obey will receive a gift consisting of the Holy Spirit; that they would receive the Holy Spirit that had been promised? Let us see from the use of the phrase in the N.T. just what is meant by it.

First, the Greek phrase "ten dorean tou hagiou pneumatou" is found only twice in the N.T. Each time it is translated "the gift of the Holy Spirit." In Acts 2:38 there is little else said to determine just what is meant by the expression. So far as the Greek or English grammatical construction is concerned it might mean something the Holy Spirit gives, or it might mean the Holy Spirit as a gift, as we shall see later in this article. But in Acts 10:45 there are other statements that prove beyond a doubt that the expression means that the Holy Spirit was the gift. There is only one thing that might confuse the careless reader, and that is the fact that in Acts 2:38 the gift is the ordinary, or indwelling manifestation, of the Holy Spirit; but in Acts 10:45 the gift is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In both cases the Holy Spirit is given and is the gift, and the difference in the manifestations (some say measures) does not affect the connotation of the grammatical construction. So let us study Acts 10:44-47.

While Peter was speaking the Holy Spirit fell on the hearers. There can be no doubt what fell on them, unless one wishes to deny the plain statement of the inspired writer. The Holy Spirit fell on them. But what was poured out? Verse 45 says the "gift of the Holy Spirit" was poured out on the Gentiles. Is there a difference between what was poured on them and what fell on them? If I receive a gift of water, and if I pour out the gift of water upon the ground, what will be on the ground? Just about everyone would understand that water would be on the ground. So when the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out on the Gentiles, and Luke says the Holy Spirit fell on them, it should be plain that the gift of the Holy Spirit was the Holy Spirit given to them. But to clinch the matter beyond honorable disagreement we should take Peter's word for it that the Gentiles had "received the Holy Spirit as well as we" (verse 47). So when the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Gentiles, they received the Holy Spirit. If the expression, in this particular form, occurs only twice, and if it obviously has this meaning in one place, why not believe it has this meaning in the other place? Only a preconceived idea to which one is wedded can prevent acceptance of this meaning in both places. And the fact that Cornelius received the Spirit in the baptismal manifestation and the promise in Acts 2:38 is the ordinary, or indwelling, manifestation does not change the meaning of the grammatical construction.

But someone says that Acts 2:38 says we will receive a gift (accusative case—object of the verb receive), and the phrase

"of the Holy Spirit" is genitive case and denotes the source of the gift. It is like the phrase "we receive the gift of God." The phrase "of God" denotes the source of the gift. So far as the grammar in the case is concerned this is a good argument—that is, the phrase in Acts 2:38 could mean either the Spirit as a gift, or something the Spirit gives. But from Acts 10 we have learned that it means the Spirit as the gift. But I shall now point out several expressions where the same grammatical construction occurs and the meaning is unequivocal. First, in Acts 2:33 Jesus is said to have "received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit." Here we have the word promise in the accusative case as the object of the verb received. And we have the phrase "of the Holy Spirit" in the genitive case, exactly the same grammatical construction we have in Acts 2:38. The phrase "Jesus received the promise of the Holy Spirit" cannot mean that Jesus received a promise from the Holy Spirit. He received from the Father the Holy Spirit which was promised and he poured forth that which was seen and heard. So to receive the promise of the Holy Spirit means to receive the Holy Spirit which was promised. And to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit means to receive the Holy Spirit which is given.

Again, Jesus is said to have died that Gentiles might "receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Gal. 3:14). Here the word promise is accusative case, the object of the verb receive; and the phrase "of the Spirit" is genitive case, and it means that we through faith receive the Spirit that was promised. And in 2 Corinthians 5:5, we read that God "gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit." The word earnest is accusative, the object of the verb gave, and the phrase "of the Spirit" is genitive case, but does not mean the source of the earnest. From Ephesians 1:13, 14, we learn that the Holy Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance. So when God gave us the earnest of the Spirit, he gave the Spirit which is the earnest of our inheritance.

In Hebrews 9:15 we are told that those who are called "may receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Did the writer mean to say that eternal inheritance had promised us something? This means that we receive the inheritance which was promised. And in Revelations 14:11 we have the same grammatical construction where certain ones "receiveth the mark of his name." They received a mark consisting of his name. So in Acts 2:38 we receive a gift, not from the Holy Spirit, but one consisting of the Holy Spirit. And according to Romans 4:11 Abraham "received the sign of circumcision." That is, he received a sign consisting of circumcision. In James 1:12 we learn that the approved shall receive the crown of life. The word crown is accusative case, the object of the verb receive. The phrase "of life" is genitive case, but it does not mean that life is going to give the crown. Nor does "gift of the Holy Spirit" mean that the Holy Spirit is going to give the gift. From these examples of the grammatical construction of the expression "gift of the Holy Spirit" in Acts 2:38 I believe we have established beyond any doubt that the "gift of the Holy Spirit" can mean a gift consisting of the Holy Spirit as well as it can mean a gift given by the Holy Spirit. And since Paul says it is God who giveth his Holy Spirit unto you" (1 Thess. 4:8), and since he says our "body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God" (1 Cor. 6:19), and since Peter says God has given the Holy Spirit to them that obey him (Acts 5:32), and since Paul said God gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts (2 Cor. 1:22), and again he said God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts (Gal. 4:6), it seems to me that we are abundantly justified in believing that God gives the Holy Spirit to all who repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins. This is the promise Peter made and Paul affirms to all who obey him.

