

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Personal Indwelling of the Holy Spirit

June 25, 26, 28, 29, 2001

Pat Donahue/Tom Bright Debate on the Holy Spirit

Pat Donahue Side A Tape 1:

The proposition that I was to affirm the first two nights is the Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit dwells personally in faithful Christians and not just or only through the Word. Now in case my proposition doesn't make it clear, I believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in us representatively through the Word, when and to the extent that we purposely obey His teaching found in His Word. And I believe Ephesians 5:18b teaches representative dwelling through the Word because it's in command form. But I also believe and this is where Tom and I disagree and is the subject for the debate, I also believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in faithful Christians personally. Now you may not know what I mean by that but I think I can give an illustration that will help you understand the difference between Tom. President Bush could go to Iraq and negotiate personally with them or he could send a representative to negotiate for him. You see, if he sends a representative he will be there representatively to negotiate. But if he went himself that would be personally. He himself would be there. So he could do it either way or he could do it both ways. I believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in us representatively through the Word. That's just by definition. My father dwells in me to the extent that I obey the teaching he gave to me when I was brought up. But the Bible teaches something more than that, and that is that you receive something when you are baptized, and that is the Holy Spirit Himself personally, not just representatively.

First I would like to turn to Acts 2:38. This is a crucial verse, though not the only verse I will use tonight. In Acts 2:38, a verse we are all familiar with and it should settle the question. Peter told these people, **“Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.”** Now I want you to notice that there are two commands to be obeyed...repent and be baptized. Two blessings will be received if you obey the two commands.....the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. Everybody who repents at that time, each and every one of them, if they do that, of course with the right attitude, after having been a

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

believer, they will receive the remission of sins, and just as sure as they will receive the remission of sins, the verse teaches they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. It's not a maybe, or anything like that, not anymore than the remission of sins is a maybe--- every one of them. You may not understand yet why this is critical but you will when Tom gets up here, because Tom is going to contend that this gift of the Holy Spirit is the miraculous endowment or the miraculous gifts from the Holy Spirit. And as such we will agree that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, the power that came from the Holy Ghost to enable people to do miracles was only given to a select few at that time. If I then can prove that this is a universal thing, this gift of the Holy Spirit, then I can prove that it is not the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. You see that? That's why I will be laboring in this speech to prove in some of the passages that it's a universal thing.

Now the gift of the Holy Ghost, you know that is ambiguous in the English and I think also in the Greek. And it's ambiguous in this way...you say gift of the Holy Ghost and you could be talking about a gift that the Holy Spirit gives, and that is the way Tom will understand it. Or you could be talking about the Holy Ghost is the gift that is given. For example, in Ephesians 2:8 the Bible talks about salvation as being a gift of God. That means that God gives a gift, not that God is the gift. But here are some examples where we say gift of something and then we name the gift that is given, not the source of the gift. For an every day illustration, gift of money. Money is the gift, not the giver. Or Ezekiel 46:17 talks about a man who gave a gift of his inheritance. The inheritance is not the giver, the source of the gift; it's the gift itself. Romans 5:17, the gift of righteousness. 1 Corinthians 13:2, the gift of prophesy. "Gift of" names the gift. It can go either way, in the Greek or in the English. I think Tom will agree with that. Here's a sort of humorous example. When I got married about thirteen years ago, I received a gift of Carol. You know I received it in both ways, her father gave her away so she was a gift to me but also she gave me a gift, a ring. So I received a gift of Carol in both ways on my wedding day. Now I'm going to show by other passages tonight in this first speech (if I can get to them) that the gift of the Holy Ghost though it's ambiguous here, we are going to prove that the Holy Ghost is the gift itself. We are going to prove that by going to these passages.

First let's go to Acts 5:32. Now this doesn't say they are going to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, it says they will receive the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

is the gift. Acts 5:32 **“And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.”** So it’s not talking about something that the Holy Ghost gave. It’s saying that God gave the Holy Ghost to them that obey Him. This explains Acts 2:38. Acts 2:38 may have been ambiguous but this explains for sure what it’s talking about. The Holy Ghost is the gift of Acts 2:38. The Holy Ghost is the gift himself. That’s clear from Acts 5:32; it says the Holy Ghost whom God hath given. He is the gift. Now who gets the Holy Ghost according to Acts 5:32? Those that obey Him. That’s similar to Hebrews 5:9 where the Bible says that Jesus is the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Who is that talking about? That is all the Christians. Every single person who obeys Christ in the way that Christ has specified will receive salvation from the Lord. And so it’s the same way here – every person that obeys him, Acts 5:32, will receive this gift, that is the Holy Ghost.

Next turn to Luke 11:13. All of these passages prove my proposition. It would only take one, but all of them prove it, because all of them teach that the Holy Ghost is the thing that is given. And that we all, Christians then and today, still get the gift of the Holy Ghost. And that contradicts what Tom Bright will teach in this discussion. In Luke 11:13, the Bible says, Jesus speaking, “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?” Now the Holy Spirit is something that God will give to those that ask him. Now I don’t necessarily have time to do all this in this speech but if you compare this passage, that is Luke 11:9-13 with Matthew 7:7-11, you will see that they are almost exactly the same word for word. And they both start with ‘Ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find, and so forth. We all understand that this applies to everybody, not just to the apostles or a select few that received a miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit, it applies to everybody. When we talk about somebody in China who has not heard the gospel and we worry about him being saved, and somebody says that’s not fair. And we say, no, if they seek they will find. God will send somebody. We know that this passage applies to all, in Matthew 7. And all Matthew 7:7-11 and Luke 11:9-13 is just a continuation or elaboration of “ask and you will receive seek and you shall find,” that’s all it is. What I’m doing is showing the universality of Luke 11:13 where it says God will give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him. That’s everybody, not just a select few, not just a few Christians who receive the miraculous, this is everybody. Now you ask, well how did they ask? Well, it’s

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

not through prayer necessarily, because this is something that is given to somebody when they become a Christian. How do they ask? Well it's just like when we talk about it with a Baptist, and debate with a Baptist, they say well how can you call upon the name of the Lord? You have to pray. No, Acts 22:16, Ananias told Saul to arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord. So how do you ask for the remission of sins? How do you ask God to wash away your sins? You do that by calling upon God to wash away your sins by being baptized. How do you call upon God or ask God to give you the remission of sins if you are a non-Christian? You don't do this in prayer, he's already told you what to do. He says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. So if you want to ask God for the remission of sins you don't do it through prayer. You can do it by doing what he has told you to do. And the same thing for Act 2:38, how do you ask God for the Holy Ghost, Luke 11:13b? You do it by repenting and being baptized because He's already told you that if you will do that then you will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, Acts 2:38. So that's how you ask him to give you the Holy Spirit, according to Luke 11:13. Before I move on, remember in Luke 11:13 he named the Holy Ghost as the gift. The Holy Spirit is the thing that is given when you ask.

In John 7:38,39 the Bible says, **“He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)”** Now this talks in two places about people believing in Christ. The believers in Christ, that's not just some people, a select few, that's anybody who believes. Now what will they receive if they believe? They will receive the Holy Spirit is what it says. ‘This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive.’ You know in John 3:16 he said those that believe would receive everlasting life. They would not perish. Is that everybody or just a select few? This is pretty much the same wording and it says ‘they will receive the Spirit’. I believe it. They received the Spirit itself, every single one of them that believe. Of course we are talking about complete obedience, not the kind they have in John 12 where they weren't willing to confess. And so, in the three passages we've been through, the personal indwelling of the Holy Ghost is a conditional gift. If you believe, you will get the Holy Ghost according to the passage I'm at. Acts 2:38, if you repent and be baptized you will get the Holy Ghost. Acts 5:32, if you obey you get the Holy Ghost. And again notice in John 7, that the Holy Spirit is the thing that is given. It's not a gift from the Holy Spirit. The Holy

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Spirit is the thing that is given. That helps us with Acts 2:38. Who gets the Holy Ghost according to John 7:39? Twice it says that those who believe on him, that is all Christians get it. Not just a select few.

And then Romans 5:5, look at that in your Bible. It says, **“and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”** Again notice it’s the Holy Ghost that’s given, not the power from the Holy Ghost. Again, this helps explain Acts 2:38. Romans 5:5 shows that all Christians are given the Holy Spirit, because that who is under consideration in Romans 5:5, and we’ll prove that by the context if we need to.

I Thessalonians 4:8 reads, **“He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit.”** Now is it a gift from the Holy Spirit, is he the giver? No, he is the gift. Again this helps explain Acts 2:38. Who is promised the Holy Spirit, by I Thes 4:8? We’ll look at the context; those who are not to despise man, verse 8, by defrauding our brother in any matter, but instead are to show brotherly love, verse 9, for God hath not called us unto uncleanness but unto holiness, verse 7. Is that all Christians, or just to a select few, maybe just the apostles? That’s all the Christians, that’s the context of 1 Thes 4:8. That’s who will receive the Holy Spirit.

Titus 3:5,6 **“not by works of righteousness which we have done, (to start with who is that talking about, just the apostles, a select few, or is that everybody?) but according to his mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, (that’s every Christian, that’s how everybody becomes a Christian) and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;”** You see there, he says **‘the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which (talking about the Holy Ghost) He (I take that to be God the Father) shed on us** (or as the Greek would say poured out on us) **abundantly through Jesus Christ.’** The Holy Ghost is what is poured out from God. The Holy Ghost is the element of the pouring, not the one doing the pouring. In the American Standard Version, **‘renewing by the Holy Ghost whom He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ.’** NIV, **‘renewal by the Holy Spirit whom He poured out on us generously through Jesus Christ.’** NKJV, **‘renewing of the Holy Spirit, whom He poured out on us abundantly through Jesus Christ.’** By the way if I don’t state a version, it will be the old KJV. So who is promised the Holy Spirit, according to Titus 3:6? Those who are saved according to his

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

mercy. Is that just a select few Christians, or is that all of them? Justified by his grace, verse 7, is that every Christian or just a select few who received the miraculous, Tom? And made heirs of eternal life. I think it is very clear that is every Christian and it says they will receive the Holy Spirit. And that's what I'm talking about. This is not referring to the miraculous because only a select few Christians received the miraculous.

1 John 3:24 **“And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.”** Again it's not a gift from the Spirit, but the Spirit is the thing that is given. That helps us again to explain Acts 2:38. Who is promised the Holy Ghost according to 1 John 3:24? Well it's those who keep his commandments. Those whose prayers are answered, verse 22. Those who dwell in God and he in them. That's all Christians, not just a select few, not just the apostles and a few others. This passage teaches that all Christians are given the Holy Ghost, not just a select few.

1 John 4:13 is very similar, **“Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.”** Again the Holy Spirit is the thing that is given. It is not the source of the gift. God is the source, God the Father. Who was promised the Holy Spirit, according to 1 John 4:13? Those who dwell in God and he in them. That's all Christians, isn't it? Those who can have boldness in the day of judgment, I hope that's all Christians and not just the apostles. So the Holy Spirit is promised to all Christians here, not just to a select few. This is not talking about the miraculous.

Now back to Acts 2:38. When we've gone through six or eight different proof texts and most of them say just about the same thing and they all show that where Acts 2:38 is ambiguous, is it a gift from the Holy Ghost or is the Holy Ghost the gift himself, it is the Holy Ghost himself. The following verses prove that the gift of the Holy Ghost refers to the Holy Ghost himself as the gift. Just a summary of what we've done – give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him, the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive, the Holy Ghost whom God has given to them that obey him, Holy Ghost which is given to us, hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit, the Spirit which he hath given us. All say that the Holy Spirit is the thing that is given. Now Tom believes that in all or practically all of them, that it's referring to the miraculous measure and I've tried to show all the way through that it's not the miraculous measure. He believes that all

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

these passages that I've been going to are all talking about the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit or whatever he wants to call it, miraculous type. And so I've laboring to prove that these passages are universal to all Christians that show his view is not true.

But you may be here and you may be thinking that at least some of these passages it's not talking about the miraculous but they are not talking about the personal indwelling either but they are talking about the indwelling through the word. So I want to spend some time on that right here and I may not get to it all during the debate because I don't think Tom would disagree with this. But I want to remind you of an argument that has been used down through the years with the Pentecostals and that's this idea that when they claim you have to be baptized with the Holy Spirit to be saved, and we say no, that Holy Spirit baptism was a promise to be received and not a commandment to be obeyed. For example, I've got some quotes from some of the debates through the years. Here is Guy Woods vs. Benjamin Franklin in 1974. Guy Woods is basically talking about something that Mr. Franklin had said, he's a Pentecostal. Mr. Franklin argues the baptism of the Spirit is commanded as an essential. "There is not one word of truth in that, it was a promise. No where are we told that baptism of the Spirit is a command, it is always a promise. Holy Spirit baptism was a promise and no where in the Bible is it identifiable as a command whereas water baptism is a command." Harold Sane versus Albert Batts in 1965, page 203. "Whereas the baptismal measure of the Holy Spirit was promised to the apostles and you cannot obey a promise. And no one was ever commanded to be baptized of the Holy Spirit." And then I have a chart at home by Jim Deason whom many of you know. His chart – "#1 Holy Spirit baptism was a promise, not a command. #2 Promises cannot be obeyed. #3 To be filled with the Spirit, Eph 5:18, was a command. Therefore to be filled with the Spirit in Eph 5:18 was not Holy Spirit baptism." I agree with that. And I believe that Eph 5:18, to be filled with the Holy Spirit is not the personal indwelling. It is the representative dwelling through the Word as I mentioned at the very beginning of my speech because it is a command. But all these passages I've taken you to – Acts 2:38, 5:32, 1 John 3:24, Rom 5:5 and so forth. All those were a promise to be received, not a command to be obeyed. For example in Acts 2:38, it says if you repent and be baptized that is in effect letting the Holy Spirit dwell in you through the Word because that's obeying the Word. If you do that you receive two promises, the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. That is a promise to be received. Now by the same reason that we've been debating the

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Pentecostals through the years that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, since it's a promise to be received and is not something to be obeyed, by that same reasoning, I'm showing you that Acts 2:38 and the other passages that I've mentioned, besides Eph 5, are not the indwelling through the Word, that's something you obey, that's something we do. When we obey the Word, that's the indwelling through the Word, representatively. A promise to be received is what we are talking about. That is the personal indwelling through the Word. It has to be, it cannot be the indwelling through the Word.

I asked Tom a question and the question is so long he said I can't agree with all the question but I agree with the conclusion. What he is basically saying is he understands and agrees with Marion Fox whom I debated before, but since these passages in particular Acts 2:38 the gift of the Holy Spirit is a promise to be received and it's not talking about the indwelling through the Word which Eph 5:18 is talking about, he agrees with that. He agrees with that reasoning, he agrees with my conclusion. You see he doesn't believe Acts 2:38 is talking about the indwelling through the Word. He agrees with me that Eph 5:18 is, but Acts 2:38 is a promise to be received and he agrees therefore it can't be the indwelling through the Word. It's not a command to be obeyed. He thinks that it's the miraculous, but I've proven that it's not. I believe that it's the non-miraculous. We are not going to get far into my affirmative but let's try Eph 1:13,14. The Bible says, **"In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."** This personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit serves as earnest for the Christian. The passage says we are sealed with the Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit being an earnest. For our first installment, down payment, deposit, pledge, according to Thayer, until we receive heaven. Now 2 Cor 1:22, NKJV, he talks about this same idea and says **"....who also has sealed us and given us the Spirit in our hearts as a deposit."** 2 Cor 5:5 says **"....who also has given us the Spirit as a guarantee."** So this earnest is the Holy Spirit being given to us, what we've been talking about for the past twenty minutes. It serves as an earnest or a guarantee and it is the Holy Spirit being given to us. These two verses makes that clear. Thank you very much for your time.

Tom Bright –Side A Tape 1: It is a distinct honor and privilege for me to be here this evening to stand before you with the first of three speeches that I will

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

give in refutation of what bro. Donahue has presented relative to what he thinks proves the personal, literal, being of deity inside the physical body that you now look upon. But first of all before we do this, let me state that I agree with bro. Pat with the idea of our thanks to the elders of the congregation to allow us to use this building. We are thankful for your presence tonight and hope it will be beneficial to you. Until this evening I had never met bro. Donahue. I've heard some good things about him. I think he is a Christian gentleman. Certainly I do know that the Bible condemns debating, but the debating that is condemned upon the pages of inspiration is wranglings and argumentation and wars and fightings. Now I think that I can speak for bro. Pat at this time, I know that I can speak for myself, that though we do disagree on this basic argument, that there is no animosity at all in either one of our hearts relative to the other personality. This does not negate the fact that we will not press the issue, we will not press the points that we believe the Bible teaches. I do not believe that the personal indwelling that bro. Donahue and others of my brethren advocate is a issue of a matter of faith. But I believe that it is a doctrine that is very dangerous. First of all, I will say that I reject his argument because it allows, it gives the opportunity based upon how he defines it, of the Holy Spirit to do something for the Christian, separate and apart and distinct from the medium of the word of God. I suggest to you my friends there is only one way that a spirit can inhabit the body of another, and that is through a miracle. And I would like for bro. Pat to deal with this because I believe that this can be shown beyond a shadow of a reasonable doubt. I want to spend the next few moments before I get into dealing with the very charts that bro. Donahue used. I'd like to ask you to study with me for just a moment. And I want to meditate upon a word that is pronounced anachronism. Now that is a fancy word for such a small man as myself. But anachronism is simply taking something out of its chronological time slot and putting it in another one. I believe that we can show various instances of the Bible where this was certainly done. That is the idea of the Holy Spirit and the various things that He did. I want you to turn in your Bible to some passages that we want to look at. Notice in 1 Cor 14:39, it is the context wherein the apostle Paul is dealing with the miraculous manifestations of the Spirit and he says **"Wherefore brethren, covet to prophesy and forbid not to speak with tongues."** The individual who takes that passage today and applies it to the Christian in the twenty-first century, is guilty of taking passages out of their proper time frame and using them in a time frame that God did not intend for them to be used. Furthermore, as we look at this basic idea, there are other things that we could state. For instance in Gen 6:14, God told Noah to build an

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

ark of gopher wood. But I don't know of anyone today that is building an ark of gopher wood and I think that most of us would say that a man is crazy who would begin to build an ark of gopher wood and argue that God had told him to do that. We understand that he would be taking it out of its proper time frame. And thus as we look at many of the passages that bro. Donahue has presented, we are going to show that he has done this very thing. Friends I want to roll back the clock 2000 years for just a few moments and let us try to put our minds in place right before Jesus was born. A little over a year before the Master was born of the virgin birth, the Bible tells us that the angel Gabriel appeared to Zechariah and he promised him a son that was going to be the forerunner of the Christ. This was, as it were, the bringing up of the curtain on the final act of God's scheme of redemption. And it is at this time that there is introduced a particular series of events that has never transpired since that time and had never transpired before that time. It is a period that lasted some forty years, approximately. And you remember that for three and one half years Jesus walked upon the face of the earth and is commonly referred to as His personal ministry. And certainly we understand that Jesus went to the cross, that he died and ultimately was resurrected. And it was that the first century church then went throughout the four corners of the world according to the command of our Master to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost and dying world. Friends there are events in that particular time period as I said that never happened prior to that, and they certainly have not happened since. That does not mean that all things that are mentioned there or statements that are made do not have application to you and me. But I do not hesitate to say that there are some instances of some things that certainly do not apply to you and me today because they are dispensational in nature. Turn to Ephe 2:8. Paul on this occasion says **"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:"**. Now bro. Donahue likes to use the word universal relative to the promises of all of these passages that he has presented for your consideration. I think all of us would agree that Ephe 2:8 is indeed universal. It was universal then and it is universal now. It was applicable to Christians then and it is applicable to Christians now. Now turn to Ephe 4:7 and following, **"But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ, Wherefore he saith, when he ascended upon high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?.....And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;"** Now Ephe 2:8 was universal then and it is universal

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

now. But friends I ask you is Ephe 4:7, that immediate context, is that universal tonight? Now according to what bro. Donahue is saying, he is going to have to respond in the affirmative. This is dispensational in nature, because it has application to the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit that were given to confirm and substantiate that Jesus Christ was indeed the resurrected Saviour and that those individuals who were proclaiming salvation in him were indeed teaching the truth. So bro. Donahue takes the universal and he makes everything universal. Now I want to encourage you, I believe there are some statements, some aspects of the first century, in fact many of them, are applicable to you and me. But when you take the first century dispensational promises and the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit and try to apply it to the twenty first century, then you have the very thing that bro. Donahue argued in the first twenty minutes of his speech. We are going to show this beyond a shadow of a reasonable doubt. Let's look at Acts 2:38, the passage he introduced first of all. I believe it was bro. Foy Wallace that used to say that Acts 2 and the events therein is indeed the hub of the Bible. Here it is that we have all things coming together. Every prophesy in one way or another prior to this had something to do with centering upon Acts 2. And every statement after that, my friend, relative to the NT church, in some way or another relates back to Acts 2. Here is the establishment of New Testament Christianity and it was indeed the principles that are set forth relative to the descent of the Holy Spirit and His power upon the apostles at this particular time. As we look at Acts 2:38, the apostle Peter speaks relative to the idea of the gift of the Holy Spirit and bro. Donahue says that is the person of the Holy Spirit himself. I asked him a question relative to the idea and I said when do the twelve apostles receive, according to your view, the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit? And he said when they became Christians. Well, when did they become Christians, Pat? That's what we want to know. But furthermore, as you look at Act 2:38 and following, notice the statement that is made here, **".....ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."** Ladies and gentlemen, the background of Acts 2 is Joel 2 and the reason that I know this is because that back in verse 16 and following, the apostle Peter quotes Joel 2 or refers to it and he says the things you are seeing is the prophesy of Joel. Well what did Joel prophesy in that? What did he state? What is it and I ask everybody this particular question and the five questions that we presented there? What did Peter say in the sermon that would lead any of his hearers to come to the conclusion that the personal, the person, deity himself, would enter

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

the body of the Christian at baptism to lead one to that conclusion and he said everything that Peter said, or words to that effect. But friends, he's not promising the Holy Spirit himself. He is promising the gift of the Holy Spirit. Bro. Donahue says it is the gift which is the Holy Spirit but indeed it is not. It is the gift which comes from the Holy Spirit. Turn to Acts 10:44 and following, in the house of Cornelius, you will find that on this occasion when the Spirit descended upon the gentile house of Cornelius, that it is referred to as the gift of the Holy Spirit. Friends, there are two times that this phrase appears and I suggest that in both instances you can definitely see a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit. Let's dispensationalize these, let's put them in their proper time frame. Let's know that the many things stated there indeed are universal to you and to me, but there are some things that were written in this day and time, that is back in the first century that does not apply to you and to me. We can look at John 14 and 15, we can look at John 16:12 and following and there we find Jesus as He is telling His apostles that the Spirit is going to come upon them and He's going to reveal some things unto them and show them things to come. That's talking about things of inspiration. Let's go on to another passage that our friend introduced here, and I mean this literally, I do not consider bro. Pat an enemy of mine. Turn to Luke 11:13. Bro. Pat introduced this passage, and he furthermore referred to its parallel at least in the words, whether the exact time is parallel or not, is not important. Jesus said basically the same thing there that he said in Luke 11:13. But there is one difference, folks, look at Matthew 7:11 "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" I want to ask you a question. Is the good things of Matthew 7:11, the thing or that Holy Spirit that he mentioned in Luke 11:13? Now either it is, or it isn't. And if it is are we going to look upon that literally and say that the Holy Spirit is good things? No my friends, this is a figure of speech of metonymy. Metonymy uses one word in place of another. It's referring to something that is similar to, or in some way connected but it uses another word. If I were to tell you, I just listened to the radio and Washington raised our taxes again. How many of you would think that the state of Washington or the city of Washington, D.C. literally raised our taxes? You would know that I was using a figure of speech. It is congress that has done it. Well, that is what he is saying here. And many times the concept of things, the word *things* is used relative to inspiration. I want to suggest some thoughts. Turn to John 16:12,13 and notice with me. Here is an event when there are eleven apostles that are with Jesus and he is telling them in these chapters, basically of some things that are on the horizon.

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

But I want you to notice starting in John 16:12 **“I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.”** That is a passage where Jesus is saying the Holy Spirit is going to come and he is going to guide them into all truth. Does that mean *everybody*? Is that universal? Oh yes everybody is going to receive the benefits of what he is saying but that’s not the question I’m asking, folks. He will guide *you*. Who is the *you*? Everybody – or is it dispensational in nature? Oh yes I have received the benefits of what Jesus had reference there to but that promise is not to me. And so the things of Matthew 7:11 is equal to the Holy Spirit and it’s put there for the things that were going to come and they were going to be indeed, revelation. Now turn to 1 Cor 2. Here the apostle Paul is contrasting the wisdom of the world with the foolishness of God. Understand that this particular reading, beginning back in chapter 1, the foolishness of God is the scheme of redemption, the gospel of our Master, as it is being viewed through the eyes of these philosophers that Paul has under consideration. And he is just merely using their terminology and he is referring to that, the gospel as the foolishness of God. Now watch this, verse 9 of 1 Cor 2 **“But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit:”** What’s the *things* of 1 Cor 2:9,10? The same *things*, my friends, as Matthew 7:11, which the Master used again in Luke 11:13 and he called it the Holy Spirit. But it is the *things* of inspiration that is under consideration. Now I’m not saying every time the word things is used in the Bible refers to inspiration or the miraculous. Look at verse 1 Cor 2:11, **“For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things.....”** Ladies and gentlemen that is not a funeral text about heaven. That is a passage that is dealing with divine inspiration, verbal inspiration, and Paul is talking about the revelation of the scheme of redemption through those chosen human channels. It was not coming from the wisdom of the world. It was coming by inspiration. And by inspiration they were receiving the *things* of the Spirit of God. Now notice what he says in verse 13, **“Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual**

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

things with spiritual.” Now friends, I don’t have time to deal with all the passages that bro. Pat dealt with but I have shown you beyond the shadow of a doubt that Luke 11:13 does not refer to the person of the Holy Spirit but it refers to that which the Holy Spirit was to reveal and that is the good things of Matthew 7:11. It is referring to the Holy Spirit used by metonymy of that which he was to do and it was the work of revelation. I wish I had time to deal with these other passages but I’m sure that in this particular discussion that time will avail itself. I want to thank you very much for your kind attention.

Pat Donahue Side B Tape 1 -- Let me finish with what I was saying before when I had to quit. We see Ephesians 1 is talking about the Holy Spirit is given as an earnest, a down payment, pledge, whichever one you want to use to define it. Some other passages that mention that same earnest, show specifically that what its talking about is the Holy Spirit that is given to us. 2 Cor 5:5 God also hath given us the Spirit as a guarantee or earnest, KJV. Who is promised the Holy Spirit in all of these passages? All Christians. Now I think you would agree with that. I don’t understand why he doesn’t think that all Christians are under consideration in this passage. He needs to tell us. Now let’s go to chart #7. And the reason I’m putting this chart up at this time, because the first thing he said in his speech, at least according to my notes, he said, the dangerous thing about Pat’s doctrine, he said he doesn’t think this is a matter of faith, but by the way, I don’t think it is either, necessarily. I don’t think a person is necessarily going to be lost because he disagrees with me on this issue. But these brethren think it’s very important so I agreed to debate it and they think it’s dangerous. He said because it will allow the Holy Spirit to do something for the Christian separate and apart from the Word. Well, I know of one thing the Holy Spirit does do separate and apart from the Word. Now I don’t think He does a lot of the things necessarily that Mac Dever thinks that he does. But I know of at least one thing that the Holy Spirit does for the Christian separate and apart from the Word. And I’m not ashamed or scared to say it because the Bible says it. In Romans 8:26,27 the Bible says **“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities:”** (if you note the context of this passage and we can do that more later if we need to; it’s talking about the Holy Spirit all throughout the whole thing) **“for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.”** The Holy Spirit intercedes for the Christian and He does this – he makes intercession for

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And I know the Word of God does not do that. The Word of God does not intercede for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. Now I don't know why it would be dangerous to believe exactly what the text says but if it is dangerous, I'll go ahead and have to be dangerous about it, because the Bible says clearly that the Holy Spirit intercedes for us with groanings which cannot be uttered, and that is certainly something that the Word of God does not do. And then he said it would have to be a miracle if the Holy Spirit could dwell in a human body. I do believe the Holy Spirit dwells in the human body, because I'm going to give you in just a minute 1 Cor 6:19 and it says the Holy Spirit is in *you*. He says it would have to be a miracle to do that. I don't care what you call it. Mark Ward here gave me good illustration the other day to help you understand, you brethren. You know God, the nature of God, can hear and understand and answer the prayers of a million Christians at one time. He doesn't have any problem in doing that. He understands all of them and can answer all of them. Yes or no. He can do a million of them at one time. You know if I could do that it would be a miracle, but when God does something like that I wouldn't call it a miracle, I'd say that's just the nature of God. He can do that all he wants to, and he does it, because that's what God does, He's deity. He has no problem doing things that would be for me a miracle. But I wouldn't call it a miracle because God does that routinely, things that I can't do, because He's God. God has no problem putting the Holy Spirit inside of a human body. If you think that He can't, then you think God is powerless. He has no problem, God can do what He wants to. We don't need to try and box Him in and say I don't think God can do that. No, God can do it. There's no problem because He says He will and He says that He did when He said the Holy Spirit is in you. In 1 Cor 6:18,19, the Bible says, **"Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. What! Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?"** Now we can make this complicated or we can just understand what Paul's simple argument is here. The Christian's body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. Therefore don't defile the Holy Spirit's temple by sinning with or against the body and specific sin he's talking about here is fornication. Our bodies are the temple of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is in *you* according to this passage. The evidence for my proposition is overwhelming. Then he brought up Ephesians 4:7-11. Well, Tom, there is a difference between Ephesians 4 and Acts 2:38. Where in Ephesians 4:7-11, which is dispensational, it talks about the apostles and the prophets, things that

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

are miraculous, things that 1 Cor 13 says would cease, where does it say that all those who would repent and be baptized would be apostles and or prophets. Now if it said that you would have something there, Tom, you'd have a point, see. But Acts 2:38 says 'repent and be baptized for the remission of sins'. Do you think that's universal to all Christians? Well then, the gift of the Holy Ghost would also have to be universal because you have two commands that you have to obey and then two results from obeying those commands. So Ephesians 4 doesn't say repent and be baptized and you'll become an apostle or a prophet. If it did, you'd have a point. Acts 2:38 says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and you *shall* receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. The ---dictionary (?)has that point ---says '*the word shall when used in the second or third person, means definitely will*'. Now in the first person it normally means something in the future but in the second or third person, it means definitely will. A person who repented and was baptized on the day of Pentecost shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. That means they definitely would, not maybe, if someone laid hands on them later. Marion Fox said probably they would get the hands laid on them. Shall means definitely will just as much as it does in Mark 16:16 "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Does that mean might, probably, as Marion Fox says about *shall* in Acts 2:38. No it means definitely will be saved if they believe and are baptized. And that's exactly what *shall* receive the gift of the Holy Ghost means in Acts 2:38, definitely will. My question written for Tom tonight is, do you agree with the following quote from Marion Fox in his debate with Mac Dever on page 229, and I have the little red book on that debate if you want to look on page 229 later. Marion said that "we would argue then that the same expression *gift of the Holy Spirit* in Acts 10:45 has the same meaning in Acts 2:38". And by the way in his last speech he basically made that point. You have gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 for it has to mean the same in Acts 10:45 because it says gift of the Holy Spirit. The expression gift of the Holy Spirit is only found twice in all of God's Word. He's saying that the same expression found in Acts 10:45 has the same meaning in Acts 2:38. That's how Marion put it. Listen carefully. They are the same in that the gift in both places is the Holy Ghost himself. In Acts 2:38 and Acts 10:45, in both places the Holy Ghost was given. Now the difference is that they had two different functions. In Acts 10:45 He was to enable Cornelius's household to perform miracles. But in Acts 2:38 and Ephesians 1 the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the giving of the Holy Spirit himself was given as the earnest, not for them to be able to do miracles but to be the earnest. In Acts 10:45 it -----the gift of the Holy Spirit. And that brings us to this point Tom. These

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

gifts, though they are the ----they have to be different in this sense. Notice in Acts 2:38 he mentions the gift of the Holy Ghost for baptism ---they had to be baptized to get the gift of the Holy Ghost. Just like they had to do those two things to get the remission of sins, they had to do those two things to get the gift of Holy Ghost. But in Acts 10:45, Cornelius and his household received that gift of the Holy Ghost, the miraculous measure before they were ever baptized. So they have to be different. They cannot be the same. And so that proves beyond a shadow of a doubt, Tom, that Acts 2:38 cannot be talking about the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit. The miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit can be received before a person obeys the gospel. Acts 10:45, Cornelius got it. Acts 2:38 and Acts 5:32, that gift of the Holy Spirit cannot be received until somebody obeys the gospel. As a matter of fact, in Galatians 4:6 says **“Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.”** Because ye are sons, God sent His Spirit. Does that sound like what Cornelius received? Was he a son at that time? Did he receive that gift of the Holy Spirit because he was a son? It would be impossible, he wasn't a son yet. You see Galatians 4:6 is talking about the same thing as Acts 2:38 and Acts 5:32. You have to repent and be baptized to get it. You have to obey the gospel to get it. Cornelius hadn't done that yet. That shows conclusively that Acts 2:38 is not talking about the miraculous measure as he claims it is in Acts 10:45. So the gift of the Holy Spirit, since it does not refer to the miraculous measure of the Spirit, can't be, since it's not referring to the indwelling through the Word, and we agree on that, I showed some arguments in my last speech to prove that, it must be the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. I would like to take you to Acts 2:38,39 and show you that this is universal, that this gift of the Holy Spirit goes to everybody, not just to a select few but to everybody. You remember he mentions John 14 – 15 about the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth. That was directed to the apostles, not to everybody. This is written to all of these people who weren't Christians, that if they repent and be baptized, they would receive the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. Not just to the apostles, as John 14 –15 was addressed. And then you mentioned 1 Cor 2, where does it say that those who obey, like in Acts 5:32, things will be revealed to them? Talking about Revelation there, where does it say that those who repent and be baptized or those that obey the gospel will have things revealed to them? If you found that, then you would have a point. But you don't have a point. Now let's notice Acts 2, I think that Peter with God, went out of his way to show that Acts 2:38 was universal. We quoted Acts 2:38 many times in this discussion already **“Repent and be**

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” Now if you couldn’t tell that was universal, look at verse 39, **“For the promise is unto you,** (that’s to those Jews there) **and to your children,** (that would be the Jews throughout history, remember the phrase for example in Acts 7, the children of Israel, your children, that would be all the rest of the Jews down through history, the children of Israel, then it says) **and to all that are afar off,** (who is that? I think most of you know but turn to Ephesians 2:13,17 “but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.” Now verse 11 defines that as talking about the Gentiles and I think Tom would agree that’s talking about all the Gentiles. In other words this is talking about that Jesus came and broke down the middle wall of partition, verse 14, between the Jew and Gentile, so those that are afar off are Gentiles. They were afar off under the Old Testament. They weren’t part of that covenant but they were called the afar off, but now they are brought together with the Jews. They are not afar off anymore. That’s the Jews, all of the Jews, afar off. Now in Acts 2:39 it says to you and your children, to all that are afar off. That little word *all* was added. In Ephesians 2, it didn’t say all that are afar off, it just said those that are afar off. I believe he would agree, and I know all of the audience would agree with me, that’s talking about all the Gentiles. Now this verse says all them that are afar off. Does that sound like it’s just talking about the apostles? Cornelius and his household and a few others that received the miraculous measure? That’s who the promise of Acts 2:38 is to, to the Jews that were there, to you to your children, that’s the children of Israel, to all that are afar off, that’s all the Gentiles, **“even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”** Who is that? Well anybody that’s been studying their Bible any time at all, would know that’s talking about all the Christians. Remember in 2 Thes 2:14, that God calls people by the gospel. This says as many **as the Lord our God shall call.** I believe in Romans 8, we have the calling, the same calling, but referred to in the sense of the successful calling. Okay. Who is that – as many as the Lord our God shall call. Is that a call for miraculous offices. That’s what Marion said, I don’t know what Tom will say. But no it’s not. You notice that this passage is quoted from Joel 2. Many of us realize that in Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13 where it says whoever call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, it’s quoted from Joel 2. And that’s true. In Joel 2 the first part of verse 32. **“It shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered:”** That’s quoted in Acts 2:21 and Romans 10:13. But now notice this phrase in Acts 2:39

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

as many as the Lord our God shall call is also quoted is also quoted in Joel 2:32. Keep reading verse 32, **“And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered:** (Now notice it’s talking about deliverance, salvation, not a call to miraculous offices. That’s why I’m going back here to show you what we’re talking about) **for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance,** (I believe that’s talking about deliverance through Jesus Christ, deliverance from sin.) **As the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call.”** We’re that remnant, Christians. We’re called to deliverance, salvation, deliverance from sin. Deliverance is not miraculous offices. That doesn’t have anything to do with delivery. And so that’s in Acts 2:38. How could you make it any clearer, to show that the promise of receiving the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, will be given to everybody who repents and is baptized, and not just a few? Then verse 39, **to you,** that’s all the Jews there, **and to your children,** that’s the rest of the Jews down throughout history, the children of Israel, **to all that are afar off,** that’s all the Gentiles, **even as many as the Lord our God shall call,** that’s just a repeat of all the other phrases. Just to double emphasize that it’s talking about all the Christians. Anybody who will repent and be baptized will receive that. And he thinks that’s just the miraculous offices, the baptism of the Holy Ghost as we normally call it, the laying on of hands, just a few select Christians at that time. I think you can see that that’s not correct. That’s talking about everybody. You ought to know that, because who would think that the remission of sins here is only to a select few? Nobody. And nobody would have ever come up with this idea that the gift of the Holy Ghost was only to a select few. And so they came up with this theory and they needed a (?) and so what they had to do is they have to, in my opinion, reject the plain meaning of many, many passages, because it doesn’t fit with their system of interpretation. And why do that? Why not just accept the plain meaning of this passage and the others? Why even have a system of interpretation, why not just read what the Bible verses say and just believe them? I mean that’s clear. Why would anybody come up with this idea, that this wasn’t talking to all? When it says to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. How would you ever get out of that verse that it’s just talking to a few people? I don’t know how you would ever do that. Now let’s go back to Luke 11. I want to show you that this is universal. If you want to you can read in Matthew 7:7-11 and I will be reading Luke 11:9-13. An again there if you notice in Matthew 7 he says your heavenly Father will give good gifts to the people. This says he will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Let me read that from Matthew 7:11 **“...how**

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" And Luke 11, the parallel passage says the Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Now you would think that what you have proved by the fact that those are two different phrases that the Holy Spirit was one of the good things that the Father would give if you ask. That's what you would think. In one place it says He will give good things to those who ask and the other parallel place he says he will give the Holy Spirit to those who ask. You would think that he's saying the Holy Spirit is one of the good things that he would give. You really think he meant the Holy Spirit is not the Holy Spirit here? That he meant something else by the Holy Spirit? You wouldn't think that. You would think that he meant he was going to give the Holy Spirit to those that ask him, those who repent and be baptized, that how you ask him. You would think that he meant that and that is one of the good things. Now everybody look at Luke 11:9 and see if it's not universal. **"And I say unto you, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find;** (is that just for a select group of people or is that for everybody, Tom) **knock, and it shall be opened unto you.** (who is that you, just a select group of people who received the miraculous measure. Is that dispensational or is that to everybody) **For every one that asketh receiveth;** (I thought that applied to me Tom) **and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.** (Until we came up with this doctrine that Tom conscientiously believes, nobody would ever have thought this was talking just about the miraculous, because it's obvious it's talking about every Christian We've always explained it that way because that's the correct way to explain it. We've always said about those folks in China, what about them, they don't have the chance to hear the gospel. If they seek they will find. Not just a few people who were chosen to be apostles in China but everybody. That's the way we've always explained it, and it's the correct way to explain it. We don't need to change now, just because somebody thinks it makes it easier to debate the Pentecostals. **"If a son shall ask bread of any of that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion?"** God is generous, He gives what we ask, if it's according to His will. **"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?"** Neither verse, not talking about the miraculous endowments, because it's everybody. That is very clear, believe it.