2852 So. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colo. 80227

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (2)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

We are reading in papers and tracts today the old A. Campbell position that the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 is that manifestation of the Spirit which was given by the laying on of apostles' hands. Jesus said the baptized believer is saved and certain signs would follow (Mark 16:17), and we learn that such signs did follow the baptized believers in Samaria when apostles' hands were laid on them (Acts 8:14ff.). This interpretation is given to avoid the conclusion that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the children of God as is stated in Galatians 4:6; 1 Corinthians 6:19; Romans 8:9-11, and others. When the Lord says the Spirit dwells in you these words must be taken figuratively or literally.

There is a rule of interpretation which says, "Words should be taken in their literal sense unless such literal interpretation involves a manifest contradiction or absurdity" (M.S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics*, p. 159). Moses E. Lard states the rule in these words, "A word, whenever met with, is to be taken in its common current sense, unless the subject-matter, the context, or a qualifying epithet forbids it" (*Lard's Quarterly*, Vol. I, March 1864, p. 236). Now, I ask, what manifest contradiction is made if we take this phrase in its literal sense? What absurdity is created if we take in its literal sense? I believe these brethren who refuse to take these scriptures which affirm the indwelling of the Holy Spirit "in the literal sense," and "the common sense" are obligated to tell us why these statements cannot be so understood. Do they violate this common rule of interpretation because of the teaching of other passages? or because they are wedded to a theory which requires them to do so?

But if the phrase "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in Acts 2:38 means the endowment with the power to work miracles and is received by the laying on of an apostle's hands, several conclusions absolutely must follow. First, since the command of Peter in verse 38 was to all who heard Peter's sermon, the promise must have been to all who heard it. Three thousand people obeyed the commands, therefore that many received the power to work miracles. Are we ready for such a conclusion? But soon the number came to be five thousand males (Acts 4:4). Then believers were the more added to the Lord (Acts 5:14), and the number of disciples multiplied exceedingly (Acts 6:7). If we multiply five thousand males by the least number possible, we have ten thousand. Then there were women obeying the gospel because we read that some widows were being overlooked in the "daily ministrations" (Acts 6:1). Did apostles lay hands on all these women and give them power to work miracles? They were baptized believers and these signs were to follow all who repented and were baptized for remission of sins—at least this is what the argument now being made says. And then the church was persecuted and scattered throughout all Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles, and they preached the word as they went. As a result of their preaching the word people, believed and were baptized. Such happened in Samaria and Peter and John went down, laid hands on them, and gave the power to work miracles. Did apostles go to every place where people obeyed that they might give all the believers the power to work miracles? Soon there were believers in Damascus, Cyprus, and Antioch (Acts 11:19).

When the church at Jerusalem heard that Antioch had received the word they sent Barnabas to exhort and encourage them. I wonder why apostles were not sent to lay hands on them that they might receive the promise of Acts 2:38? If the promise of Acts 2:38 was miraculous power, and all who obeyed the

commands of that verse received miraculous power by apostles' hands, these twelve men were required to go to every person who obeyed the gospel regardless of where he lived. This would have been a physical impossibility; nothing less than miraculous transportation could have made it possible. Who among us is willing to affirm that these apostles were miraculously transported to every place, every time, people obeyed the gospel? When you realize that these scattered Christians were teaching and baptizing people every day, the apostles would have had to make many return trips to the same place and this fact would compound the impossibility. And then I wonder who laid hands on the Ethiopian eunuch. Philip who baptized him could not lay hands on him and give him the gift of the Holy Spirit because the apostle had to go to Samaria where he baptized people. The eunuch went on to Ethiopia without the gift of the Holy Spirit, without the Spirit dwelling in him, according to this theory.

But in Romans 8:9-11, I read that if any man does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. The Spirit of Christ is the Holy Spirit (1 Peter 1:10, 11; 2 Peter 1:21.) So if any man, even in Rome, does not have the Holy Spirit, he does not belong to Christ. And this eunuch who went to Ethiopia without the gift of the Holy Spirit because there was no apostle at his baptism to give him this gift, did not belong to Christ, according to this doctrine under review. And those Samaritans who believed and were baptized, but according to this doctrine did not receive the Holy Spirit to dwell in them until the apostles came down, could we say they belonged to Christ as soon as they were baptized? And what about the brethren to whom Paul wrote in Rome? So far as we know no apostle had ever been in Rome at the time Paul wrote to them. He said he wanted to go there that he might impart some spiritual gift (Rom. 1:11.)

If this spiritual gift was the "gift of the Holy Spirit," as this doctrine affirms, it follows that the brethren at Rome did not have the Holy Spirit and so they did not belong to Christ. Paul certainly wrote this letter during the "apostolic age," the time when this theory under review affirms that the gift of the Holy Spirit of Acts 2:38 was imparted by the laying on of apostles' hands. In this Roman letter Paul speaks of many whom he knew, some were his relatives, who had gone to Rome after their conversion. We can account for their having the gift of the Holy Spirit, since they may have been converted by an apostle, or had apostles' hands laid on them before moving to Rome; but for Romans who had been converted by these who had the gift and had moved to Rome there is no way to account for their having that Spirit of Christ, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and therefore we must conclude that they did not belong to Christ—if this theory under review is correct.