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Tom Bright: Side B Tape 1 -- It's a joy to be back for the second speech this evening in response to what bro. Pat has said. I think when this day is over that bro. Pat and I still will not be agreeable for there is just not enough time but it's just something we will have to deal with. First of all I want to deal with what he said relative to Ephesians 4:7,8 and in that particular context he totally missed the point I was making and the argument he made didn't even deal with the argument that I made. I was just simply showing, you remember I introduced the word *anachronism*? Well Pat is taking many passages out of its proper context and placing it and giving it a twenty-first century interpretation. Now I want to keep that word before you – *anachronism*. And friends it just won't work when you take something out that had miraculous aspects attached to it and then applying it to a twenty-first Christian as if it had certain applications and put a twenty-first century interpretation upon the people in the first century. We are certainly familiar with those New Testament Christians with the concept of being indeed within the miraculous period of time. And so what he stated about it not mentioning baptism has nothing to do with it. I mentioned that **grace** in Ephesians 2:8, was universal then, and it is universal now. Whereas in Ephesians 4:7 concerning the gift of Christ, etc. etc. and the miraculous, that was universal then, but it is not applicable today, friends. And that was the point I was making. And so his response indeed was a total misfire. It is indeed that some things that are stated are universal. Repentance and baptism is universal, it was then, it is now. Before we go to Acts, I want you to look in Ephesians 1:13,14. Bro. Pat says that the Holy Spirit is the earnest and the seal that is given here. That is his basic argument, the Holy Spirit, the person, is the earnest and the seal. Friends when you look at verse 14, the word that in the KJV is translated **which** refers back to its antecedent **word**. It is not the Holy Spirit that is under consideration but it is the **word**, and it is that guarantee. Notice it something that is given as a guarantee. God inspired the Word and he confirmed it by the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit and so when we look at that we know beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is the **Word**. Now the second question that I asked bro. Pat, I said, according to your view of the Holy Spirit being a **seal**, Ephesians 1:13,14, is that something known by any single one or any combination of the five senses of a person receiving this particular **seal**. He said no. Because the Word, friend, we ultimately have to go back to the Word. Now before this debate is over Pat is going to explain to us what the **seal** does, and what he is exactly, and we are going to be looking forward to that. Now I want to deal with Romans 8:26, 27. When he presents the idea that here is something that the Holy Spirit does for the Christian that the Word does not do.

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

Friend, first of all, would you observe that which is under contemplation is intercession. And it is intercession at the throne of God. If that is the Holy Spirit, and I am convinced that it is not, when we have the idea that it is the transpiring in Heaven and you don't need the personal literal indwelling of the Holy Spirit for intercession. And so even if he were correct, which I'm convinced that he is not, then indeed, it is that which transpires in Heaven. Another thought that I would like to bring to your attention in Romans 8:26,27, **“Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings** (I want to ask a question, the Greek word here means groanings which cannot be uttered, inarticulate, inexplicable. Do you conceive of a Holy Spirit being in such a position as that? The Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead as we normally refer to him, is so incapable and unable to express himself. Now that's what this doctrine is teaching that bro. Pat is advocating that it is the Holy Spirit that does the intercession. The fact of the matter, my friends, it is the woman's spirit that is under consideration. I don't have time to go into that but as you look at the spirit, the word spirit, every time it is used in Romans 8, you are going to find it is used in different ideas. There is the spirit of his Son, there is the spirit of bondage in verse 14, the spirit of adoption in verse 15, and so the word spirit is used in more than one way in that very chapter. And so on this particular occasion it is the individual who is undergoing great trials and tribulations and there is that constant warfare that he introduces back in chapter 7 and it is to that point that sometimes we reach a point that we don't really how we ought to pray. And so he who knows the mind of the spirit, who is that, is that the Holy Spirit? Well friends that wouldn't make sense that it's the Holy Spirit and certainly it wouldn't make sense to say that it is God. We understand that. I am of the deepest persuasion and I believe bro. Pat would agree with me beyond a shadow of a doubt. The Holy Spirit does not know one single thing that God the Father does not know, or that Christ the Son does not know. But if we understand that it is the human spirit that is under consideration and it is groaning and it is unable to express certain thoughts and then we find the great intercessor, notice if you would my friends, the one who knoweth the mind is not the spirit, gramatically speaking, but it certainly refers to him who in verse 34 is referred to as our intercessor. And that is the Lord Jesus Christ. And so here is the picture that is painted, at times we don't know how to pray as we ought. And so, he that knoweth the mind of a human spirit, that's Christ, and he makes intercession for us at the throne of God. Even if it were as I said the Holy Spirit, it's still in heaven, it's not here on earth. Look then there are other things

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

that I want to look at concerning the idea of Acts 2 because bro. Pat is saying that this is the gift of the Holy Spirit and it is different than the events of Acts 10 because there it was on the unconverted and presents the idea that you can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit in my view when you are not a Christian. Friends I mentioned a while ago, let's put this in a first century context, which was a special period of time, and the events at the house of Cornelius were and understand I'm using that in a hyperbole, were indeed very special. It was shown beyond a shadow of a doubt that God was accepting the Gentiles. And there was a miracle poured out upon the Gentiles to convince the Jews that God was going to accept the Gentiles. Even an inspired apostle could have gone in and made the statement, well I preached the gospel to them and laid my hands upon them, they wouldn't have accepted it. Turn to Acts 15. Here is a Jerusalem conference and here the apostle Peter and others are found at Jerusalem and they are settling the matter as it were did the Gentiles have to be circumcised to be saved? And notice if you would, that an idea is presented in verse Acts 15:8 and here is the apostle Peter **"And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us;"** Many people look at that and say God knew the Gentile heart. No he knew the obstinate Jewish heart, they would not accept the Gentiles. It took a miracle. That's the difference my friends there but the fact is Acts 10 and Acts 2 are still miraculous. Now let's turn over to Acts 2 and notice here, he says the gift of the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit himself. Okay. Then in John 4:10, Jesus said to the woman at the well in Samaria if thou knewest the gift of God, so if the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 is the Spirit himself then why isn't the gift of God in John 4:10 God himself. Furthermore notice the idea that is presented in Ephesians 4:7 concerning the idea that to every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. If the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 is the Holy Spirit himself, why isn't the gift of Christ, Christ himself? What makes the difference? I know there's a lot of difference but I'm saying why does he say the gift of God in John 4:10 is not God himself and the gift of Christ in Ephesians 4:7 is not Christ himself, I'm assuming he's going to make that statement; and then turn around and have the idea that the gift of the Holy Spirit is indeed the Holy Spirit himself. Joel 2 is the background of this. He mentioned prophesies, visions and dreams, and that's what he mentions in Acts 2:17, and furthermore seeing the apostle Peter is quoting in Acts 2:17 and following, he says **"And I will pour out of my Spirit"** Friends this is a verb prefixed by a (?) preposition. Now all that means in the Greek, and I can explain it where I can understand it, so I know you can, being intelligent people.

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

The concept of the (?) in the Greek is the idea of that which is poured from an origin or source, he is pouring out from the Holy Spirit. He not only used the verb pour out with the prefix (?) proposition, but immediately following that is another (?) . Friends it is the preposition of (?). Friends the gift of the Holy Spirit does not refer to the Holy Spirit himself. It is that which is pouring out from the Spirit. And that is the power. Now let us go look at another place. He says the promise, that is a universal promise in Acts 2:39 'For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all them that are afar off'. Turn to Joel 1:2,3. I wonder why our friend here is going to allow us to let Joel define who the children are. You see he's offering it is posterity. Many generations, that's his basic argument. And if I'm not correct on that, I know bro. Pat will correct me. Now let's look at Joel 1:2,3 "Hear this, ye old men, and give ear, all ye inhabitants of the land. Hath this been in your days, or even in the days of your fathers? Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation." Now let's put the definition in place of the word children. That's a good way to look at that. Look at verse 3 "Tell ye your posterity of it, and let your posterity tell their posterity and their posterity another generation." Friends children is one generation as under consideration here. In fact we need to understand that beyond a shadow of a doubt it appears seven times in the entire New Testament and it applies to one generation. The promise, the promise is to you. You know right here John the Baptist said ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost with fire. I believe that is a selected few of the whole or part. Some of the Jews were going to receive the baptism of fire which would be destruction. And so when we say the baptism of the Holy Spirit, that is certainly the idea that is presented in Acts 2, some of them did. For the promise is unto you and to them that are afar off even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Look at *as many as*. *As many as* by its self has a natural limitation. How many are going to receive this? *As many as*. Let us notice in Mark 6:56 where they brought the sick to Jesus. Notice "as many as touched him were made whole." How many, everybody, no, it's a natural limitation. Notice if you would in Galatians 3:27 "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Not how many had received this blessing, how many had received this very thing under consideration? *As many as*. In Romans 6:3 "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" I want to know, how many? *As many as*. That's why Peter said, "The promise is unto you and your children and to all them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Now bro. Pat thinks that's the gospel call, friends. But that's a totally different Greek

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

word, it is posteileo(?) And as its root, this word (?) that is sometimes used or all the time really is used relative to that. But notice what this particular word of Acts 2:39 says. (?) says that this can be a calling to a special office. (?) Analytical Greek lexicon says called to the performance of a thing. Called to a special task as Arndt and Gingrich. Turn to Acts 14:2 please. I think we will find a very good definition of this. "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Was that to be a Christian? No they already answered the gospel call before. But there was a special task. Paul was going to pursue that course of working and becoming one who is indeed the apostle to the Gentiles. And that's what Acts 2:38, they were promised, yes it that's universal, it was then, it is now. My friend, I'll tell you brother Pat, everybody would tell the apostle, now why are you separating that here and they would take him over to Mark chapter 16:15,16 when Jesus gave the great commission and then they will say why do you believe in verse 17 he said "And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devil; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." The signs that will follow them in Mark 16:17 is the work of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38. And the promise of this miraculous is to you, your children; one generation, not posterity, as many as. How did they call them? As the Lord our God shall call them. And how did they call them? By the laying on of miraculous hands, friends. Not everybody received the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit but it was just for a select few. He presented the idea and says God has the power to answer the prayers of millions. What does it prove? It's powerless? Now I think brother Pat knows I don't believe that. Friends we are not talking about what God can or cannot do, we're talking about what God said he would or would not do in the first century. That's what we're talking about. What did God say he would or would not do; it's not a matter of power. If God himself says I will do it in a certain way or do a certain thing then certainly we want to understand. Go to 1 Corinthians 6:19. Friends I would like to ask you to consider something very important here and I'm not going to have time to explain this because of the time element. Let's see what he is talking about in this chapter. Notice he presents the idea here in verse 15, brother Pat is saying that it is the Christian. 1 Cor 6:15 "Know ye not that your bodies (plural) are the members (they are the integral part, and we understand that it is everybody collective makes up the Church, here he is pointing to them as individuals) of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make

Tom Bright / Patrick Donahue Debate - 2001

them the members of a harlot? God forbid. What! Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body?” They can become one? Well how do they become one? Well because-----is under consideration. And so he turns there in verse 19 “Know ye not that your body (that’s singular) is the temple (tape ended)

Pat Donahue/Tom Bright Debate on the Holy Spirit

Pat Donahue –Side A Tape 2 -- Tom said that Pat said I was making that mistake taking stuff out of context basically that was intended for them at a different time and applying it today. He said I didn't understand his point. Well I may not have pronounced the word correctly or know what that means but I understood exactly your point Tom. And the way I responded to was by trying to show by the context, and I did this in both speeches. In my first I tried to show by the context in each case that it was universal to all those Christians and then it even extended, remember how I did that for Acts 2:39. So I tried to prove from the context that it was universal and that it extended to all Christians throughout this dispensation. Now it won't do any good to come up here and assert that it's dispensational and that Pat's got to prove that. No I did labor to prove it, you need to respond to my point. You can't just assert that something is dispensational just because you want it to be. You must prove it. Please prove that these passages were dispensational, meaning they only applied during that time. Give us some proof for it. Don't just assert it. He said repentance and baptism was universal then and now. He said Ephesians 2:8 "For by grace are ye saved through faith;" is the universal. How did you know that Tom? Just because you wanted it to be or you asserted it? No because the Bible teaches that it was universal. The way you prove that it was universal is exactly the same I proved my passages were universal. Not just because we assumed it, it's because we can prove it. We go to the context and find out who it's for. We can look at 1 Cor 13 and see that time shall cease. We can look at Acts 2:38,39 and see that the gift of the Holy Spirit will go to you and your children, and to all those that are afar off and as many as the Lord God shall call. That's totally different than 1 Cor 13, time shall cease, that's the very opposite of it, Tom, the very opposite. Turn to Ephesians 1:14. I'm fixing to show you and, Tom I believe is a very nice man, but just to show you how Tom operates. I've used Ephesians 1:13,14 to show you that this Holy Spirit was an earnest or seal. It says the Holy Spirit of promise, then in verse 14, which is the earnest of our inheritance, okay. Now what would you think that that *which* is the earnest of our inheritance, *which* is referring there to the Holy Spirit right before it, or back up to *the word* which is at the very first of verse 13? He just asserted that it referred back to *the word*, way back up at the first of verse 13. He didn't give any proof of that, he just asserted that, and that's how he operates. Anybody can get up here and just say Pat's wrong. That doesn't do anything. You must show why I'm wrong, Tom. That's all you did was got up here and you just said, Pat said the Holy Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance and he's wrong, *which* refers back to *the word*. You gave no evidence whatsoever. Now if anybody just looked at that which one would you think he is referring to? Which is the earnest of our inheritance. It would refer back to the last noun, okay. Also Mr. A. T. Robertson, who knows the Greek here, here's what he said about it. Okay I don't know the Greek very well but here's what Mr. Robertson commenting upon the Greek says about this passage. "God's gift of the Holy Spirit is the pledge and first payment for the final inheritance in Christ." Now that's what he said about the Greek. Evidently he thought, and he knows the Greek, he thought *which* referred back to the Holy Spirit. Do you know the Greek better than Mr. Robertson? If so, give us some evidence why you think it must go back to *the word*. Now that's what Mr. Robertson said about it. Now, there's one other thing, we don't actually have to take Mr. Robertson's word for it even though he knows the Greek about ten times better than Tom Bright and me put together, we don't have to take his word for it. Do you remember I showed some other passages that are talking about the same thing? If Ephesians 1:13,14 is not clear to you that the earnest is the Holy Spirit but you think it might be *the word*, then we'll find a passage that is clear to you. 2 Corinthians 1:22 leaves no doubt "who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts", as a deposit. Now what is the deposit and what did he seal it with, the word of God? Or was it the Spirit? Which one, it names it, it's specific, it leaves no doubt. Now if he thinks Ephesians 1:13,14 is ambiguous, but I say it's not, but if it were ambiguous, this makes it clear. 2 Corinthians 5:5 says "...who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit", or he should have said the word of God is the guarantee. Now the word of God could be a guarantee and it wouldn't be any problem with it being a guarantee because it does guarantee a lot of things, but it says who also hath given unto us the Spirit as a guarantee. There it is, the deposit, the down payment, the pledge, whatever you want to call it, the earnest as the KJV calls it, the guarantee, the deposit NKJV, these verses show that Ephesians 1:13,14 that the KJV is right there. And that Mr. Robertson is right about the Greek. God inspired, told us the right answer and that is that the Holy Spirit is the earnest. And then he said about Romans 8:26,27 and that's where it talks about the Holy Spirit being an interceptor for us, an interceding for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. He said it could be done in heaven, and I don't have a problem with that. I said that in the last debate that it is possible that this interceding could come from heaven. This doesn't prove the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. I