And what about people today who repent and are baptized for the remission of sins? There are no apostles on earth today to lay hands on them and give them the gift of the Holy Spirit, which the theory says is the promise of Acts 2:38. We must obey the commands of that verse, but we cannot enjoy the promise of that verse. Can someone tell me why the commands of the verse are binding, but the promise of the same verse is no longer valid? Peter said God had given the Holy Spirit to them that obey him (Acts 5:32), and Paul said God "giveth his Holy Spirit" to the brethren in Thessalonica (1 Thess. 4:8.) If he would give the Holy Spirit to them, and to the brethren in Rome where no apostle was present, why will he not give us the Holy Spirit today when we obey him?

But I am told that if the Holy Spirit is given to us today the person of the Spirit would have to be divided into millions of pieces so each Christian could have a piece. I have seen some wild statements in my day, but this takes the cake! Was the person of the Spirit divided into twelve pieces so that each apostle could have a piece for himself? This denies the omnipresence of the Spirit. More to follow.

2852 S. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colo. 80227.

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (3)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

One writer of wide reputation among us as a scholar is now circulating a tract concerning the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in which he denies that the Holy Spirit can actually dwell in us. He says, "The Holy Spirit is a Person. He is a divine Person. . . . One person, though he may be in another by his teaching and influence, cannot literally inhabit another." I think all of us know that it is impossible for one human person to inhabit another human person, but where did this brother get his information that a spirit person cannot possibly inhabit a human person? He must have been reading some book other than the Bible that has not come across my desk. Is a demon, a spirit being, a person? Are angels persons? or are they mere impersonal influences? The demons are fallen angels. Did they lose their personality when they fell? and did they become mere impersonal influences? I read of demons inhabiting human bodies and Jesus cast them out (Matt. 8:16). And I read that a legion of demons inhabited the body of one man; they knew Jesus and what he was going to do with them (Matt. 8:22ff.). Were these demons merely teaching and influencing this man? When they were cast out of the man, they went into a herd of swine. Or did they merely teach the swine to run down the hill and jump into the sea? If wicked spirits could inhabit human bodies, why is it thought to be impossible for the Holy Spirit to dwell in our body?

John the Baptist was a person and he was "filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1:15). I understand this to mean that he was filled with the Holy Spirit from the time of his birth. If the Spirit dwells in us only as he teaches us, what did the Holy Spirit teach little John the first few days, weeks, and months of his life? Does the term "filled with the Holy Spirit" mean he was taught and influenced by the Holy Spirit? These "word only" brethren take scriptures that teach that the Spirit influences and guides us by his teaching as a premise and then they draw the conclusion that the Spirit dwells in us through the word only. When they prove that the Holy Spirit leads us through the word, they have not proved that he dwells in us through the word. In the case of John the Baptist, being "filled with the Holy Spirit" did not mean that he was influenced through the word of the Spirit. Nor did it mean that he was enabled to work miracles, for he never worked a miracle (John 10:41). When the brethren at Antioch of Pisidia were "filled with the Holy Spirit," was this something different from that with which John the Baptist was filled? Did it mean that Paul had laid hands on them and had given them miraculous powers? It did not mean that John was given such powers, so why should we think it meant that these Antioch brethren were given these miraculous powers? Though these brethren were filled with the Holy Spirit, I do not believe they were led by "hunches and physical feelings." Being filled simply means that the Holy Spirit dwelt in them, but being led by his teaching is something else.

Was Jesus a person? The Holy Spirit came upon him (Matt. 3:16), and he had the Spirit without measure (John 3:34), and he cast out demons by the power of that Spirit which he had without measure. Was Jesus a human person? Or will we take the Pentecostal position that Mary produced only a body of flesh and Deity indwelt it? Jesus was a human person in every sense in which we are persons. We must believe this or deny his humanity. But if the Holy Spirit is a Person and Jesus is a human person, we must admit that a divine Person inhabited a human

person. If this is true in the case of Jesus and of John the Baptist, why should it be thought impossible in our case?

Let us consider this phrase, "dwells in you," a word at a time. The word "you" refers to the brethren, the children of God. The word "in" is the translation of the Greek preposition "en" and Thayer says when it is used with the dative of a person it means "in the person." And he gives Romans 8:9, 11 as examples of this use. In the phrase "in you" the Greek is "en humin" and the word "humin" is dative case. So the word "en" is used with the dative of a person and means "in the person." And the word "dwells" simply means to abide; it carries the idea of permanent abode rather than transient. Dr. A. T. Robertson, perhaps the greatest Greek scholar of our time, treated the phrase in this manner: "Dwelleth in you (en humin oikei). The Spirit of God makes his home (oikei) in us, not in temples made with hands."

We have the same Greek phrase, "en humin," used in other passages which will throw light on its meaning. Paul writes to Timothy about the unfeigned faith that is "in thee," and in his mother and grandmother (2 Tim. 1:5). Here we have the preposition "en" with the dative case, dative of person, and means in the person. Where was Timothy's faith? My respondent is obligated to show why the phrase "in you" is to be taken literally here, but not in Romans 8:9, 11, or to agree with me that when Paul said the Holy Spirit dwells in you the phrase is to be taken literally and that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the Christian. Again, Paul tells us the Christian is to let the word of Christ "dwell in you" (Col. 3:16). All of us agree that the phrase is to be given its literal meaning here, but why is it not to be given its literal meaning when Paul says the Holy Spirit dwells in you? In both examples we have the Greek preposition with the dative of a person. Unless someone can show us beyond a doubt that a manifest contradiction or an absurdity is involved in giving this phrase its literal meaning when we are told that the Holy Spirit dwells in us, we cannot reasonably reach any other conclusion than that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the Christian.

But as further proof that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in the Christian I cite several statements where both the Holy Spirit and something else fill the Christian. First, seven men are said to be full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom (Acts 6:3). The word "full" is used but one time in this statement, so it must be given the same meaning with reference to the Holy Spirit that it is given with reference to wisdom. It cannot be literal with reference to wisdom and figurative with reference to the Holy Spirit when it is used but once. Where was the wisdom of these men? When you locate the wisdom, you will also locate the Holy Spirit. If the wisdom was actually in them, the Holy Spirit was actually in them. Next, Barnabas is said to be full of the Holy Spirit and of faith (Acts 11:24). When you locate the faith, you locate the Holy Spirit. If the faith was actually in him, so was the Holy Spirit actually in him. The word "full" cannot be given two meanings when it is used but once. And, last, the disciples were said to be filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:52). Where was the joy? Was it actually in the disciples? So was also the Holy Spirit. The word "filled" cannot be taken as literal with reference to joy, but figurative with reference to the Holy Spirit.

2852 S. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colo. 80227

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (4)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

In a tract which is now being widely circulated to teach how the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians we read that "There is a sense in which the Holy Spirit dwells in us. Some, among us, are taking such passages which merely assert the fact, and from them conclude that because it is said that the Spirit is in us, it must be literally, personally, and immediately. This is an unwarranted and improper handling of the scriptures. . . . It ignores the doctrine of the personality of the Spirit, and leads to the view that the Spirit is simply or only an influence or examination. . . . The view that the Spirit may be literally and actually divided into as many portions as there are Christians, with each Christian being granted a literal portion thereof, is to ignore all that the scriptures teach regarding the personality of the Spirit. It is to partition—divide—Deity, an action which Paul sharply rebuked the Corinthians for with reference to Christ. (Is Christ divided? Literally, the Greek reads, "Is Christ broken up into portions?" 1 Cor. 1:13). Some among us today do not hesitate to teach the doctrine of partition. All who argue that the Spirit literally, actually, and bodily dwells in the heart of the Christian supports such a view, whether they avow it or not." I have given this long quotation to be perfectly fair. Now let us notice its affirmations and implications.

First, the writer says there are some among us who teach that the Holy Spirit dwells in us "literally," "bodily," and "personally." I don't know all among us and what they teach, but if there are any who teach that the Spirit literally dwells in us, they must surely not know what the word means. The word "literally" has to do with letters and how it can be used to describe the indwelling of the Spirit I cannot see. The word "bodily" has to do with the material, physical, body and if the Holy Spirit has a physical body I am not aware of it. God is a Spirit. Do spirits have bodies? The Holy Spirit is a spirit and so far as I can learn does not have a body. So he cannot very well bodily dwell in us. The word "personally" is not so objectionable, but Moses E. Lard and others refused to use it lest people might be misled by the use of it. But these terms are used to make us who hold to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit look as foolish as possible.

Again, it is said that the doctrine of the actual indwelling of the Holy Spirit ignores the doctrine of the personality of the Spirit and leads to the view that the Spirit is simply or only an influence. In my last article I showed that a spirit person may dwell in a human person. So the tract writer's affirmation here is without any basis in truth. But the idea that the Spirit must be divided into as many portions as there are Christians denies the spirituality and the omnipresence of the Holy Spirit. How does the writer of the tract know that a Spirit cannot be in two or more places at one time? Does the writer under review believe the Holy Spirit is localized, limited in space, so that he can be in only one spot on the earth at one time? Does he believe that the Spirit is omnipresent only in his influence? If he does not imply that the Holy Spirit is a mere influence, he certainly believes that he dwells in us only by his influence. He says the Father is in us "as his will influences and dominates our lives." He says the Son is in us "as his teaching pervades our lives, and his characteristics may be seen in our lives." And from this premise he concludes that the Holy Spirit can dwell in us no other way. Let us see some conclusions from this position.

First, the Holy Spirit was never in John the Baptist; he merely influenced John from the day of his birth. Next, the Spirit was never in Jesus; he could not be in Jesus and John at the same time. He merely influenced Jesus by his teaching and as his characteristics were seen in the life of Jesus. Next, he could not possibly have been in the apostles at the same time,

though Jesus said "he shall be in you" (John 14:17). But how could he have been "in" Peter in Babylon and "in" Paul in Athens? The writer of our tract thinks he was not "in" either one of them; he merely influenced them as his teaching pervaded their lives. Or he was in them as he gave them power and inspiration. But he had to give them this power and inspiration from without, not from within. Next our tract writer affirms that we are partitioning the Spirit as the Corinthians were trying to partition Christ. Jesus said where two or three are gathered in his name he would be there in the midst of them (Matt: 18:20). Did Christ plan to break himself up into as many pieces as there are congregations gathered in his name? Or did he mean to be there only as his word influenced them in their life and worship? Can Jesus actually be with every group of true worshipers? If he could be in heaven while he was standing and talking to his disciples on earth, why should we believe it impossible for him to be with every congregation (John 3:13)? The trouble with the writer under review seems to be his inability to believe that God, in the persons of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is omnipresent and that he can actually be with every group of believers who worship in truth; or that he can actually dwell in everyone born into the kingdom without being broken into millions of pieces. R. L. Whiteside, in his *Doctrinal Discourses*, said, "I cannot understand how the Holy Spirit can be in different persons at the same time; but to say that such is impossible is to contradict plain statements of Holy Writ. On Pentecost twelve apostles 'were all filled with the Holy Spirit.' . . . I do not understand it, but I believe it. Let us not try to measure the operations and possibilities of deity by our own limitations. On this, as on other points of Christianity, the Bible is our only source of information; and what it says should be the end of controversy."