didn't intend to use this passage to prove that. The interceding could come from heaven or from inside my body as a personal indwelling, either one. That's not why I brought up this passage, Tom. I brought up this passage to prove this – you said in your speech that the danger of our position is that somebody might think that the Holy Spirit would do something separate and apart from the Word. I said I know one thing he does separate and apart from the Word and this is it – whether he does it in heaven, from Hawaii or from within my body, this is something he does separate and apart from the Word. The Word does not intercede for me with groanings which cannot be understood. He said basically that this talking about the human spirit interceding for myself. Tom that doesn't even make good sense. The human spirit intercedes for my myself. Look at verse 26. Likewise the human spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we (who is that, that's us, that's the spirit, it's in our bodies, it's something we know, that's our spirit) for we know not what we should pray for as we ought, so the spirit helps us. So my spirit doesn't know what I should pray for so my spirit helps me? No. My spirit doesn't know what I ought to pray for or how to word it, so the Holy Spirit helps me. It does not make any sense to say this the human spirit. Again, respectfully, Tom, nobody would ever come up with this interpretation unless they had to set out to try to prove that the Holy Spirit does nothing for the Christian separate and apart from the Word. They came up with that conclusion first and then they saw this passage – and boy it sure does look like on the surface he does at least one thing separate and apart from the Word. We are going to have to try to get around the plain meaning of that. Now I say that respectfully but I've got to believe that's what happened. How could you come up with an interpretation from this verse that this is talking about the human spirit interceding for itself? For the human spirit interceding for the body? It does not make any sense. Instead of coming to a conclusion and then trying to fit every passage to prove our conclusion, why not just look at the verses and accept what they say? It's easier and simpler that way Tom. And then he said well in Acts 2:38, if the gift of the Holy Spirit there is the Holy Spirit himself what about John 4:10 where it talks about the gift of God? Well in John 4- and Tom you would have known the answer to that before that already because I said when we went over Acts 2:38 that gifts of something can go either way. If you find gift of God and it's talking about from God, I already admit that you are going to find that. When talking about the living water in verse 4, he's talking about salvation, that's what it represents, salvation. And the gift of God then in John 4:10 is salvation. If you drink this water, the living water, that's take advantage of the death of Christ -- that's what that's talking about. Sure that's a gift from God. I admit that it occurs in the Bible that way but I also show other places in the Bible where you have the gift of something and it names the thing that is given, not the *giver* – gifts of money –that an everyday illustration, gifts of inheritance—the inheritance is the gift, gifts of righteousness, gifts of prophecy, gift of the grace of God – the grace is the gift that comes from God. So it can go either way. That's why in the Bible it can go either way. That's why I show about 6 or 8 passages like Acts 5:32 where it says from the Bible that God gives the Holy Spirit to them that obey him. It doesn't say that when you obey him you get a gift *from* the Holy Spirit or a gift of the Holy Spirit. It says the Holy Spirit is given. You see that – that's how I prove what Acts 2:38 was talking about. You do admit that they are parallel – they are talking about the same thing – don't you? I certainly think that you do. Now here are some of the passages I gave and I spent a lot of time on this Tom. Yeah it could go either way. Give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Is that a gift from the Holy Spirit or is it the Holy Spirit is the gift? Which one? Spirit which they that believe on him shall receive. What are we to receive? Something from the Holy Spirit or is it the Holy Spirit itself. You make up your own mind. Remember Bob said that we confidently believe our position. I may not convince Tom tonight but you can make up your own mind. It's easy. If you can read English you can see that. Holy Ghost whom God has given to them that obey him. He doesn't say from the Holy Ghost he says the Holy Ghost is the thing that was given. Now is that clear or is it ambiguous? I admit the English and the Greek I think from Acts 2:38 could go either way but these can't. Holy Ghost which is given unto us. It can't go either way there Tom. Passage 1 Thes 4:8 Has also given unto us his Holy Spirit. Now is the Holy Spirit the thing that gives or is a gift from the Holy Spirit or is it the Holy Spirit the thing that is given? Very easy to see. Now if we didn't have something here that we just were holding on to for dear life so that we have to try to change all of these passages what they plainly say –nobody would think a thing about believing his position. This is easy. The Spirit which he has given us. Is the Holy Spirit the gift or the thing that gives? Or is it a gift from the Holy Spirit? Very easy. Acts 2:17 Now this is a little off the subject but it's okay. It's sort of on the subject. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: (a quote from Joel 2) and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams." He says there's something here called abblacat. Now the abblacat is here and it can mean that something is the source and as a matter of fact the KJV does a good job of letting you know that an

abblacat is there – usually has the word of. I believe 1 John 4:24 has that word to show you that it is an abblacat. Instead of his saying I will pour out my Spirit it says I will pour out of my Spirit to let you know of the abblacat which sometimes means source is there. Now actually it does not mean the source necessarily. Now that's where Tom is messing up. Sometimes it can mean source but I want you to notice the passage Tom, where the abblacat is used exactly the same way – apo. Luke 22:18 talking about the Lord's supper "For I say unto you I will not drink of (that's the abblacat – apo) the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." Now if you notice this the fruit of the vine is the source and the element, the thing that is drunk, the element. I will not drink of – what's the source? The fruit of the vine. What's the element they are drinking? The fruit of vine. Notice I asked Bob Waldron whom many of you know and he knows a lot about the Greek. The reason I asked him is because we are going to Joel 2. I said the Greek New Testament uses apo – from or of the Spirit because they were making, this is his comment, they were making the point that God would not exhaust the Spirit he poured out. In other words it's not meaning because it's the source of the element because when you take this element, the Holy Spirit, it does not exhaust it. There's still some left you might say in the best language I could use, for other folks to also get it, not just one person. Thayer – a separation of a part from the whole; where of a whole, some part is taken. Here's some other examples. Here's examples of apo where source and element are used like Acts 2:17. I will not drink of this fruit of the vine.....All of these places here meaning many of them are source and element. Here's an example of element not source. Now here's what we are going to do to nail this down, in Acts 2:17, we have a quote from Joel 2 again. It's always good to be able to go somewhere else if something is ambiguous because this could mean source. Joel 2:28 "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh;" Now there is no abblacat there. I asked Mr. Waldron about the Hebrew here. A. T. Roberts said on Acts 2:17 -- Of my Spirit but the Hebrew has it -- I will pour out my Spirit, no abblacat there, no idea of source there. Bob Waldron's explanation – here's my question for Mr. Waldron, who's a Greek- Hebrew expert. The Greek in Acts 2:17 could be that the Holy Spirit was the source not the element of what was poured out. Would the Hebrew, not the Septuagint but the Hebrew allow this? The abblacat the fact that the Holy Spirit was the thing that was poured out. The Hebrew of the statement I will pour forth of my Spirit is 'esh osh' – I will pour, whatever that says, my Spirit. The esh that I left untranslated is the key to answer your question. It is called the sign of a definite object. It does nail down the fact that the Holy Spirit was the thing that was poured out. In Acts 2:17 it could be that the Holy Spirit is the source or could be that he was the source and the element. But when you see where it was quoted from in Joel 2:28 it does not have that, it's not ambiguous. It says "I will pour out my Spirit". It is the element. Now this is talking about the miraculous measure of the Spirit not the personal indwelling that we are talking about tonight. The personal indwelling is the non-miraculous measure or type. But the same kind of language is used over in Titus 3:5,6 ".....and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;". Poured? No abblacat there. Poured on us. The Holy Spirit is the element. Joel 1:3. "Tell ye your children of it, and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation." He says well if children means your posterity, all through generations. It would be tell your posterity about it and then their posterity and etc. That doesn't make any sense. You are right. You are right on that Tom but you know Acts 2:39 is not a quote of Joel 1:3. It's not. Acts 2:39 is like Acts 7:23, "And when he was full forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel." Yes children can be just the first generation. My children, I have four, that's the first generation. That's all I mean by that. But what does children of Israel in Acts 7:23 mean? Does that mean just one generation? Or does that mean all the posterity of the man Israel Jacob? Children of Israel, that's Jacob. Does that mean just his twelve or thirteen children – he had more than that, he had some daughters, or does that mean all of his posterity, all the Jews? We know children can go either way in the Bible, first generation or down throughout. That why we go to look in Joel 2:32 and showed that the deliverance the thing we're being called "And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call." Now is that talking about miraculous offices or gifts or is that talking about deliverance from sin. Which one Tom? It is talking about deliverance, it has nothing to do with the miraculous. Go back to Act 2:39 "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off" He didn't comment on that. Please tell us in Ephe 2:13,17 where it talks about afar off, is that all the Gentiles or just one or two of them? And then after you answer that tell us then what 'all that are afar off' would mean in Acts 2:39? The audience knows what it is talking about. We all know that it's talking about all the Gentiles throughout history. Okay but I want you to tell us what it means. And then it said "as many as the Lord our God shall call" and he said that expresses limitation. Sometimes it does but the very verse you gave to prove that it

does, proves otherwise, the opposite. Gal 3:27 is not limitation but all. Now he's talking to Christians here in Gal 3:27, he's talking to Christians, that's who the book is written to, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Every single one of them had been baptized into Christ. As many as doesn't necessarily mean a limited number, it just means as many of you. If I said as many of you who have ridden a bike, that's what it would mean. If all of you had ridden a bike that would mean all of you. If two of you had ridden a bike it would mean two of you. It doesn't necessarily mean limitation, it means as many of you. In Gal 3, it means all of them, all the Christians had been baptized into Christ. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. That's everyone that he's speaking to, writing to. Now in Acts 2:39, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Well, he says it's a different word, there, than in 2 Thes 2:14. He admitted really that it's the same word, just a different preposition, a preposition added. Here's one word *calleo*, (I'm not sure I'm pronouncing it right), *to call*, *summon* advice. Here's *profcalleo*, *to call*, *to summon*. What's the difference there? There's the two words, they are really the same word, one has a prefix on it. They mean the same thing don't they? The words are identical except one has the preposition *prof* prefixed to it. Turn to James 5:13,14,16,17,18 we have *profechomia*, Mr. Sutton, and then *echomia*, one time. We have this four times there in the five verses, and one time this. Every time it's translated *prayer*, they are used interchangeably. I want you to look at that and tell me from the English, which one is the one without the preposition and which one is. You won't be able to tell. You know why, because they both mean *to pray*. There's not enough difference there to make any difference. The difference in *profcalleo* and *calleo* in Acts 2:39 and 2 Thes 2:14 is no significant difference. As many as the Lord our God shall call means exactly what you always thought it meant just by reading it without a biased mind. It means all these people that repent and are baptized who will receive remission of sins and they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost and the promise is not just to you, but it's to you and your children, children of Israel, Acts 7:23, to all those that are afar off, those that afar off in Ephe 2:13,17 are all the Gentiles, and this says *all* that are afar off, and the word *all* is not even in Ephe 2. As many as the Lord our God shall call, that's all of them. It's like God anticipated that Tom would be making this argument and so he decided to elaborate over and over and over to underscore that Acts 2:38, the promise is to everybody down through the centuries. He put that down there ahead of time as if he was trying to anticipate your argument. Underline it is what God is doing there.

Mr. Tom Bright – Tape 2 – Side A It is a joy for me to be before you for the third and final time this evening. Being in the negative, bro Donahue and I have agreed that every night that the last speech for the negative that he cannot introduce any more arguments. And in dealing with some of the things that bro Pat dealt with, I did not get to respond in any way to some of the arguments that he made. And so I refuse to deal with that again tonight because it will be introducing new material on my part. I want to deal with the last argument that bro Pat made, my friends, because he seemed in some way or another to slight the idea of the original language in which the Bible was written. At least the New Testament. I want you to notice in this particular chart when he challenged me to look at James 5:13- and to look at the different English translations of the word prayer or pray that is used there. He mentioned the idea that some of these words were some with a pronoun and three of them were just from the regular verb itself. Here's the point, my friends, that if we do not have the ability to express the various nuances that are found in the original language by the English language. Indeed we understand that that might be a shortcoming but that's a part of the situation. I want you to notice here what Mr. Summers says in his grammar concerning the addition of supposition. The meaning of a verb may be altered through many shades by the use of prepositions. Now if you desire that we get other quotes from other individuals who are Greek grammarians, at least recognized, you and I need to understand that the challenge that he gave to me to show the difference in the Greek words in James 5 is no part at all. Ladies and gentlemen, the Holy Spirit inspired James in the Greek language, not English. He wrote it in the original language, not English. And they read it in the original language, not English. And so I would suggest for your consideration, notice here is a translation of a Greek preposition and the word *filleo* that we are going to be dealing with more in this debate. This is the verb to call. Notice here, it just simply means the verb itself to call. Notice this is a form of the Greek preposition *e*. Notice here how it is translated – I Paul said shall answer for myself for things whereof I am accused of the Jews, Acts 26:4. Now here is the word *calleomi*, you remember I made an argument on *prasalleomi*. All right here is another proposition that prefixes this. The Greeks would take propositions they would stick them before verbs and they would give a meaning. Notice here, I appeal unto Ceasar. Yes there is the basic idea of call. We see the different slant the different idea the different nuance that is given here with the addition of prepositions. In fact as some people have said as they've studied the original language, that the Greeks were proposition loving people and certainly they used them in a different way than you and I use them tonight. And so this argument here, my friend, seems to me to reflect upon the verbal inspiration of the scriptures. He is somewhat using the idea that these propositions the Holy Spirit chose to use really doesn't mean all that much. And so he gets up here and he challenges me to read some things and are a passage of scripture in the English text and says now tell the difference in the Greek words. Well I have to admit I couldn't if I didn't know what they were. That's not the point, friends. The point is did the Holy Spirit use these various many other verbs prefixed by a proposition? Did he do that just to have something to do? Just to confuse his readers? Why did he do that? I think it's clear that this argument that bro Pat has made is really no argument, my friends. But it's just simply something to try to divert the attention of what we have said here. He mentioned the idea of universal and how did I know that Ephe 2:8 was universal? Friends, my argument here that there are many statements that are made in this special time period – you remember anachronism? Taking things out of the proper time. Bro Donahue has done that in all of the charts he has used relative to the promise of the Spirit. He has taken them out of a first century context and he has placed them and given a twenty-first century definition. And thus, it applies to us as a personal or as the Holy Spirit himself. I propose for your consideration then, the reason that I knew Ephe 2:8 was universal –because we understand it was universal then and it is universal now. But the point is that in the same book sometimes things were given, they were universal in the first century but they are not now. Ephe 4:7 and the next few verses that mention the miraculous gifts have no application tonight. You don't have it, no Pentecostal has it, no body else has it, and that's the point that we are going to make. Anachronism, friends, I want you to remember that because I'm going to use that word. This is what my good friend is doing on this particular occasion. He presented the idea –'Tom you made an argument', turn over to Ephe 1:13,14, I made the argument that the Holy Spirit in that particular passage was indeed not the earnest that is under consideration, and understand, friends, that earnest is simply a guarantee, it is something that is given as to guarantee, to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt. And he said Tom how do you know that, you assert that. Well I'll tell you how I know it. Notice, if you will please, and I can read many

Greek grammar that says a relative pronoun agrees with its antecedent in gender and number but not in kind. Now friends you can look at the word spirit and you can find that it is masculine singular in the Greek. Now if you look back and find the antecedent of that pronoun, well Pat, what is it? What is the antecedent of the pronoun? He knows what it is. It has to be a noun that is in the masculine singular and that is the word *word*. So I didn't assert it. Now I am assuming he is going to bring up an argument tomorrow night attraction. I'm assuming he's going to do that, he may not, I hope so. Let's look at some thoughts he presented here concerning the thoughts of A. T. Robertson. Who was A. T. Robertson? Mr. Robertson was recognized as a Greek grammarian. He was also a member of a denominational group. There are many errors that he theologically speaking held. But what bro Pat read here was comments, not the meaning of the word. Now he argues that this is how the word is used, and that's fine, we don't have any problem with that. But we need to understand that is there something in the word, in the context that demands that conclusion? You can look at Mr. Thayer who is another lexicographer, a lexicon is just simply a Greek dictionary. Many times they will give a definition of the word and then say this is how the word is used. That's okay but we need to understand that that is their interpretation. That is how they feel that it ought to be used. It ought to be used in this way in this particular verse because of this and that and those and them. Well that's what Mr. Robertson is doing here. He is just simply giving his denominational concept that the idea of what he thinks. What we want is proof that that conclusion is demanded by the very thing that is under consideration. Turn to Romans 8:26,27. Notice again that it is the intercession of the Spirit that is under consideration here. Now keep in mind as we look at this according to what my friend here is arguing it is the basic idea that the Holy Spirit has to do the groanings. Now if I am misrepresenting you, bro Pat, be sure and let me know, but that is your basic view that it is the Holy Spirit who is doing the groaning according to your view. He is shaking his head in the affirmative. He agrees that it is the Holy Spirit that is doing the groanings with unutterable words or the idea of that which is inexplicable. I personally cannot conceive that the Holy Spirit can have a certain situation, that is – I can't explain what I'm saying. Even if it is referring to what he is the idea of the individual for whom he was interceding. It would still be the idea – the Spirit could take these inexplicable things and he could translate them to the Father. I don't believe that's the Spirit, I believe it's Christ. And it is the unutterable groaning of the individual that is under consideration. And it is Christ who is our intercessor sitting at the right hand of the throne of the Father on high who is making intercession for us according to the rule of the Father. Friends, Jesus Christ lived here in the flesh. He suffered in all points like as we are, yet without sin. He know what it is to be tempted with sin. He know what it is to have to bear the burdens in such things as man has to bear in this life. And certainly we do understand that as our intercessor that he can take these things that sometimes, not all the time, but I am convinced that it is things that we ourselves do not have the ability to express. Have you ever prayed for someone that you desire to hear the gospel and believe? Have you ever prayed for that and you prayed that they would hear the truth? And yet you don't know how to pray for the fulfillment of that. Friends this is just a very poor excuse on my part of trying to give an example of what we are talking about. And so the thought that is presented here is simply that it is groaning, it is the human spirit that is doing the groaning and it is the Christ himself, look at verse 34, who is our intercessor. If that's not the case, then we have two divine intercessors. We have to have two divine intercessors because I know verse 34 says that Christ is our intercessor. And so if you think about this. Look at the idea if you would please, at his argument on *apo*. You remember he said –turn to Luke 22:18 – and what he is saying, friends, I made the argument that *apo* refers to that origin or source and it was based upon the argument that I made and based upon Acts 2:17 that it was the Holy Spirit who was to do the pouring, that it was not the Spirit himself. And so he comes along and he says well look at Luke 22:18 and it is an example of an ablatat preposition that is used to show it is the source from which the pouring comes and the element poured out. So what we've got friends, according to that interpretation, is the Holy Spirit poured out himself. Now that is what he is contending, at least that's the implication of his doctrine. But furthermore, good people, his illustration does not illustrate. Look at Luke 22:18 "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Friends what he is talking about is indeed is that drinking of the fruit of the vine. When people drink of the fruit of the vine, there is less there than before they drank. Is it the idea then, that the Holy Spirit enters, according to his doctrine, the body of the Christian? That there's less of the Spirit than there was, is it less of the totality than there was before the person was baptized? I don't think he would agree

with that, but that's certainly demanded by the very idea that he has presented. Friends, it was the power that was poured out in Acts 2. Jesus presented the idea and the promise that the Spirit was going to do this, that they were going to receive the Holy Spirit. And Acts 2 is the fulfillment. It is a very special day, a very special occasion and it is a very special time. We have never seen anything like it. There never has been before, there is not since that time. It is a unique, it is a one of a kind situation. And Acts 2 is definitely fulfilling that. Notice if you would, the basic idea that he says the children. I made an argument based on Joel 1:3 concerning the children. Now the reason I referred back to that friends, was that Joel himself, the prophecy that he gave, is the background of Acts 2. Now how do I know that? How do I know that Joel, his prophecy, is the background of Acts 2? Because Peter said that he was. Peter says, this is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, and it shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out of my Spirit, literally pour out from, upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophesy. It is the power of the Spirit and it is the miraculous power that is under consideration on this particular occasion. Friends, I ask you to look very closely at that and turn with me again to Joel 1. Let's look again at what bro Donahue is saying here if you would. Joel is the background. Joel uses the word children. Peter uses it, I'm like him, I don't think it's a quotation of that but Joel defines what is meant by children, doesn't he? Or are we just to completely separate what Peter said in Acts 2:38,39 from Joel's prophecy? Are we just to discontinue that, to just remove it. Again notice he says "Tell it to your children, and let your children tell their children, and their children unto another generation." And that's what he is promising in Acts 2. Repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ. That is universal. It was then, it is now. So is for by grace are you saved through faith. It was universal then, it is now. But then we come to something else, that is special in its emphasis, and it refers to that which to that particular time. Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Well, in Ephe 4 the apostle Paul referred to the same thing. Yes, it was universal, but bro Pat wants to make everything that it said, and I'm saying here in general terms, that it's found in that particular period of time and he wants to apply it to this particular period of time. Oh he's going to say the miraculous manifestations are not applicable today. But friends, that's the thrust of what he is arguing. That's the conclusion that we have to come to. Let's put these particular thoughts in their particular place. I want you again to turn with me please to 1 Cor 14 and notice if you would Paul's statement in verse 39, "Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy,..." Yes this was miraculous gifts, but dear people, this is not the only statement that is made in all of the New Testament. In that particular time, that applies to the miraculous manifestation. It is not the only reference to the idea of in some way or another the Holy Spirit and his miraculous work being manifested. And so as he says here, yes, that was universal then, but is it universal tonight? Well again I want you to turn to Luke 11:13. Notice here it is the Holy Spirit that is given. Let's look at that. I've already presented the fact. Notice if you would that the other passage that says basically the same thing, it refers to the idea of things, not as the Holy Spirit. And bro Pat said well the Holy Spirit is some of the things, the good things that is presented. Well is that what he's saying. Oh no my friends, the good things here refer to that which the Holy Spirit is going to pour out. And it is that which the Holy Spirit and it refers to things of inspiration. You remember in John 16, we've already presented this idea that Jesus says the Spirit is going to show you things to come. Paul in 1 Cor 2:9 and following, refers to the things, things of inspiration. And so in one passage he referred to the Holy Spirit, in another passage he referred to the good things that was going to come from the Holy Spirit. And so as we look at this I would ask you to consider very closely this particular idea. Notice that he says, 'the promise is unto you', I'm back in Acts 2:39, 'and your children, and all them that are afar off.' My friends, that's the things of Matt 7:11. That's what the Holy Spirit...(time up)