Next, the writer of the tract under review reasons that since both the Father and the Son dwell in us through the word, the Holy Spirit must dwell in us through the word. Of course he gives no proof that the Father and Son dwell in us through the word, so he has no proof that the Holy Spirit dwells in us through the word. But what does that phrase "dwells in us through the word" mean? If it means that the Holy Spirit actually dwells in us because we have received and obeyed the word, I agree with it and accept it as being scriptural. But if it means that the word is the representative of the Spirit who revealed the word, I reject it as being an unscriptural idea for the following reasons: First, it is not so stated in the scriptures. Next, it forces us to take the phrase "the Spirit dwelleth in you" as a figure of speech contrary to the accepted rule of interpretation. Next, according to Luke, people first received the word and then were baptized (Acts 2:41). If when we receive the word we receive the Holy Spirit, we have all the Spirit we are ever going to get before we are baptized. But Peter promised people they would receive the Spirit following their baptism (Acts 2:38). Again, one must receive in faith the word before he can obey it, for God gives the Holy Spirit to them that obey him (Acts 5:32). If when one receives the word he has received the Holy Spirit, it would follow that one receives all the Spirit he is ever going to receive before he obeys the Lord in repentance and baptism. Next, one must receive the word and be baptized before he can become a child of God. But Paul says God gives us the Spirit of his Son, the Holy Spirit, because we are sons (Gal. 4:6). If God gives us the Spirit because we are sons, it follows that we must become sons before he gives us the Spirit. We must receive and obey the word in order to become sons, but we must become sons in order to receive the Holy Spirit.

Here is the scriptural order: 1) receive the word; 2) obey the word; 3) become sons; 4) receive the Holy Spirit. But if when one receives the word he receives the Holy Spirit, it follows that he receives the Spirit before he comes a child of God. So I reject the idea that the Holy Spirit dwells in us through the word. There are those who think that when they prove that the

(Continued on page 10)

## World Mission Information Bank Announced

The elders of the Freetown Road Church of Christ in Grand Prairie, Texas, have announced the creation of a major new tool to aid world missions. Known as the World Mission Information Bank, it will serve as a funnel-point for mission information. Since nearly every one of the estimated 18,000 congregations of the body of Christ around the world has some mission data in its possession, it is felt that by sharing this material our mission activities could be made even more effective.

It will be the task of the Bank to accumulate as much valuable material as possible and then place it in a form by which it can be shared with churches, schools and individual Christians. Several forms of storage and retrieval will be utilized, notably the computer and microfilm. Data that changes rapidly, (missionary addresses, etc.) would be computerized and the information available almost immediately to anyone with need, by letter, or telephone. Permanent material will be placed in storage on microfilm or microfiche (such as a 4x6 card containing the equivalent of the pages of an average book). Material on microfiche can be cheaply produced and mailed to anyone having access to a reader and wanting to do a thorough study of a given subject. This would be of most value to the missionary, and students in colleges or schools of preaching. Elders and others needing only portions of this material would be sent photocopies of the microfilm. As well, current and popular missions information will be made available in regular paper form. This includes the already published "Resources Update", a "where to find it" booklet for missionaries, students and churches. In the near future, there will also be sketches on various nations and peoples of the world. This will be designed to aid in basic decision making of elderships as well as presenting useful data to missionaries, preachers, students, and Bible class teachers.

Not only will the Bank be drawing upon missionary advisors around the world, but the research work of students in schools and colleges will also be sought. Most of our missionary training institutions have some valuable data useful to their needs. However, because of the autonomy of the church, there has not been a natural center of information. And until now, there has not been a major effort to bring together a comprehensive collection of material from all of the congregations and workers involved in mission works. Thus the main aim of the Bank will be to serve as a primary center for resource and historical information on missions. The Bank does not wish to duplicate any extensive efforts now being carried on, but will serve as a primary storage point for data and will provide directions to material on almost any mission subject. Material will be available to all Christians and churches by telephone, cable, letters, booklets, microfilm, microfiche, tape cassettes, video tape, and other mediums. Since the World Mission Information Bank is located

only minutes from the new Dallas-Ft. Worth Airport, the largest in the world, it will share in the thrust of modern technology that will make this area a major cross-roads of the country and the church.

The Freetown elders have asked Lynn D. Yocum to direct this effort. He attended York College, Abilene Christian College, and received his B.S. degree from Oklahoma Christian College. He has done work toward the M.A. at Harding Graduate School, and has had extensive training in missions. Six of his thirteen years of preaching were spent as a missionary in South Vietnam and Hong Kong. In 1972 he assisted Stanley Morris in establishing the new Bible translation effort that is being carried on in Burlington, Mass. and Arlington, Texas. The World Mission Information Bank will be assisting this foreign translation effort by providing much of the country background data necessary. Lynn and his wife Carol have been working with the Freetown Road congregation in Grand Prairie since March of this year. As well as serving as the director of the Bank, he also leads a Missions Learning Center which is used to educate the entire Freetown Bible school on mission needs, and is involved in teaching international students at the nearby University of Texas at Arlington (UTA) campus.

The Freetown elders are now appealing to congregations for financial assistance and the sharing of mission data for this new work. Those wishing to receive more information should contact Lynn D. Yocum, World Mission Information Bank, Freetown Road Church of Christ, 1038 Freetown Rd., Grand Prairie, Texas 75050. Telephone (214) 262-8030; 263-9179.

Paul S. Gray, 613 Dale Avenue, Clarksburg, W. Va. 26301, Nov. 13: My meeting at Wayne was most enjoyable with fair to good attendance. Elmer Hayes, the regular preacher, directed the singing in a fine way. My more recent meeting at Pursley was also very pleasant. Emery Heintzman directed the singing in a fine way. My second meeting at Buckhannon was well advertised but not as well attended. Joe Brian who recently moved there from southern Illinois directed the singing with most appropriate songs.

Paul Southern, 858 Harrison, Abilene, Texas, Oct. 25: Two were baptized and four restored during the Burlington, N. C. meeting. I shall be with the Cedar Bayou church in Baytown, Texas, Oct 28-31, speaking on the theme, "Christianity, the Bible and Mental Health." Following the Baytown meeting I go to Blacksburg, Va.

Spirit works through the word as his instrument to convert and sanctify people they have proved that he dwells in us through the word. But one does not dwell through an instrument, though he may work through an instrument. The writer of the tract quotes through N. B. Hardeman as saying, "There is no such thing as the Spirit of God operating away or distinct from the written word." We who believe in the actual indwelling of the Holy Spirit believe this as confidently as Brother Hardeman believed it, but we believe that operating through the word is one thing and dwelling in us through the word is another thing. One is taught by the Lord and the other is not. But there is more to come.

2852 S. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colorado 80227

O. J. Russell, 4257 Abrams Road, Dallas, Texas 75214, Nov. 13: During October 21-24 I was involved in a fine gospel meeting with the Denton Drive church in Carrollton, Texas where brother Robert Howard has done a fine work as the local evangelist. Two were restored and one confessed sins. Brother Howard has now moved to Tulia, Texas. On November 4 through 7 we were involved in a series of evangelistic meetings in Canton, Texas. This meeting marked the opening of a commodious, beautiful and, elegant building in this rapidly growing county seat town. Three were restored and two confessed faults. It was good to be back in my own home county and to have fellowship with so many friends and Christians whom we have known in the past. Please note our change of address.

Adrian Cole, P. O. Box 66, Ames, Okla. 73718, Oct. 29: The church here has just closed a meeting with J. T. Marlin doing the preaching. Seven were restored and four baptized. The preaching was powerful and simple.

### COMMUNION BREAD

We keep on hand regularly a supply of fresh, pure, unleavened bread for communion purposes. Eleven wafers in the small carton and three of these cartons to the large carton—all carefully sealed so it will keep indefinitely. Every congregation should have on hand a good supply at all times. Price: Large carton, each, \$3.00, postpaid, if money is sent with order.

Firm Foundation Publishing House

Box 610, Austin, Texas 78767

# Free POSTERS

Free Samples of "Christian Attitudes Posters." Write on church letterhead to Bible Posters, 1030 Belvidere Drive, Nashville, Tennessee 37204.

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (5)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

This is the further study of a tract written by a prominent brother among us on the subject of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We now notice his argument against the actual indwelling on the ground that this would be an incarnation. We quote him fully.

Indeed, such a doctrine, that the Spirit literally inhabits the Christian, is the doctrine of incarnation! That the Holy Spirit is Deity—possessed of the divine nature, as much so as the Father or the Son—no one among us, in his right mind, will deny. "Incarnation," is the endowment of Deity with human flesh. Jesus became incarnate by literally and actually entering a fleshly body and living in it here on earth. If the literal occupancy of a human body by the second Person of the Godhead constituted incarnation, why does not the literal occupancy of human bodies by the third Person of the Godhead also constitute incarnation? We do not believe that anyone among us would affirm such; yet, to this conclusion the doctrine of a personal and literal indwelling irresistibly and conclusively leads.

In 57 years of preaching and 45 years of writing; in a lifetime of reading and many years of controversy and much of it on the subject of the Godhead, I have never read anything as wild as this assertion. And as proof that it is a mere human assertion all we need to notice is that the writer gave not one single quotation of scripture, no, not even a reference to a book, chapter, or verse: The first mistake our writer makes is in his definition of incarnation. He says, "Incarnation is the endowment of Deity with human flesh." To "endow" means to provide one with something. So according to our writer Deity was provided with a body of flesh in which to live. To him this is incarnation. That I am right in this conclusion the reader will notice that he said, "Jesus became incarnate by literally and actually entering a fleshly body and living in it here on earth." To the writer of the tract this is incarnation.

First, I object to this doctrine because it denies the humanity of Jesus. According to the writer of the tract under review, Mary did not give birth to a human being; she merely provided Deity with a body of flesh in which to live. A human being consists of an outward man (the body of flesh) and the inward man (the spirit that returns to God who gave it). That which Mary brought into the world was composed of a body of flesh and a human spirit of which Jesus on the cross could say, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit."