Pat Donahue – Tape 2 -- Side B

I'm going to spend the first few minutes trying to review some of the things that I went through last night simply because there are some here tonight that weren't here last night, but I'm not going to spend my whole speech just repeating that because probably most of you were here last night. But I want to start with Acts 2:38 chart. That chart summarized what I said last night. First of all you remember in Acts 2:38 Peter said repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sin and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. And I would maintain and I don't think there's any way to successfully contradict that, that there are two commands given and each and every person here that obeyed those two commands, repent and be baptized, received both blessings that were promised. Remission of

sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. So remission of sins, let me say it this way, the gift of the Holy Ghost, Tom, and the remission of sins are exactly the same universally, meaning that one is not universal and the other not. They are both universal. If the remission of sins was to go to everybody then, who repented and was baptized, so would the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now the reason this is important is because he believes in Acts 2:38, the gift of the Holy Ghost is the miraculous, he doesn't think that this is universal. He would agree with me that if I can prove that it's universal it cannot be the miraculous. So I spend a lot of my time proving these passages are not referring to the miraculous. And the way I do that is by showing that it's universal. Now, simply put as I did yesterday, the gift of the Holy Ghost, that phrase, could mean a gift from the Holy Ghost, or that the Holy Ghost himself is the gift. In the English and the Greek by the way, it could go either way. For example in Ephe 2, we have the gift of salvation is a gift of God, that means God gives the gift of salvation. But here's some examples going the other way. For example, in 1 Cor 13:2, you have the gift of prophecy. Prophecy is not the one doing the giving of the gift, it is the gift itself. So gift of, can name the gift. And I maintain that's the way it is in Acts 2:38 and now I will prove it. And again this will be a summary of what I did last night. How am I going to prove that? I'm going to look at other passages that are not ambiguous in this way, that show that the Holy Spirit is the gift itself or himself, not the one who gives the gift. For example, 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?", you see at the bottom of the chart, the Bible says that God will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. See, it's clear there. That's not ambiguous. The Holy Spirit is the gift. Not a gift from the Holy Spirit. John 7:39, "(But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)". What is actually going to be received according to that passage? The Holy Spirit, not something from the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit himself. A good one is Acts 5:32, "And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Those that obey God will be given the Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, not a gift from the Holy Ghost, as you might could interpret Acts 2:38, but the Holy Ghost is the gift itself. Rom 5:5 "and hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." By the way we will show in the context later on, that's all Christians. 1 Thes 4:8 "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit." 1 John 3:23,24 "And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment. And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." It's clear from all of those passages, they are not ambiguous, that the Holy Ghost is the thing that is given. So that is the thing that is given in Acts 2:38. So Acts 2:38 then becomes crystal clear. By the way, Tom, before I move on, I want to mention to you, that – we try to take copious notes and had others help me take notes – by my notes I gave 15 passages as proof text for my proposition last night. And you referred to, I won't say you answered them, you referred to six of them. Nine of them you did not even refer to. What I will expect you to do tonight is to go through all of these passages, and if you don't think they are universal, you show from the context of each and every one why they are not universal. Okay, that's the point of contention between us, isn't it? So I will go to the passages and try to show they are universal and you tell us why I'm wrong. Okay, don't just fail to respond to all of them, that's not the way debates ought to be, that's why we have three speeches apiece, so that I can say something and you can respond then I will respond to that and then you will respond. We need you to respond to the passages so then we can develop a discussion about the context of each passage, okay? And so now my next chart is I want to show you a summary of why all these passages can't be miraculous. And I'm going to do that two ways. Now the first way is found in what I call column 2 here and I've already started to do that. There's a question there that I asked Marion Fox back on this day and I guess I could read that – 'Would you agree, Marion, that if I can prove that a passage promising the Holy Ghost like Luke 11 or the gift of the Holy Ghost Acts 2:38 applies to all individual Christians and not just to a select few then I have proven that the passage cannot refer to the miraculous. In other words, he agreed that if I can prove that the passage applied to all Christians, then, universally, that it was not the miraculous. And I believe that Tom has agreed to that tonight. I asked him, 'Considering passages like Rom 1:11 and 1 Cor 12:29,30 did all the Christians during the miraculous age receive or have the gift of the Holy Ghost mentioned in Acts 2:38?' He said no. Now what he's saying is, not all the Christians then, even during the miraculous age, received the gift of the Holy Ghost that's mentioned in Acts 2:38. Now that means and implies, Tom, you correct me if I'm wrong, that if I can prove these passages were universal to all Christians at that time, it can't be the miraculous, because you agree with me that not all the Christians even at that time received the miraculous. Some of them did, and perhaps most, I

don't know, but not all of them. And you agree with that. So if I can show that these passages are universal to even all the Christians during the miraculous age, then I've proven that this is not the miraculous. Now for those of you tonight who think that Acts 2:38 or some of these other passages may be referring to the indwelling through the word, Tom and I agree that they are not. Okay. And if you want to talk to me about that, because if you take that position, talk to me after the service tonight and we'll talk about it. But because Tom agrees with me on that and he thinks all of these are talking about the miraculous, that's where I'm going to spend the time in the debate talking about. And so what I'm going to do next is I'm going to go down through – here we have a thing on column 2 I will show in all these passages that they are universal to each and every saint. And when I do that, since he has admitted even at that time not all the Christians received the miraculous, then I will have proven that these passages don't refer to the miraculous gift. If I can show they're universal. Okay so we are going to put up chart number 2 and let's look at Luke 11:13. Now everybody just look at Luke 11 and we are going to look as we did last night at the context of Luke 11:13b and that's where the Bible says the Father gives the Holy Ghost to them that ask him. And by the way we showed last night that the way you ask for the Holy Ghost is by obeying the gospel. Just like in Acts 22:16 Ananias told Saul to arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. So how do you call upon the name of the Lord? The Bible says in Roms 10:13 whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How do you do that? Is it by prayer? No, Acts 22:16 shows it is by obeying the gospel to ask God to be saved. The way you ask God for the Holy Spirit is by doing what Acts 2:38 told you to do to receive the Holy Ghost, repent and be baptized. And if you compare Matt 7:7-11 you will see it's the same as Luke 11:9-13. I think you will notice that it is a context of the non-miraculous. For example, in Luke 11:9 and Matt 7:7, the Bible says ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find. Now I asked Tom—I brought this up last night—and I asked Tom in a question tonight 'would it be a misapplication to use Matt 7:7 and Luke 11:9, seek and ye shall find to explain how a person in China or another such country where the preaching of the gospel has been minimal through the years, to explain that they will be given a chance to hear the gospel if they are a true seeker. He said no that would not be a misapplication. He is saying this phrase in these passages, seek and ye shall find, can be applied today and it not be a misapplication. It would be right to say if somebody were to come up to you like Eddie Garrett, Sr and say what about all those folks in China, they're going to be lost, they've never had a chance to hear the gospel? If I were to say, Eddie, Matt 7:7 says seek and ye shall find, and so if they are a true seeker they will find. God will send somebody to preach the truth to them like he did Cornelius. He was a true seeker. Tom agrees with me that is a proper way to use this passage. So he agrees with me that Matt 7:7 and Luke 11:9 have application today. Well have you noticed then that Luke 11:10-13 are simply an elaboration upon verse 9 of Luke 11? He says ask and it shall be given you, seek and ye shall find. And it then he talks about that in verse 10, everyone that asketh receiveth, he that seeketh findeth, to him that knocketh it shall be opened. He's just talking about that. He says if a son asks bread of any of you that is a father he gives illustration. If my son asks for bread from me am I going to give him a stone? Or if he asks for an egg am I going to give him a scorpion? He's just elaborating upon verse 9 that says ask and it shall be given unto you seek and ye shall find. In verse 13 it just continues the elaboration and so does verse 11 of Matt 7. It says if you then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, he's just illustrating – says a father in this world would know how to give good gifts to his physical children. If you can do that certainly the heavenly Father will do that. How much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. So that is just an elaboration of that. And so since Tom has admitted that Luke 11:9 applies today and since verses 10-13 are just an elaboration of verse 9 then verse 13 would have to apply today. How much more your heavenly Father will give them the Holy Spirit to those that ask. I don't see any way to get around that. Now before you put that next chart up, Bright said there was a metonymy going on here. Now Tom please prove there was a metonymy. You know with the one container brethren we talk about a metonymy. We look at 1 Cor 11:27 "Whosoever shall drink this cup". We realize the cup can't be the container there, because you don't drink the container. So we prove there's a metonymy. Now you said there was a metonymy going on here. Please prove it. Okay. Now let's go to John 7:38,39. This is another passage that I used last night. I don't think you responded to it if I remember. But the Bible says in 38,39 "He that believeth on me as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive for the Holy Ghost was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Now we have this phrase here that is used many times in the book of John about believers. And it says if you believe you will receive the Holy Ghost. Now is this universal, does this apply today, or was it universal to all the Christians back then? Well it certainly was and so that shows it cannot be the miraculous. Let's look at this phrase in John 3:18 about the believers "He that

believeth on him is not condemned.” Does that apply to all the Christians then and us today. Certainly. John 3:36 “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 5:24 “...He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” John 6:35 “...and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.” John 6:47 “...He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” John 11:25 “...he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.” A passage very similar in Rom 3:26 “...the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus”. All of those applied to everybody back then and they apply today. So why wouldn’t the exact same phrase apply to everybody back then including us today. He that believeth on me out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water but this spake ye of the Sprit which they that believe on him should receive. Do you get the point? Why would you look at this phrase and think it only applied to a select few when that same phrase all the way through the book of John applied to everybody universally? Then we went to Acts 2:39 and we’ll be repeating some that we did last night. In Acts 2:38 where it says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost – verse 39 makes it very clear that it’s a universal promise. The promise is unto you and to your children to all that are afar off even as many as the Lord our God shall call. To you – that would be the Jews standing there; to your children – that would be to their posterity like Acts 7:23, the children of Israel; then to all those that are afar off – we mentioned last night Ephe 2:13-17. I’m sure Tom will agree that afar off there means all the Gentiles – afar off, and this says all that are afar off. Now that would have to be all the Gentiles. And then he nails it down by saying as many as the Lord our God shall call. Well he says, Tom said last night that this word for call *proscalleo* is different than the word *calleo* in 2 Thes 2:14. Well the definitions don’t look very different. Here’s *calleo*, 2 Thes 2:14, the Bible says we are called by the gospel – to call, summon or invite. *Proscalleo* means to call to or summon. The words are identical except one has the preposition *pros* prefixed to it. Now to illustrate that this does not, this prefixed preposition does not change necessarily the meaning significantly. We notice that *prosecomei* is in James 5:13,14,16,17,18. There are five cases where you see the word pray or prayed. Four of those times is *prosecomei*, one time *ecomei*. But they are used interchangeably. They mean pray every time. You see there is no difference in the meaning of those words even though the preposition is put there. Okay now put up Tom Bright’s summary chart. Tom this quote agreed exactly with what I already said. I said that the prefixed preposition does not necessarily affect the meaning significantly. That’s what this says. The meaning of the verb may – I don’t see why you could put this quote up and think that helps your case because it says may. That’s exactly what I’m trying to say. The meaning does not necessarily affect the definition significantly. It’s significantly in shade of meaning, you see that? That’s saying that’s exactly what I think about it. Many times in the Greek the preposition added does not affect the meaning significantly. Even then, it says it may do that. And so you know what that means Tom, if you want 2 Thes 2:14 and Acts 2:39 to mean something different simply because the preposition there is prefixed in Acts 2 you are going to have to prove that, because your quote said that it may. Well that means that it may not. Kittle’s theological dictionary of the New Testament says this – in defining these words he said in one verse Acts 2:39 it is plain that *proscalleo* has here the significance of *calleo*. Now I can show you that if you want but in Kittle’s dictionary – that’s where they define words – he says in Acts 2:39 *proscalleo* has the same significance as *calleo*. Okay. So he didn’t think there was any difference in defining the words. And then I asked Tom a question. I said is the calling by the gospel of 2 Thes 2:14, a call to deliverance? And I define that word as salvation. That’s how my Randomhouse College English dictionary defined deliverance – salvation. Okay. I said is the calling by the gospel of 2 Thes 2:14 a call to deliverance? He said yes. So if he knows that the call, when it says I have called you by the gospel, that’s the call to salvation or deliverance. But here’s where we can prove this and it doesn’t matter anything about the Greek, he can prove it with the English in the Bible beyond any shadow of a doubt. Acts 2:39 is a quote from Joel 2:32. At the very end of that verse and we did this last night with no response, Joel 2:32 explains the call. When it says in Acts 2:39 even as many as the Lord our God shall call that’s from the end of Joel 2:32. It says “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.” The call is to deliverance...for salvation. He said that’s exactly the same thing as 2 Thes 2:14, it’s a call to deliverance or salvation. That’s what it is in Joel 2:32. And Acts 2:39 quotes Joel 2:32. So that proves that Acts 2:39, the call, it has to be a call to deliverance, because it’s quoting Joel 2:32 and that’s what it says. Not a call to miraculous offices. And since you’ve admitted that 2 Thes 2:14 is a call to deliverance, that means that 2:39 has to be the same as 2 Thes 2:14. And that’s what you would have thought if you had just read it and he hadn’t explained it away, wouldn’t you? You’d think that’s talking

about the call to salvation, wouldn't you, and the people accepting that call. Because that was mentioned right there in Acts 2:38, wasn't it? Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. Didn't say anything about the miraculous offices in there. The remission of sins. As many people that will repent and be baptized and get the remission of sins, that is the call. And God's answer to that call is he gives them the remission of sins and he gives them the gift of the Holy Ghost, and that promise is to you and to your children, that's the posterity of the Jews, all of them down throughout history, to all that are afar off – by the way you haven't replied to that phrase – that's all the Gentiles, as many as the Lord our God shall call. That's the call to deliverance, same as 2 Thes 2:14. You know last night, Tom, you defined proscalleo. One of your definitions was called to one's service. That's exactly what I think it is in Acts 2:39. It means a call to God's service and that gets everybody, not just those who receive miraculous gifts. In Acts 5:32, we want to show that it is universal. Acts 5:32, the Bible says that God gives the Holy Ghost to them that obey him. Okay. Who were the ones obeying him at that time? Well you remember in Acts 2:41, you had three thousand obeyed. Then in Acts 4:4, it says either five thousand more or the number was up to five thousand, you can't tell for sure. But at least five thousand were Christians and obeying at that time. And then in chapter 5:14 it says the believers were the more added to the Lord. So even more than five thousand were obeying God presently at that time. Okay. And in this verse says that God gave them, past tense, the Holy Ghost those that were obeying him, present tense. That would be over five thousand people at that time. Not just the apostles and a few more who got the miraculous but all of those obeying him, present tense, that would be all the Christians, universal, which will show then that it's not the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. It has to be the personal indwelling – what Acts 2:38 is talking about. Does everybody see that? You know if you look and compare Acts 5:32 and Heb 5:9, the Bible says Jesus became the author of eternal salvation, past tense, to all those that obey him, present tense. That is exactly like Acts 5:32. It's particular participle, dative, uses indirect object and plural. Now is Heb 5:9 just the apostles or is it everybody. It's everybody. So is Acts 5:32. Now remember I didn't get through with my speech. But remember why am I trying to show that all these passages are universal? Because he admits that even then the gift of the Holy Ghost miraculous was not universal. So if I can prove that it was universal to the Christians at that time which I've done, indisputably then it can't be the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. It must be the nonmiraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. And that applies to us today. That's obvious. Thank you very much for your time.