Next, I object to the writer's definition of incarnation. He seems to think that the mere indwelling of Deity in a human being is all that is comprehended in incarnation. If this is true John the Baptist was an example of incarnation, for he was filled with the Holy Spirit, Deity, from birth (Luke 1:15). The apostles were all filled with the Holy Spirit, so we have 13 more examples of incarnation. Of course our writer under review denies that the Holy Spirit merely influenced them and empowered them to work miracles, but the Bible says they were all filled with the Holy Spirit. But the biggest blunder of our writer is seen in Jesus. He argues that if the second Person of the Godhead dwelling in Jesus was incarnation, the actual indwelling of the third Person of the Godhead in us would be incarnation. Well, that the second Person did dwell in the body of Jesus is admitted by our writer; now, will he admit that the third Person of the Godhead, the Holy Spirit, came to Jesus at his baptism and actually dwelt in him? That is what the Bible says and surely he will not deny a plain statement of the Bible.

Was this a double incarnation of Jesus? And did the Holy Spirit become one person with Jesus? And was the indwelling permanent, as was the incarnation?

When the Word (Deity) became flesh (John 1:14); when God was manifested in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16); when he partook of flesh and blood (Heb. 2:14), the divine nature and the human nature formed one Person. There were not two persons in Jesus, though there were two natures. And this union of Deity and humanity in one Person was not a temporal arrangement for a third of a century; it will continue throughout eternity. He was the God-man on earth; he will be God-man in eternity. Our mediator is a man (1 Tim. 2:5); we will be judged by a man (Acts 17:31). But the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Christians is not a union of such nature; it is not a union of Deity with human nature for ever; it is not a union of a human person with a divine Person so as to form only one person. And the indwelling can be terminated if the human being becomes an unfit temple for Deity to indwell. The divine and the human composed one Person in Jesus before the Holy Spirit came to him. And the coming of the Holy Spirit to him was not another incarnation. We are a human person from birth and the coming of the Holy Spirit to us to make our body his temple is not a union of a divine Person with a human person so as to form one person any more than the coming of the Holy Spirit to Jesus at his baptism was to form one person of Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

But our writer under review is so pleased with his argument on incarnation that he concludes that if the second Person of Deity dwelling in human flesh made Jesus a proper object of worship, it would follow that the third Person of Deity (Holy Spirit) dwelling in us would make every Christian a proper object of worship; and that it would be just as proper for us to worship one another as it is for us to worship Jesus Christ. I have done some reading in my time, but I have never read anything as wild as this. Was John the Baptist a proper object of worship for the people of his time? He was filled with the Holy Spirit at his birth. Can you conceive of his parents and relatives who gathered to name him falling down before little John and worshiping him even as they worshiped God? Although Peter was filled with the Holy Spirit, he would not allow Cornelius to worship him. But though our writer under review denies that the Holy Spirit actually dwelt in Peter, a higher authority, even Jesus, said the Holy Spirit was with them while he was there, and that he would be "in" them when he (Jesus) went to the Father (John 14:17). So when Jesus went to the Father he sent the Holy Spirit on Pentecost in fulfillment of his promise that the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, would be "in" them. And Peter said God gave the Holy Spirit to them that obey, which included the apostles (Acts 5:32). Were these apostles proper objects of worship when the Holy Spirit was given to them? and while the Holy Spirit was "in" them? Our author of the tract under review says, "Such a prospect, as one Christian bowing before another, shocks and disgusts." That is true, but should it be any more shocking and disgusting than the idea that the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christians is an incarnation of Deity? or that the Holy Spirit coming to Jesus was a double incarnation? or that the Spirit dwelling in us makes us proper objects of worship?

Our writer under review bewails the fact that the belief of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit "leads to the view that the Spirit is simply or only an influence." It seems to me that his denial of the actual indwelling of the Spirit in John the Baptist and the apostles, and all Christians, and his affirmation that the indwelling means only that we are influenced by the teaching of the Spirit will contribute more to the belief that the Spirit "is simply or only an influence." Once more I remind the reader that I do not believe the indwelling of the Spirit enables us to work miracles or speak in tongues.

2852 S. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colo. 80227

## The Gift of the Holy Spirit (6)

ROY H. LANIER, SR.

Since my series on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit appeared in December I have been urged by readers to be sure to include a study of two verses of scripture which are supposed to be parallel and are supposed to prove beyond doubt that the Holy Spirit dwells in Christians through the word of God. Other scriptures reveal the fact of the indwelling, but these verses reveal the mode of the indwelling, we are told by brethren who insist that the Holy Spirit dwells in us through the word. And these verses are Ephesians 5:18, 19 and Colossians 3:16. The reader is requested to read them now before reading the rest of this article. But before studying the verses we need to determine what is meant by parallel verses of scripture. Webster says for two statements to be parallel there must be "conformity in essential parts." There are several different parts in these verses that are alike in word and thought. This is true to the extent that Expositor's Greek New Testament says they are partially parallel. I think it worthwhile to give an example of parallel verses to illustrate this matter of "conformity in essential parts." To do this I will use Acts 2:38 and 3:19 as follows:

Repent; be baptized; remission of sins; receive gift of Holy Spirit.

Repent; turn again; sins blotted out; refreshing, presence of Lord.