Tom Bright – Tape 2 Side B

Bro Donahue, gentleman moderators, ladies and gentlemen, it is a joy for me to stand before you for the first of three negative speeches that I will give in response to the things that bro Donahue deals with as the time permits. I want to commend you for being here tonight. Certainly it honors him and me likewise because we are in this discussion of something that we think is very important. Although I think we both agree that it is not a matter of doctrine or that which would cause a rift in fellowship. Before I get into responding to the things that bro Donahue has said, I would like to bring something to your attention that transpired last night. And I think that it needs to be dealt with and I want to deal with it as kindly as I possibly can. And bro Pat, I'm old enough to be your father, and I hope that you will take this not in a condescending way. I do not in any way mean to speak down to you but you have done something last night in two of your three speeches, you impugned my motives. You set forth the idea of why that I was teaching this particular doctrine relative to the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit, and you led people to believe that the reason I was simply doing this was that I wanted to respond in some way or another to the Pentecostals. He has, friends, violated the very basic concept of public debating. And I'm going to ask Pat in a very kind way not to do that any longer because whatever my motives might be, and I'm going to explain those in just a few moments, certainly it is not because I'm afraid of what a Pentecostal preacher might preach or what he might say, because I have debated Pentecostalism publicly relative to the duration of miracles with me taking the position that they ceased in the first century. All you have to do is go to our website on the online Academy of Biblical Studies Website and look at that debate and I think you will see that certainly it was not anything that damaged me at all. So I'm going to call upon Pat in a very kind way not to do this. I may not agree with him and I'm not asking Pat – don't press your point – you disagree with me and that's fine, that's why we are here. But certainly let's don't be doing this. Many people don't like debates because they think it's wrong. We are in a society that thinks you ought not take a stand on anything. And so let's not do anything in our demeanor that would reflect upon that. Now concerning the motives, ladies and gentlemen, of why I teach and advocate what I'm teaching and advocate, I'm going to go through this very slowly again. I drew an idea last night that in the first century

there was a special period of time that had never been realized up until that particular moment. And after the cessation of the miraculous, and it did cease in the first century, that there has never been a time like that since. Now I have presented the facts of brother Pat as he has taken some of these things and he has drawn them forward to the twenty-first century and I have used the word anachronism. And that's simply taking something out of its proper time frame and applying it to something else. Now I'm advocating that is what he is doing in these passages that he is using to prove his particular position, that they were referring to a specific period of time. And I would suggest that as we look at this I am going to show this. Now brother Pat has come back to Acts 2:38,39 and he introduced that in his first speech last night. And I think that we understand that this is indeed a good passage to discuss the differences that brother Pat and I have. Now friends, this is his foundation stone and all of these other passages that he has introduced has simply been used to show that this is confirmation of his basic argument. But the fact is, friends, if you can show that his foundation stone does not teach what he says that it teaches, then you have overturned the very argument that he has dealt with. I do not have time to deal with every single argument and every single passage but as the time permits I am going to. I want you to consider that Joel 2 is the background of Acts 2. Now the reason I know this is because the apostle Peter quotes Joel 2:38 and following in Acts 2:16 and verses following. And so we know Joel is the background of Acts 2. And certainly Joel was speaking of certain things that were going to happen – your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men dream dreams, etc. And so as we look at this, we know that it is a miraculous thing that Joel had under consideration. And the apostle Peter affirmed that that which you see right now is the very thing of which Joel was speaking, so there can be no doubt. Now friends as you look at Acts 2 and you see all of the various references to the Holy Spirit and or things that are pertaining to him on this particular occasion, every one of these have a reference to or indicated that which was miraculous in nature. And so as we look at this and we are going to say some things further about this, I would ask you with the descent of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:1-4 that they were amazed, verse 7, and I think it also says that in verse 13, as the apostles were standing up and they were speaking in other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance, and as they were miraculously guided to for the first time proclaim Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. When the apostle Peter came to Acts 2:38,39, mentioning repentance and baptism, Pat and I agree on this, and then promising the idea of the gift of the Holy Spirit, what do you think these people had in mind? Do you think that they had in their mind that this was a personal indwelling non-miraculous of the Holy Spirit? Friends, we can go back and we can show that the old testament prophets when they spoke of this that this was the basic idea. Now notice in Acts 2:38 he says ye shall receive. Let's see our chart. Notice this particular idea of the word shall. Brother Pat last night dealt quite extensively with the idea of the English shall, in showing that it has to be and it can be no other way. I want to draw your attention to a very interesting statement, if you would please, and notice here this particular idea, notice that in Acts 2:38 ye shall receive. Now he's emphasizing this particular word. Here is the Greek word whether we can pronounce it or not does not mean a thing. The exact same Greek word is found in John 5:43 and here Jesus says I am come in my Father's name and ye receive me not, if another shall come in his own name, now watch, him ye will receive. Right there is the translation of that word. Now why in one passage did the translators use will and in another use shall? Well friends, the answer is very clear. Notice here shall, and this is copied off of the internet, after if and some verbs which express condition or supposition, notice the word, shall, that's what we are looking at, in all persons simply foretells. Brother Pat was unaware of this particular exception. This was taken from Mr. Webster's, the reprint of his 1828 edition. Now friends, they were much closer to the time of the translation of the KJV than you and I are today. And so I suggest that there is no distinction that is to be made. The apostle Peter is just simply saying and he is foretelling something that they would receive. Now let's look at the gift of the Holy Spirit and we are going to look at this in just a few moments. But there is another thing and I come back to this. Notice he says for the promise. Now the problem that brother Pat and I have, the disagreement is over what is the gift of the Holy Spirit? But let's look at the context. The background, the prophetic background was miraculous. The events of that day were miraculous. Now Peter says ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now watch what he says. For the promise is unto you and your children. Let's have chart 30 please. Notice here if you would please, the background of this is Joel 1:3. Now he presented the idea in his first affirmative speech concerning your children. And he says that is posterity. A good way to check the definition of anybody's word that they are using is just to put that definition in the place of the word. And so Joel is saying, you tell it to your children of it and let your children tell their posterity and their posterity another generation. Friends the background of Acts 2 is Joel 2. Now notice here if you would in Luke 32:28, here is an occasion when Jesus is on his way to the place of crucifixion and he turns and he says to the daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but

weep for yourselves and your children. Of what is he speaking? Friends, looming on the horizon in a few years about forty years from this particular time was going to be the total rejection or destruction rather of these people, nation of Israel at this particular time. And so the basic idea as we look at this, is that indeed the promise is unto your children and it is referring to that specific generation of time. Now brother Pat last night when I made mention, and I mention this idea, show us one example where the phrase, group phrase in the New Testament ever refers to more than one generation. Now brother Pat came up with the idea, the children of Israel. And he says that shows posterity. Friends, that's not what I asked. The word that is translated right here, your children, and in Acts 2:39 appears I believe 99 times in the New Testament. And that it does sometimes refer to posterity who is going to deny that? I accept that. But the fact is that the phrase that the apostle Peter used in Acts 2:39 where is it found that that is ever used to refer to more than one generation? And so as we look at this friends, ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, it was promised to you, that is those people there, and to your children, one generation, and that is when the miraculous gifts, in my judgment at least, ceased to exist in one generation at the destruction of the city of Jerusalem. I'm not going to argue the time that they ceased. I know that they did. Notice he says the promise is unto you and your children and all them that are afar off. Brother Pat has made quite a to-do about why I haven't dealt with it. I didn't think it was necessary, friends. There is no doubt, all that are afar off are the Gentiles. And the miraculous gifts went to the Gentiles, Ephe 4:8-12. There the apostle Paul talks to the church at Ephesus which was a Gentile congregation and he refers to the spiritual gifts. 1 Cor 12, 13 and 14 chapters referred to the same idea. So yes those that are afar off - and the Gentiles received that. Notice he says all that are afar off - that's all flesh. Back in Acts 2:17 as Peter begins to quote Joel 2, he says I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh, you, your children and all them that are afar off. That's exactly what he did. For the promise is unto you and your children and all them that are afar off as many as. Now friends, I want you to look at that. As many as. That very concept has the idea that indeed there is a natural built in limitation. Notice here in Romans 6:3 the apostle Paul, and there are other passages that we could look at, how many? He says as many as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. As many as. That limits it. There is a totality but it is looking to as many as. And notice he says as many as the Lord our God shall call. And certainly then, it is looking to those that call and the way that it is going to come. He says they will be called. He doesn't tell us when they are going to be called. He doesn't tell us how they are going to be called. That's not in the passage. God shall call. And by the way my friends, he is talking here about the word *proscalleo* but the word we are looking at is the word *proscalleomi*. And he mentioned the idea called to one's service. Well also notice the analytical Greek lexicon says to call to the performance of a thing. Call to a special task or office, so says Arndt and Gingrich. The Holy Spirit said separate me Saul and Barnabas, Acts 13:1,2 to the work that I have called them. Indeed the word *proscalleomi* is the word we are looking at friends. And so here the basic idea is shall call. Now let's go to Luke 11:13. Here the Master presents the idea that they are going give the Holy Ghost to them that ask him. Now brother Pat says that that refers to obedience. But my friends, the Greek word that is found here, unless I have overlooked, is never used in the New Testament to refer to obedience. But he's got it down there that the way that you do that is obeying that. Now he says those that ask, he shall give the Holy Spirit to them. Now remember the context. Remember the word anachronism. Lets puts these thoughts in the proper time frame. Turn to Acts 8:14,15. I'm going to show you exactly how the Holy Spirit was received, my friends. Philip had gone into the city of Samaria. There he had preached the gospel. There they had obeyed the gospel of Jesus Christ and the Bible says in Acts 8:14, When the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John who when they came down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Now friends Acts 11:13 says that he is going to give, God is going to give the Holy Spirit. We find that this is exactly how he did it. And I pointed out last night that the parallel passage as some would call it in Matthew 7:11, points out the idea of the things. And so we see the promise here of the gift of the Holy Spirit to your children and all them that are afar off. God is going to call them. How? To the work of the miraculous by the laying on of hands. He doesn't say how in Acts 2 but he shows us how in Acts 8. Let's turn if you would then to Acts 5:32. The apostles are on trial among the religious leaders on this particular occasion. In Acts 5:32 there is an interesting statement here where the apostle Peter is testifying or arguing as it were, that we have been with Christ, we have seen his death, we have seen his resurrection, and then he says we are witnesses of these things. And so also is the Holy Spirit whom God hath given to them. Now brother Pat that that is the Holy Spirit himself, to all that obey him. Well my friends, this is an argument relative to the idea of divine authority. The religious leaders told Peter and the apostles we told you to keep your mouth shut. Peter says in verse 29 and following, we must obey God, ought to obey God, rather than man. He then refers to these

things that they were witnesses and he says we are witnesses of these things and so also is the Holy Ghost that God hath given to them that obey him. Picture in your mind if you would please, brother Pat and the apostle Peter standing up with each affirming what they affirm. What brother Pat affirms is the personal non-miraculous indwelling of the person of the Spirit himself. I want to draw your attention to something that I think is very important. And consider what the apostle Peter said in Acts 5 and notice verse 32. Notice here that he says, concerning the witness, the Holy Spirit is a witness he says. Now watch what happens in verse 33. When they heard this they were cut to their heart, and took counsel to slay them. Do you think if Pat were standing there and said that's just referring to the non-miraculous personal indwelling. You can't feel it, there is no perception whatsoever, nobody can see it. And do you think the people would take umbrage with this? And they would say we are going to take counsel to kill you? No my friends, they understood the import of that particular statement. This is the Holy Spirit as Jesus said in John 14:25,26 when he says that ye shall testify and the Holy Spirit shall bear witness. The same Greek word. Now the apostle Peter, here is doing exactly what Jesus said they would do. They would bear witness and the Holy Spirit would by the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Now friends that's the background of Acts 2. That the very passage the brother Pat is arguing from. And certainly we understand that it is miraculous. Everything about it was miraculous in the sense of the time and the events at that particular time. Peter, in light of that, promised them the gift. Everyone of them? No, no more than John the Baptist promised to everyone of the Jews baptism with fire or baptism with the Holy Spirit, Matthew 3:11 and verses following. And so here the apostle Peter is simply saying concerning that they would by the laying on of the apostolic hands receive the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit in order to confirm and reveal, etc. **End of Tape 2 Side B**

Tape 3 Side A I'm going to try to refer to that speech when I get time but I'd like to get through with my first affirmative speech that I didn't get to. I'm in the middle of trying to prove that the passages I brought up last night, I'm actually repeating some of what I said last night, trying to prove that these passages are universal. Let's go to Romans 5:5. There the Bible says "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." And by the way Tom, I do feel Acts 2:38 is an important passage in this discussion, but I brought up 15 affirmative truth texts, and if you were to disprove one of them that it's not talking about the personal indwelling, you would still have fourteen left. All of them stand upon their own merit. If one of them, only one proves my position that's all it takes. All of them stand or fall by themselves, not together. Even if you take one of them away, even Acts 2:38, you'd still have the fourteen left. For example, this Romans 5:5 is very clear. It can't be the indwelling through the word because it's a promise to be received. God commanded to be obeyed. The Holy Ghost is given, not a power from the Holy Ghost which you would maintain. Now is this just to a select few or to everybody? Let's look at the context. Let the context answer. We are talking about Romans 5:5, let's go back to verse 1. Who is promised the Holy Ghost according to Rom 5:5? The people that received the Holy Ghost according to Romans 5:5 are those who are justified by faith. That was just the apostles, of course, they were the only ones justified by faith...peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: -- that's going to the apostles and a few others....have access by faith into this grace -- that's probably the apostles and a few of the not all of them. Those who have hope maketh not ashamed obviously we are talking about all the Christians those have love of God in their hearts, that's all of them, those who are justified by their works—every Christian at that time and every Christian today those who will be saved by his life, not just the apostles and a few others that received the miraculous, those who are reconciled to God -- every Christian then and every Christian today, those who will be saved by his life—every Christian then and every Christian today. Now what would I have to do to prove that Romans 5:5 is universal to all the Christians then and now, if this isn't the way we do it. Now isn't that what we are supposed to do? Okay we have a dispute, is Romans 5:5 universal or just to a select few? Look at the context and find out from the context. Fortunately in this case the context in about seven or eight ways prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that it is universal to all the Christians then and all Christians now. And you know what that is. The Holy Ghost was given to these people and all these saints, every one of them. That proves my proposition. And the reason it does is because it proves that it cannot be referring to the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. We agree that it was not universal then and to nobody now. But this shows it was universal then to every Christian and it's universal today. Gal 4:5-7. I don't have a chart that exactly shows in that same way the universality but I could have made one and should have made one before I came here. But remember Gal 4:6 "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." So we would see the Spirit of his Son. Now if you think it was

talking about the second person there are some other passages that show that its talking about the Holy Ghost, even though it says the Spirit of his Son. It's talking about the third person of the Godhead. We can show that from other passages. I don't think you will dispute that. Now let's look at the context. Verse 5 "To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Now is that just the apostles that receive the adoption of sons or is it all the Christians? I think we know. Verse 6 "And because ye are sons, --is he saying because ye are apostles an or prophets? -- no because ye are sons. Everyone of them. Verse 7 "Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; -- every Christian—"and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." That's every one of them and every one of us. Tom whether you know it or not when you were baptized a Christian and I think you were you received the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. You don't know it's in there but you've got it. I believe the context shows conclusively that that's every Christian. And then we looked at this last night 1 Thes 4:8. You remember there it says that the Holy Ghost is given to somebody. He was given to us. The Holy Spirit was given to us is what the writer Paul says. Who is that? Well verse 8 says it's the people that were not to despise man. Was that just the apostles or a select few? For God hath not called us (there's that same pronoun) unto uncleanness, but unto holiness. Now was it just to the apostles and just a few others. Next let's go to Titus 3:5-7. Remember last night I brought this up. "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; Which (referring back to the Holy Ghost), he shed on us (sometimes people think it would be better translated poured out) on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." God poured out on us or shed on us the Holy Ghost. Now who is the us? Who is the us? Let's look at the context. Well first of all let's look at this question I asked Tom last night. I asked Tom who does that apply to? All, just a select few of the Christians, or other. Tom said other, and wrote dispensational -- to a special group. Now can you imagine that, that a gospel preacher who would say that Titus 3:5 and 3:7 do not apply to everybody. It just applies to a special group, dispensational. What he means by that it doesn't apply today. That's what he means by dispensational. He thinks that verse 5 does not apply to all them men but applies to other, dispensational

Tape #3, Side A starting about half way of Pat's speech due to sound problem

Pat Donahue: Tom did Cornelius receive what he received because he was a son, because he was a Christian? I don't think so. He got that miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit before he was baptized. He wasn't a son yet. And so Gal 4:6 cannot be referring to the miraculous measure of the Spirit. That's to you everybody because you are a son. As a matter of fact the moment when you become a son, God gives it to you because you became a son. Cornelius received what he received, the miraculous measure, before he ever became a son. ☺ 1 Jn 3:24, you can make the same point here. In 1 Jn 3:24 we mentioned earlier about the first part of the verse, says he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him and he in him. Now that means in figurative language they are a faithful Christian. Okay. And -----they wouldn't have been given the Spirit except for the fact that they were faithful Christians. God dwelled in them and they in God. The same thing can be made with 1 Jn 4:13 Hereby we know that we dwell in him and he in us. We are faithful Christians because he has given us of his Spirit. So the only way you can get the Spirit according to these passages is that God dwells in you and you in God, when you are a faithful Christian. That cannot be true about Cornelius. These passages cannot be referring to the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit because God didn't dwell in Cornelia. And Cornelius did not dwell in God. -----I want the audience to see that you make a lot of Greek arguments and you might be mistaken about some of these Greek arguments. -----Just understand that when you make that Greek arguemnt it doesn't mean that argument is true. You know the only thing we have here is the English and you can read in your English Bible whether something is true or not. -----He's making mistakes many times in the Greek -----just know that he does make mistakes in the Greek. Now he's also making mistakes in the Greek in Eph 1:13,14. Now due to the very technical nature, Tom, of the dispute here in Eph 1, I've decided I'm not going to, it's a very, he's made an argument on Eph 1 and he's wrong about it, the Greek argument. Okay? It's a very technical dispute and because it is, I'm not going to bring that up-----I assure you it is very technical. He is wrong in that argument he makes from the Greek. Instead of trying to give you all that technical Greek stuff which I couldn't begin to tell you about, I can bearly even read it-----I assure you he's wrong about that argument he makes in the Greek in Eph 1. But what I can do for you is prove that the earnest in Eph 1 is not the word of God but is the Holy Spirit. You know how I'm going to do that? I'm going to prove it from the English from another passage. It will make it very clear for you. Turn to 2 Cor 1:22, from NKJV it says who also has sealed us and given us the Spirit in our hearts as a deposit.-----2 Cor 5:5...who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. It is made clear by these two passages that it is the seal and the earnest. ----I want to respond to something you made on 1 Cor 6. In 1 Cor 6 he's trying to say 1 Cor 6:19,20 is talking about the church when it says the temple of the Holy Ghost is your body. His argument was you have your body, your is plural, but body is singular so it must be a bunch of Christians but one body so it has to be the church. -----Thank you for your time.