There are four "essential parts" in these verses. Some are identical in wording; all are identical in meaning. The "turn again" of 3:19 cannot mean repentance because it is preceded by the word repent. So we believe Peter meant for them to turn to the Lord by being baptized into Christ. Some may doubt that receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit and seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord mean the same thing, but I will not stop here to argue the point, though I think it is easy to prove. But some of the best minds among us for generations have made the point that these verses are parallel. If it can be proved that "be baptized" and "turn again" do not mean the same thing, the verses will be proved to be not parallel. And if "remission of sins" and "sins blotted out" do not mean the same thing, the verses are not parallel. Now let us arrange Ephesians 5:18, 19 and Colossians 3:16 as some brethren are doing, as follows:

Be filled; with Spirit; speaking; in psalms, etc.; singing, etc.

Dwell richly; word of Christ; teaching; with psalms; etc.; singing, etc.

Here we have five "essential parts" of these verses. Obviously four of them are alike in thought. But if to "be filled with the Spirit" and "the word of Christ dwell in you" are parallel, they must mean the same thing. We saw that to "be baptized" and to "turn again" are not identical in word, but if they are not identical in meaning the two verses are not parallel. So if to "be filled with the Spirit" and "the word of Christ dwell in you" are not identical in meaning, the two verses are not parallel at this point. I can remember when some brethren used these two verses, with John 6:63, to prove that the word is the Spirit, and the Spirit is the word.

But some of my brethren are saying these two phrases do not mean the same thing; they simply teach that the Holy Spirit dwells in us through the word. This is an arbitrary interpretation. Why not conclude that these verses teach us that the word dwells in us through the Spirit? I can read a dozen other verses that teach us that the word dwells in us through the Spirit, but

I challenge all my brethren to find one verse that teaches us that the Spirit dwells in us through the word. I deny that these two verses teach us the mode of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. In fact I deny that Ephesians 5:18, 19 teaches us that the Holy Spirit dwells in us. The command to "be filled with the Spirit" has no reference whatever to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

The words "be filled" are from a Greek word (*pleeroo*) and, according to Thayer means: "to make full, to fill, to fill up—followed by *en* with a dative of the instrument: *en pneumati*, Eph. 5:18" (Lexicon, p. 517). In this verse we have "en" with the dative case—"pneumati" and Thayer says it is instrumental—meaning that the Spirit is the instrument that fills us, not the content with which we are filled. Lenski says: "en does not state 'with' what we are to be filled. Paul is not stating with what we are to be filled, he has no opposite with 'wine.' He lets us gather what this filler is to be from the context: it is spiritual joy . . ." (Commentary, Eph. 5:18). The Expositor's Greek New Testament says: "The *en* may be taken, therefore, as the instrumental *en*, and the sense will be 'filled with or by the Spirit.' . . . The contrast is not between the instruments but between the states—between two elevated states, one due to the excitement of wine, the other to the inspiration and enlightenment of the Spirit." H. A. W. Meyer and Ellicott both say the same thing. So I conclude that the verse does not teach anything about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Again, when people are said to be filled with, or full of, the Holy Spirit the Greek phrase "*en pneumati*" is never used. T.K. Abbott says, "But the use of *en* with *pleeroo* to express the content with which a thing is filled would be quite unexampled" (International Critical Commentary, Eph. 5:18). I have checked every occurrence of the words *pleeroo* and *pleeres* used with the Holy Spirit and not one time is the Greek preposition "*en*" used with these words to denote the content with which a thing is filled. This is not only true with reference to the Holy Spirit, but it is true with such words as filled with anger, strife, righteousness, etc. This is also true of the Greek word "*pletho*." The reader might see Luke 1:15; Acts 2:4; 6:3, 5, 8; 19:28; Romans 1:29 and others.

It will be well to examine the phrase "*en pneumati*" (with, or by, the Spirit) as used in Ephesians 5:18. What is its meaning as used elsewhere? In Romans 15:16, we are said to be sanctified by the Spirit (*en pneumati*). This does not teach us that the Holy Spirit dwells in us; it simply says the Holy Spirit is the agent of our sanctification. We have the same expression in 1 Corinthians 6:11. In 1 Corinthians 12:9, we are told that spiritual gifts were given by the Spirit (*en pneumati*). Paul tells us that the gospel came to people "in the Holy Spirit" (1 Thess. 1:5). This same Greek phrase is used there. Many other examples of the use of this phrase could be cited, but these are enough to prove that it does not mean that the Spirit dwells in us. Since the phrase "*en pneumati*" is never used to teach us the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; and since other Greek phrases are always used to teach us about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, we are abundantly justified in concluding that Paul was not commanding us to be filled with the Holy Spirit, in the sense of his indwelling, in Ephesians 5:18. And, therefore, these two verses, Ephesians 5:18 and Colossians 3:16, do not teach us that the Holy Spirit dwells in us through the word of God. They do not teach us the mode of the indwelling of the Spirit.

But let no reader think for a moment that I believe the indwelling of the Spirit is the same as the baptism of the Spirit, or that the indwelling enables one to speak in tongues or perform other miracles. Three thousand people on the day of Pentecost received the indwelling of the Holy Spirit when they were baptized. But it is foolish to think they were baptized in the Spirit, or that they all were miracle workers, or could speak in tongues.

2852 S. Knoxville Way, Denver, Colo. 80227