Mr. Bright: It's good for me to be back with you this evening. I do appreciate very much your staying here. I know that before this night is over, it's going to be somewhat late. And we do appreciate you very much. I would like to deal with something that Pat brought up in casting reflection upon this idea. Let me explain to you ladies and gentlemen, what we did on this so you will understand that we are not bumbling idiots. Now Ron has made the chart here but I'm involved in it so. I've been telling him for 30 years that he's about as dumb as a stump. No Ron and I are very close friends. What we did here ladies and gentlemen, Ron asked me, Tom do you want this in Greek and English. I said let's just put it in English. But what we did is just removed the Greek -----is that a transliteration? Absolutely not. It's a minor thing and I just wanted to do it because I did not want to bore the people with this idea of that we've got to know Greek. So many times when we use the Greek language that is the things that people say, well you are telling us that we have to know the Greek in order to understand the Bible. And I don't want to do that. And so that is just taking that Greek word removing that Greek -----and allowing the English letters to come up. Because I guarantee you any time you are in a computer and you're typing in the Greek if you an omega you hit the w, you do that every time, I don't know of an exception to that. And so that responds to that. Let's turn to Rom 5:5. We want to deal with this as the time permits with those things that bro Pat dealt with on his second argument. ***And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.*** Now you remember the word anachronism, my friends, it is taking something out of its proper time frame. Now the question that bro Pat has to answer is, how could the personal indwelling in his view, which ladies and gentlemen, is the

inference of deity in this physical tabernacle actually literally dwelling within this physical frame. How could the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit shed abroad the love of God in the twenty-first century? Now Pat has assured me last night he was talking to Ron and I relative to the presence that he thinks the Christian has of deity in the flesh of the Holy Spirit as a personal indwelling. He says it is not sensual, it is not anything else. Well that's what the apostle Paul says in Rom 5:5, when he says that hope maketh not ashamed because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Well how is that done friends? Let's read the very next verses of this particular passage and I'll show you exactly what the apostle Paul is talking about. Now Pat is interpreting this as the Holy Spirit himself. It is the person of deity in the Christian, friends, that is his view. But notice here, verse #6, 7,8 ***For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.*** Friends, when he is talking about Rom 5 that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, he is talking about the divine revelation of the gospel of Jesus Christ through inspired men in the first century. In the first century, ladies and gentlemen, people did not have the New Testament as we have it today. The Jews had what we would call the Old Testament, but they did not have the New Testament. For a period of time, you remember this period of time that I keep coming back to, this special dispensation as I refer to it. This special period of time. There were miraculously endowed individuals in local congregation who had received these spiritual gifts by the laying on of apostolic hands and they were for three basic purposes. They were for revelation, they were for confirmation to confirm the gospel of Jesus Christ, and they were for edification. And so the basic idea that is presented here, yes, you can talk about it is the Holy Ghost, but he is talking about revelation through the inspired word. And I think that all of us can see that. It is not the idea of the personal indwelling that is here, and if it is, bro Pat, then you tell us how does the Holy Spirit, the personal indwelling, how does it fit into your interpretation of Rom 5:5? And so let's move on to Gal 4. The passage that bro Pat mentioned just a few moments ago. In Gal 4:4 he said ***But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, now notice here, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because,*** bro Pat says that is at that, that's not what Paul says there, he said ***because you are sons***, you say they get the Holy Spirit when they are baptized, but Paul says here, ***because you are sons***, you have received this.. I think we understand beyond a shadow of a doubt, friends, notice here, he says he has ***sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father.*** Well friends what is that? What is the spirit of his Son? Bro Pat says it was beyond the shadow of a doubt the Holy Spirit. I'm convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt it is the spirit of adoption that is under consideration. Notice if you will please that the apostle Paul in this passage says, whereby ***we cry Abba, Father***, that is Father, Father. Now hold your fingers there and turn back with me to Rom 8, if you would please. Notice in verse 14, ***For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.*** Well there is evidence there, my friends, that the KJ translators thought that was the Holy Spirit but it is the spirit of his Son or the spirit of the Son of him that is under contemplation back in Gal 4 and that is exactly what he is saying. Notice this please, that in both passages, what is the result? Abba, Father. And it is the spirit of sonship that is under consideration here. I am of the deepest persuasion and have long held the position that this basic idea is not the Holy Spirit but that it is indeed the spirit of adoption that Paul mentions in Rom 8:14. Let's move on is you would to his statement in 1 Jn 3 and look very hurriedly if you would please at vers #24. ***And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.*** Now friends do you notice that in this passage he is saying, ***hereby we know***, and the reason that we know that is ***by the Spirit which he hath given us***. Now bro Pat is arguing that this spirit that he has given us is the personal indwelling. Now he has assured me that it does nothing sensory, there is no feeling of the person who has it, there is nothing seen, there is no evidence by anybody that is in the vicinity of that person. But here the apostle John says, ***hereby we know that he abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us***. How did they know that? How did they know that? He's going to say, well, it's by the word. Now friends, it's either by the word or it's by a miraculous manifestation. That's what the apostle John is saying in this particular passage. By this, ***hereby we know that he abideth in us***. John how do you know it? How do you know it John? ***By the Spirit***. Now is Pat going to come up and say, well, I know that I have the personal indwelling of the Spirit because the inspired word of God, I know that beyond a shadow of a doubt. But he is saying that it is by the Spirit. Then friends, there was a way in the first century beyond the shadow of a reasonable doubt, individuals could stand up and make and they could teach and preach Jesus

Christ, and then they had the ability when the necessity was there to perform the miraculous manifestation in order that they might confirm. Turn in your Bibles if you would please, to Mk 16. Here the master is giving the idea of what we call the Great Commission, and I think that is a good thing or name to put on that. But notice what he says in 16:17, ***And these signs shall follow them that believe***; well believers, all of them, did all of them have the spiritual gifts? I don't think so. I think bro Pat and I would agree on that. The spiritual gifts were given by the laying on of apostolic hands. But ***these signs will follow them that believe***. Now if you would, verses 17 and 18 tells what they are going to do. Go to verses 19,20 ***So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, watch it, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following***. Friends these signs were visible. They were something that could be seen. Back in Acts 2:33, the apostle Peter is talking about this and says, ***... and having received the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see***, is that the person of the Holy Spirit? ***... and hear***. You see and hear these things. My friends, that was the miraculous manifestations. And that is what is being taught in 1 Jn 3:24 ***He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby***, now watch this, we've been talking about universal, I am convinced that the first half of this verse is still applicable to you and me today. But it is an anachronism to take this idea and say that we know, now friends there has to be some way we know by the Spirit. Now is bro Pat going to say it's simply because the word tells us. Well I think that ought to be enough, but is that how he is going to answer that. It's just simply because the word, I know I've got it because the Holy Spirit tells me through the inspired word. He doesn't do anything, he's a hibernating spirit, he's just there, he never does anything. But friends, is that what John is talking about here? I want to ask you to consider very closely, he says that the spirit or hereby we know that he abideth in us. Let's turn right on over if you would very hurriedly. . . well there's on other thing that I want to deal with 1 Jn 3:24. I want you to turn back there please. Now watch if you would please, in the very next verse 1 Jn 4:1 ***Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world*** . . . try the spirits. How did they do that? Well over in 1 Cor 12:9, among the nine spiritual gifts that the apostle Paul lists there is the idea of the discerning of spirits. There was an inspired man who had received a spiritual gift by the laying on of apostolic hands in the first century church that had this ability, as it were, to discern the spirit. That's what he is talking about in 1 Jn 4:1. Can we do that today? Not in the way they did it in the first century. My friends, we have the confirmed word of God. They didn't have that in the first century at that time. But we have it today. It has been signed, sealed, and delivered. And so we see that it is a miraculous context beyond a shadow of a reasonable doubt. Well let us deal with something else here if you would please. I want you to turn to Acts 10. Now bro Pat made an argument concerning this idea and I think it is extremely important friends that we notice the thing that is under consideration. Now bro Pat has made the argument concerning this thought that if the gift of the Holy Spirit mentioned in Acts 10 relative to the house of Cornelius, if that is miraculous then I in-----or another, give up the argument based upon the fact that Acts 2:38 repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ. Now friends, keep in mind if you would please, there is a special time period, there has never been one like it before, there has never been one like it since. There was a special time, and in Acts 10 we see that in the infinite mind of God it was time to make known to the Jews that indeed God intended for the Gentiles to be accepted in the covenant relationship with him, separate and apart and distinct from becoming a Jew or becoming a proselyte. And so here as we look at this, this is a special event. You remember the Bible says that when Peter came into the house of Cornelius, an angel had told Cornelius go down to such and such a place, and call Peter. Peter came, and the Bible says as he reveal in Acts 11, as he's called up to Jerusalem, he said and as I began to speak—as I began to speak. And notice the Holy Spirit fell upon them. The question that I want you to consider with me tonight—why the miraculous events at the house of Cornelius? Why? We will answer my question. Here's a man who has not heard the gospel, he has not believed the gospel, he has not repented, he has not been baptized for the remission of sins – and yes he received the miraculous. Why? My friends, there was only reason for the events at the house of Cornelius and that was to convince the Jews that God was going to accept the Gentiles. A miracle had already been performed – remember Peter's vision? A sheet as it were, a great object let down from heaven, unclean beasts – arise Peter, kill and eat and he said not so Lord. That was already a miracle. And so when Peter comes to the house of Cornelius, he understands – he says, well I understand now. And so the events, come with me if you will please to Acts 11. Acts 11, Peter gives the things that are in Acts 11, he gives his defense. Look if you would please, in verse 2, ***And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem they that were of the circumcision*** – who is that? Jewish Christians – ***contended with him***. Why? You went into the house of Gentiles, Peter. You wasn't supposed to do that. You see the

Jewish prejudice here? And so the apostles Peter begins to explain. And notice in verse #15 Peter as he said *And as I began to speak the Holy Ghost*. Notice here as he began to speak this happened. It brought to his mind. Now look at the effect that it had upon the apostles and elders in verses #17,18. ***Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ; what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.*** And in Acts 10:45 the apostle Peter referred to it as the gift of the Holy Spirit. Yes my friends, the miraculous gift of tongues, miracles descended to convince the Jews. Let's turn to another passage to show this, Acts 15, if you would please. This is a spiritual event. This is something that is very unique. God has to convince the Jews that he is going to accept the Gentiles. Notice here Acts 15 – there is a great Jerusalem conference – they're deciding, as it were, do the Gentiles have to keep the law of Moses and be circumcised? Paul and Barnabas, they are dealing with this particular subject. In this so called Jerusalem conference, Peter stands up and he begins to speak. Notice in 15:7 ***And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.*** Notice what it says. ***And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us.*** Now some people say that God knew the heart of Cornelius —oh no my friends – God knew the heart of the obstinate Jew and it was a miracle. Thank you very much.

Tape 1, Side B

Pat Donahue: Tom, I really appreciate you taking up some of my passages that time. That was excellent the way you at least tried to respond to at least 4 or 5 of the passages that I brought up. You of course didn't get to them all, but you know we are limited in time, and I understand that, and I hope that you will continue to get some more of them. I spent my first speeches just doing affirmative, I didn't get to respond any I don't believe to your first speech. Now I did go back and respond a little bit of your last night's things so now I'm going to take up with his first speech tonight. He mentioned in his first speech about in Acts 2 – what do you think the folks would have had in mind. You know would they have had in mind a personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Well I don't know what they had in mind. The Bible doesn't tell us what they had in mind. But you know I wonder what the people had in mind when Jesus talked about the kingdom. Did they have in mind a physical kingdom? Well does that make it right? Or did it turn out to be a spiritual kingdom? See what people who have incomplete knowledge have in mind doesn't really make any difference. What makes a difference is what the Bible says. People thought there was going to be a physical kingdom. It didn't turn out that way. Suppose the folks in Acts 2 were expecting a miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38. It wouldn't mean anything. Because they could have been wrong about it. Peter was right. Okay? Rather than make -----what they had in mind, but we don't actually know what they had in mind. You sort of just imply that they had the wrong thing in mind, but didn't, as far as we know. Now he mentioned about shall in Acts 2:38. And I never said that shall had the same meaning every place, in every place in the Bible – but I did parallel to Mark 16:16 and he failed to notice that. See I'm contending that in Acts 2:38 that ***shall*** means certainly will, definitely will. What does it mean in Mark 16:16? ***He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*** Does that mean some time off in the future? That they may be saved? You know when you debate the Baptist, sometimes their tact on Mark 16:16 is to say that – well that's talking about eternal salvation. It doesn't help them any but they do it any way. But they're wrong about it. You can compare it to Luke 24 and see that it's talking about the remission of sins that happens when you're baptized. But you know, they want to do the same thing you want to do – that ***they shall*** means some time in the future in Mark 16:16 and they are wrong. In Acts 2:38 ***the shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*** means exactly what it means in Mark 16:16. And you're wrong if you try to make it off in the future. But even if you were right – that it meant sometime in the future, you wouldn't agree with your own statement, because you don't believe all of them got it. You don't think they certainly got it even in the future. You think only some of them got the gift of the Holy Spirit – even back then. ☺ ☺ So not only is he wrong about when it occurred, he says, well, only some of them would have got it. But the Bible is right – it says ***they shall***, definitely will receive it and they received it right then. And then he went into it again about ***your children***. You know I think we all know what ***your children*** means in Acts 2:39, but let's suppose you are right ☺. Here's another case, but you don't even believe your argument, Tom. Because, let's suppose that this meant one generation, when it says ***the promise was to you and your children***, just one generation, like in Joel 1:3, but not like Acts 7:23, the case I gave. Now suppose you are right, that would mean all the folks, all the children of the Jews, but just that one generation, every one

would have received the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. He doesn't believe that ☺. He doesn't even believe it was to their children of one generation. He just believes it was to a few of their children, one generation. So he doesn't even believe that. And then he mentioned about **those that are afar off** and he said a lot of words, and what he really meant was, was that the Gentiles, this just means the Gentiles received it representatively, meaning a few of them received it. Remember how he paralleled it to Acts 2:17, **all flesh**. That means a few of them received it. And so that means the Gentiles received it representatively. But I paralleled this, and talk about consistency of language, Tom, remember I paralleled this to the other places in the Bible that talk about **afar off** – Eph 2:13-17. Was that just a few of the Ge – you know Jesus died on the cross to make the Jew and those that are afar off together in one, by breaking down the middle wall of partition, which I believe was the Old Testament law. Now was that just a few of the Gentiles that he brought together with the Jews, and so we can say that the Gentiles were brought together with the Jews representatively, or was it all the Gentiles? We all know that Eph 2:13-17, **those that are afar** was not just a few of the Gentiles, so that the Gentiles were there representatively – it was all the Gentiles. So what would it mean in Acts 2:39, when it says **all those that are afar off**? Do you think that would mean by consistency of language, that it was just a few of them representatively? I don't think anybody is going to accept that view. I know you believe it. But I don't believe anybody here would even think about, dream about accepting that view. And then he brought up again the phrase **as many as the Lord our God shall call**, as if **as many** necessarily proved a limited number. Of course we went to Gal 3:27 and showed that was wrong last night. It doesn't necessarily mean that. Look at Gal 3:27 – now who are we talking to – who is Paul talking to in Gal 3? Christians. If you want to see that, look at Gal 1, he's talking to all the brethren with me, unto the churches of Galatia. He's talking to the Christians. He says in Gal 3:27, he says **For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ**. So some of the Christians have been baptized and he's saying well here's some of the Christians that hadn't been baptized but the ones that have, they've put on Christ – because it's limited, he's trying to limit it – no he means everyone of you in this case. Tom, you know what **as many as** means, in the Greek? It means **as many as**. It doesn't necessarily limit it, or necessarily not limit it. It just means **as many as**. That's what it means. And so in Acts 2:39, it means **as many as the Lord our God shall call**. And again, something he hasn't responded to, if you go back and see what he's quoting from – remember audience, I beat this like a drum last night and I think I referred to it earlier – **as many as the Lord our God shall call** is a quote from Joel 2:32. Now look back there, and what was it a call to? Now verse 39 doesn't specify what the call was to – now verse 38 does, **repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost** – that's what he's calling people to. Verse 39 doesn't mention it again, but verse 39 is a quote of Joel 2:32. And you know what it mentions there that the call is to – deliverance or salvation. That should nail it down for you right there Tom. What is the call in Acts 2:39? Well it's a quote from Joel 2. And what was that call? Was it a call to miraculous offices? No, it was a call to deliverance. My definition for deliverance out of my Random House Dictionary was – salvation. That gets every body. If that doesn't prove it, what would I have to do Tom, to prove it? If that doesn't prove that Acts 2:39 is universal to every body, what would you want me to do to prove this? I mean I'm going to the very verse that he quotes and showing you that it was a call to deliverance. And then he mentioned Acts 5:32 and 29. Now what he's doing, brethren, is, it says in Acts 5:32 – if you can find that chart on Acts 5, put it up – then he talked about folks obeying him, and so he's going up to verse 29 and say see, there the apostles are saying we ought to obey God rather than men. ☺ And so he's trying to say well, it was only the apostles in Acts 5:32, because if you go back up and find the word obey in 29, it's talking about the apostles. But I asked him a question last night and he answered it none of the above. But I want to ask you. You preachers out there, have you ever used Acts 5:29 in this, in these ways? Remember we are talking about Acts 5:29 and he's trying to limit that to just the apostles. But I want to ask you if you've ever used – just suppose you know we look at Eph 5:22,24 and it talks about the wives to be submissive to their husbands, that's the law. But suppose the husband is telling the wife to do something that's unscriptural like, you can't go to services or something like that, or you're going with me to the beach, or something like that. Would she have to obey her husband or would Acts 5:29 say that she can disobey that command because it violates the Bible? Why I would believe that Acts 5:29 would say that she could disobey that. Now have you ever applied it that way? Well according to Tom, you are misapplying it because it only applies to the apostles. Now have you ever used that passage, you know 1 Peter 2:13, says we are to submit to the government, and we are, and we are to obey them. But what if the government told us something that was contrary to the scriptures -- like the government told them back then to quit preaching? Now would we quit preaching -- or would we have to obey God? We ought to obey God rather than men. But you know we can't apply that to that today, that was

only to the apostles. If you did that today, and applied it to today Acts 5:29, you would be misapplying it ☺ because it doesn't apply today – it's only the apostles. And what about if you were teaching a young adult, say he was 20 or 21, but still in the house and he wanted to become a Christian but he said I can't do it because my parents tell me I can't. Would you teach him well, Acts 5:29 would say that you ought to obey God rather than men? Ron, have you ever done that? You know Marion Fox has done all of these. ☺ And I have too. You teach him. No, you'd be misapplying it because Acts 5:29 doesn't apply today, it only applies to the apostles. And you know, I asked Tom if he's ever used that passage for these three things, these three examples – he said no. That's amazing isn't it? I believe most of you preachers out there, any of you men who have done preaching, have probably used that countless times, to those examples, hadn't you? But according to Tom you're misapplying it because that only applies to the apostles. Do you really believe that, or do you believe what the Bible says **that those that obey God will receive the Holy Ghost**, Acts 5:32? Now I ask you— turn that on Mark – what did we point out in earlier speeches? Who at this time was obeying God, Acts 3:41, three thousand. Acts 4:4, it had increased to either five or eight or thousand depending on how you take that term. In Acts 5:14, even more were added. There were at least 5000, more than 5,000 who were obeying God presently at that time. Now the Bible says that God ☺ gave the Holy Spirit to those that were obeying him, present tense. We know that at least 5000 or more that were obeying him at that time, not just the apostles or a select few. Now who are you going to believe – are you going to believe Tom that it was just a few, maybe 30 or 40 at that time, or over 5000 who are obeying him? You know, I'll tell you what you should believe, that if today you obey God, God will give you the Holy Ghost, because that's what he says in Acts 5:32. And then he mentioned about verse 33. It says **When they heard that, they were cut to the heart, and took counsel to slay them**. And he says of verse 33, Pat do you think they would have got made like that and wanted to kill them, because he had just preached to them that if you obey God you get the Holy Ghost, that a personal indwelling would – No I don't think that would have got them made, and I also don't it would have probably gotten them mad if they had found out if they were going to receive the miraculous measure, if they obeyed God. I don't think that would have gotten them mad. But you know what would have gotten them mad – when they told them to quit preaching and they said we ought to obey God rather than men, and by the way you hung and you slew the Son of God, verse 30. Just like in Acts 2 says you murdered the Son of God, they were pricked in their hearts, but those people responded favorably. You accuse somebody of murdering the Son of God, that will prick their heart, and they'll react one of two ways – they are going to get mad, and they're either going to get mad and obey the gospel or they're going to get mad and think about doing something bad to you. That's why they got mad, it wasn't because they were told if you obey God you will get the miraculous gift of the Spirit. And then Rom 5:5 – he said that's an anachronism. ☺ He, he wanted me to explain how getting the personal indwelling could, how could that make the love of God **as shed abroad in our hearts**? Well, even if I couldn't explain that, you wouldn't have dealt with what I said. It says there that the Holy Spirit was given them, given to us, and I showed from the context who the us was. But it's not hard to explain. This is talking about, when it says the love of God, this is talking about God's love for us, not our love for God. How does God show his love for us? By giving us the Holy Ghost. **His love is shed abroad in our hearts by giving us the Holy Ghost**. He shows us love by sending his Son to die on the cross and then he shows his love when we were baptized, he gives us the Holy Ghost. That shows his love for us. That's not hard to explain. And then he said, Pat interprets this as the Holy Ghost himself. No Tom I didn't do any interpretation. All I did was read the verse. It says the Holy Spirit is given them. Not something from the Holy Ghost. I didn't interpret that. I read what it said. The Holy Spirit is given them. That's what it said. I didn't interpret it that way. He said this means that the love of God is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost. I agree with that Tom. And then the very next phrase it says the Holy Ghost is given us. That's the part, you're right, the love of God is shed abroad by the Holy Ghost which is given us. That was the point I made – which is given us. And then in Gal 4:6 it says Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son – he said how can that be so, I thought you got it when you were baptized. That's right Tom, that's exactly how you become a son of God is by believing, repenting, confessing and being baptized. And so when you are baptized you become a son of God and God gives you the Holy Spirit right then because you **became a son of God**. That shouldn't be hard to understand. And then he turned to Rom 8:15 and he said that's parallel to Gal 4:6 is Rom 8:15. I agree, let's look at that. He said this is talking about the spirit of adoption. Is that what it's talking about? In Rom 8:15 it says you **have received the spirit of adoption**. What spirit is that Tom? Well is that the Holy Spirit or what? Well let's look at the context and find out. Look at verse 14 **For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God**. Are we talking about the deity Spirit – there's good reason why the KJ translators capitalized the word **Spirit** in verse 15.

It's not talking about the human spirit, it's talking about the Spirit of God. That's what the context says. Again in verse 16 it says ***The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.*** Now is that first Spirit – is that Deity or is that the human spirit? If it's the human spirit, that would mean, the human spirit itself beareth witness with our human spirit. Or were the KJ translators right when they capitalized Spirit there because it's talking about the Holy Spirit, which one Tom. I think we all can see. Now I'll go ahead and tell you, when it says in Gal 4:6, it says the Spirit of his Son, I think we do need to go ahead and show at least one example when you can see that could be referring to the third person, not the second person. It might be confusing at first, because it says the Spirit of his Son. But look at Acts 5:9 and then verse 3. In Acts 5:9 ***Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord?*** Now you would think it was talking about Jesus there, perhaps second person Spirit. And it could be. But if you go to verse 3 it's talking about the third person. ***Peter said Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost.*** So sometimes you see Spirit of the Lord or Spirit of the Son, you might think well, that is the second person Spirit. Well no, just like sometimes it will say the Holy Spirit of God, you might think, well is it talking about the Spirit of the Father? No it's referring to the Holy Spirit, the third person. And then he went to 1 Jn 3:24, Let's turn there, 1 Jn 3:24. First of all Tom the passage says, I didn't say this, he says how can you know that you're saved by the personal indwelling by the Holy Spirit being given to you? How can that be? He doesn't understand it. It doesn't matter whether we understand it. You remember Isaiah 55:8,9 ***God thoughts are higher than our thoughts.*** You don't have to understand it. The passage says that we know that he abideth in us, in other words we are saved, by the Spirit which he hath given us. I don't care whatever, you can think whatever you want to about the rest of the passage, but the bottom line is it says the Spirit is given to us, and I've already shown from the context from verse 22, it's talking about the people whose prayers were answered, the first part of verse 24 it's talking about the people who God dwelled in them and they in God. It's talking about all the Christians, not just a select few. The Holy Spirit is given to the people, the us, of that context. It's all the Christians. Doesn't matter whether or not you can understand it, just believe what it says. That's the whole thing. Abraham didn't understand how he could have a big posterity through Isaac and still sacrifice him. He didn't understand it, but he did what God said. That's what you need to do. Don't be like Naaman, who couldn't understand it and at first refused to go and dip in the river Jordan. At first he refused because he couldn't understand it. You're being like that. And then he said 1 Jn 4:1 shows that the context here is miraculous, ***trying the spirits***, remember we have the miraculous discerning of the spirits. He stopped. Needless to say he sustained his case by stopping but he would have ruined his case if he would have read the verse. ***Hereby know ye the Spirit of God***, here's how you discern the spirit according to this verse, ***every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God.*** Doesn't take a miracle to do that. If a guy comes up to me and says that Jesus Christ did not come in the flesh, I don't need a miracle to tell you that that person is a ***false prophet***, according to verse 1. Doesn't take a miracle to ***discern that spirit***. That's what we are talking about here, is the non-miraculous, not the miraculous. And then don't forget about verses 22 and 24 that I've already shown that it's talking about all Christians. And then he mentioned this last night. Put up #64. And he did again tonight. Mark 16:17, ***about the signs that follow them that believe.*** Does that mean every single Christian, believer, could perform a miracle? No, we agree that they couldn't. Okay. That's why it didn't say that the believers would perform miracles, it said the ***signs would follow the believers***. For example Tom, would you agree with this statement – I'm talking about the time the Israelites when Moses came and they had the plagues and then when they left Egypt there were a few miracles that occurred, like the parting of the Red Sea and etc. During that time frame, would it be correct to say that signs followed the Israelites? Yeah it followed them. That doesn't mean that every single one of the Israelites performed a miracle. Moses did, and I think Aaron did, and maybe there were one or two others that I don't remember. But there was one or two, or perhaps three or four of the Israelites, that actually performed the sign or miracle, but you'd still be able to correctly say that the signs followed them. Because all that means, it doesn't mean that every believer performed the sign, that just means as a general rule, everywhere Christians went you would find signs at that time. Okay. Because one or more of that group would be able to perform miracles, that's all it means, it means as a collective. And you know – well let me read something here, raise it up Mark – on the other hand passages like Acts 2:38 show that each individual person, not as a collective body, must ***repent and be baptized***. So that each individual person, not as a collective body, ***would receive the Holy Ghost***. Just like each individual person, not a collective body, ***received the remission for sin***. You know Tom agrees that Mark 16:17 is collective exactly as I was talking about. And he agrees Acts 2:38, ***repent and be baptized for the remission of sins*** is an individual and not collective. He doesn't think a few of them repented and were baptized and all of them

got the remission of sin. Why would you bring up the argument, when you agree with me that one is collective and one is individual? And then you mentioned that I believe the personal indwelling is the hibernating Spirit. ☺ No Marion said it's a semi-hibernating, not hibernating, Tom. Because I believe I've talked to you about Rom 8:26,27. The Holy Spirit is not hibernating, doing nothing, **he's interceding for us with groanings which cannot be uttered** and the word of God does not do that. He is a **seal or an earnest**, Eph 1:13,14. And then he said well Cornelius was a special time period. Cornelius received the Spirit to prove Gentiles could be saved. Tom, I don't have any problem with that. That's exactly why **Cornelius and his household received the Spirit**. But during that special time period Peter said you had **to be baptized to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost**. And Cornelia, during that special time period, received it before he was baptized. During that special time period – that phrase – during that special time period, **the gift of the Holy Ghost of Acts 2:38 cannot be the gift of the Holy Ghost in Acts 10:45**. Peter said during this special time period you had to **repent and be baptized** to get it. Cornelia got it before that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Tom Bright: I'm glad to stand before you tonight in the last of the three speeches that I'm going to give this evening. Again we thank you for your presence. I do want to ask each of you to think of everybody else on the way home, because of the traffic situation. I would like to ask you to remember bro Pat, he's got a long way to go. Remember him in your prayers that he might have a safe journey hom. Let's try to deal with some of the things that bro Pat said. He responded to my argument in Acts 2, concerning the miraculous context of that particular event. When I asked the question, what do you think that they would have in their mind? Then he says he doesn't really know. Well, friends, I just ask you, do you think that they had any mind at all or any thoughts at all, relative to the miraculous? Various charges were going around, they couldn't understand why these twelve men were standing up and speaking in tongues that they had never studied and that's the thrust of the Greek language. Do you think this basic idea of the speaking and the preaching that was being done by the -----of the Holy Spirit etc etc, that they had in mind that it would be a personal indwelling? Now I asked in one of the questions the other night, last night rather, bro Pat, what was stated in the sermon that Peter preached, that would allow the individual or lead the individuals in Acts 2 to come away with the idea that it would be the literal personal indwelling, the person of the Holy Spirit, actually physically entering into the human body, what in it? And he said all of the whole speech. Well, I want to know friends, because every instance wherein the Spirit is mentioned, and you notice the details, it always refers to the idea – there's about six or seven different verses in Acts 2 – that presents the idea that it was definitely miraculous. Now bro Pat might try to dodge that, but I suggest that unto you, that certainly these individuals learned and understood that this was indeed a tremendous event in their life. And that possibly, I don't know, they may not have realized at that time that they were a one of a kind in the sense that they saw something that had never happened prior to that and it would never happen again. And so it's hard for me to believe that they didn't have some concept of the miraculous. Well he presents the idea of **shall. Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost**. Friends, I have explained what the apostle Peter is talking about there. I have pointed out time after time that this is the special time period. This is the period wherein we are going to see the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit. And try to take that out of it's first century context and give it a twenty-first century is what we have been referring to as anachronism. Good people, I would suggest for your kind consideration, that as the individuals in that day and time as they thought about what Peter had stated relative to the gift of the Holy Ghost. Now friends here is – well I can't introduce that because it would be new material. I keep forgetting this is my last speech. Indeed I pointed out the idea that shall should indeed or can indeed, because of the conditional nature of that, can just refer to that particular something that is future. It is not definite, as bro Pat seems to want to lead you to believe. **Ye shall receive**. And he is emphasizing the point that **ye** means every body. He seems to think that I've made that – Pat, I've never made that argument. I've never believed that. I believe that it is collective in nature. I believe that the Holy Spirit would follow those in his miraculous manifestations in the first century, of the collective group of New Testament Christians. And so as we look at this, this is really no argument at all. He comes back to Acts 7:23 relative to my argument in Joel as Joel defined in Joel 1:3, who the children were. It is this generation telling this generation and this generation telling this generation. And he comes back in Acts: 7:23 wherein the inspired writer mentions the children of Israel. And he says, see, there is the idea where children means posterity. I've never asked that. I've asked for the specific term that is found in Acts 2:39 where it refers to posterity. Friends, it's interesting to note that the word in Acts 7:23 is not even the same word in the original language, as the word translated **children** in Acts 2:39. And it certainly, he says, it means **all shall receive**, and I don't even believe that. Friends, I've never argued that all people, every single Christian would receive that. This is dispensational

in nature. Yes repentance and baptism applies now because it was commanded. But here's the point, friends, Peter and other Christians were preaching baptism for the remission of sin, that indeed there was one God, one Saviour, virgin born, killed upon the cross, in the tomb three days, resurrected, and finally carried back to heaven and there he reigns over his kingdom. That was their message. And this one who is the only begotten Son of God commands them to be baptized. Indeed, and they used the miraculous manifestations in the first century to substantiate, to confirm the preaching of the gospel. I have never argued that all Christians in the first century were to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, or the miraculous. I've pointed out more than once, the apostle John said, he, speaking of Christ, shall **baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire**. Does that apply to everybody? Is everybody, every Jewish person in that day and time going to be baptized with the Holy Spirit and with fire at the same time, or even on different occasions? No, I said that is a synecdoche, which is a figure of speech, where we sometimes put a part for the whole or a whole for the part. Some of them indeed would be baptized with the Holy Spirit. And some of them indeed won't be baptized with fire. And so I've never made that argument. Friends, I do not believe-- now I want you to listen very close-- I do not believe all Christians in the first century, who lived during the miraculous age were able to perform miracles. Now I don't know how much plainer I can make that. Now Pat's going to say that is a universal promise. No, my friends, when he makes that statement it is just another instance of anachronism, taking something out of its first century context, and placing it, that is relative to the Holy Spirit not repentance and baptism, but the reference to the gift of the Holy Spirit and giving it a twenty-first century interpretation to make it mean that it is the gift which is itself the Holy Spirit. Well, notice if you would please, then the idea of **afar off**. He mentioned this also. Friends, I've always believed that refers to the Gentiles. I don't know what the problem is with this particular situation and I really don't understand the argument that he is making. Indeed I believe that these individuals that the apostle Paul -- turn to Eph 2 for just a moment, if you would please -- Eph 2. Notice here the apostle Paul in Eph 2:17 **And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh**. To whom did he have reference? To the Ephesians. They were Gentiles, my friends and certainly it was those who were **afar off**. But notice in this particular point if you would please, that we can turn over, skip the third chapter and go forward to the fourth chapter, and look in verse seven and following -- **But unto every one of us is given grace according -- notice -- to the measure of the gift of Christ**. He then launches into, and I use this in a good way, the idea of mentioning the various miraculous gifts. The Ephesians who were **afar off** had received the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. I'm assuming that it was by the laying on of the hands of Paul himself -- notice I said I assume. That would be logical to me, but it may not be -- I don't know--but I do know that he planted the church there, my friends -- I do know that, Acts 19. And notice if you would please, the idea of **as many as**. Now I've made the statement, and he says what does it mean in the Greek? Well, it means **as many as** -- that's my argument -- **as many as**. Who is it? Who put on Christ? All of those were baptized. Now notice that the promise of as many as in Acts 2:39 would be limited therefore, with that reasoning, to those to whom the promise was made, or to whom it applied. Well, does that mean every body -- I don't believe it does, my friends. But it was to those that God himself would call. Yes indeed Gal 3:27 teaches, let's turn over there and read **For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ**. Now he used the idea was that suggesting that some could put on Christ and not be baptized, or words to that effect? Absolutely not -- it's as many as. And that's what the apostle Peter said in Acts 2:39 **For the promise is unto you and your children and all them that are afar off** -- now watch this -- **even as many as**. I want to ask a question folks. Does that statement **as many as** mean every single person? **As many as he shall call**. And again that particular word there is not **calleo**, not the normal **call** in 2 Thes 2:14 -- **he called you by our gospel**. That is a different word. And as we have mentioned more than once friends, that particular word shall call is found 30 times in the New Testament. And every time it is never used in reference to the gospel call. It is used to call to an office, to a special something that is extraordinary, if I may use that terminology, not attempting to quote from any individual. Well and so if we look here, the promise is to as many as the Lord our God shall call. Is that a promise -- yes. Unto whom? As many as the Lord our God shall call. How is he going to call them. He doesn't tell us. When is he going to call them. He doesn't tell us. But then we find in Acts 8 where the apostle Peter and John went up to Samaria and there they laid their hands on the Samaritans and the Holy Spirit came upon them. And that's exactly what we are talking about. Jesus said it would happen and certainly Luke in this particular event in Acts 8 is saying that it did happen. And so as we look at that friends, I want you to think very seriously about this idea of calling. Yes there was a call to deliverance from sin. Who doubts that? Isn't that what the phrase remission of sins means in Acts 2:38 -- does it mean that or not? I don't have a problem with that. But friends when we take that which a promise was given and it was limited to a certain

period of time we come on back to this word anachronism. That's the point. The question is not whether statements made in Bible that were universal but the question that Pat and I are dealing with, was every statement universal for all times and I think bro Pat would agree that certainly not the case. And that's the very argument that I am making folks. Yes, they shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. To whom? Those that God would call. How would he call them? Again Acts 8 is a classic example of that and so I would ask you to consider that. Well he presents the idea of a quotation from Joel. Now if I remember correctly, bro Pat, you said last night, that Acts 2:39 was not a quotation of Joel Chapter 2 – I'm going to check on that, and I may be wrong – well friends, the point is yes Joel was talking about the events that transpired in Acts 2, Peter says this is that which was spoken of by the prophet Joel and on down in that sermon he told the people to repent and be baptized. Joel is the background. Therefore Joel prophesied of it. But was every promise Joel prophesied of on that occasion applicable to all people for all ages until the end of time? Your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, does that apply to every individual in every generation until the end of time? That's the point friends. Yes there are universal statements. I don't have a problem with that. I do have a problem with those particular statements that we found in the idea that indeed that every promise of the Holy Spirit is applying to you and me today. Well I was somewhat surprised about what he said in Rom 5:5 and he emphasized the point of this. Notice ***And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.*** He says, Tom, the Bible says ***which is given us.*** Pat it also says ***the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts.*** How is it done? That's the point – that's the point, I want to know. I maintain it is through the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Yes, the love of God that he has for man and that produces love in the heart of man. Now you could get into an argument – is it the love of God for us or our love – I'm not going to get into that argument. But the point is, something the Holy Spirit it sheds abroad in our hearts, which is given us. My friends, again, it is not given to everybody in the sense that it is the miraculous, in the sense the Holy Spirit by inspired men was revealing the gospel of Jesus Christ. And friends there is no greater love spread in the gospel than the master. And that's what the apostle Paul is talking about in that passage. Yes, the Holy Spirit was given, but again what is he talking about when he says the Holy Spirit was given? Pat says it's to everybody in the twenty-first century. Oh no my friends. He made an argument on the collective concept. I agree with that. And that is exactly what he is talking about. Friends, they had the Holy Spirit in the New Testament church in the first century and all they had to do, and I don't mean this in a slight way, to perform a miracle, was to perform those particular miracles, and so I think beyond a shadow of a doubt. I want to look very hurriedly at Acts 5:32, pursuing the idea of making these individuals mad. Yes, they were mad, because they were calling upon the authority that all Jews should recognize as they the leaders of the Jewish nation, to the degree that the Romans would allow them, in order to exercise this authority. And the Romans, concerning the preaching of Jesus Christ in such events as this, they weren't concerned about this as long as there was no riot, there was no real civil problems. And so the context of what he is talking about, is, it stands in opposition -- you the council is telling us not to do this. We are to obey God rather than man. Now Pat I do agree that principal is applicable to all people. And Peter sets forth a principal, and certainly it is applicable today. ***We are to obey God rather than man.*** Who is going to deny that? There are many other passages that bro Pat referred to that shows that. But the apostle Peter appealed to the miraculous manifestation that Holy Spirit – this is proof beyond a shadow of a doubt. We are the obeying ones in verses used. Yes the church collectively, that group that was represented, if I may use that term, by the apostle, I don't have a problem with that. I'm not talking about every individual and certainly the apostles were the ones that were that at that time and it is the apostles who stand in contradistinction between the Jewish rulers. Now friends, as we look at this I would suggest that you consider very carefully what bro Donahue and myself have said in these two nights. I would ask you to think very seriously, are we guilty of taking things out of the proper time frame, anachronism. Or are these things promised to all Christians for all times to the twenty-first century? Then if they are, then what ever is contained in those passages ought to be ours to enjoy. And if the Holy Spirit sheds something, then why don't we know it. I would suggest then that we think very seriously about this. I wish that I had more time but I do not.

Mr. Bright/Donahue Tape 4, Side A

Mr. Bright: Bro Donahue, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it a distinct honor to stand before you tonight in the first of three speeches that I will give relative to the proposition that has been ----- But before I do that I would like to take just a moment if I could and correct something that I think was a misunderstanding last Tuesday night. Either in my second or third speech I mentioned to Pat that I thought that he had said on one night that Joel 2:32 was quoted in Acts 2:29 and then on another occasion I thought that he had said just the opposite. Pat was right, I was wrong. I apologize for that Pat. I don't want to reflect upon anybody in a negative way. And so my assumption, my thought last Tuesday night was certainly incorrect and I want to make that very straight before we get into the lesson and our study tonight. It is the responsibility of the affirmative speaker in the first speech that he gives to clearly define the proposition so that there can be no misunderstanding whatsoever. Now the scriptures teach and the idea of the scriptures I mean that which we call the English Bible. 39 books of the Old Testament, Genesis through Malachi and 27 books of the New Testament, Matthew through Revelation. To teach means to impart knowledge to lead us to draw us to a specific conclusion. The Holy Spirit that which is sometimes, most of the time referred to as the third person of the Godhead. Dwell, I simply mean that it inhabits and we'll deal with this in just a few moments. In the faithful Christian the child of God, one who is walking in the light 1 Jn 1:9. Now here is the next word *only*. This word is very important, ladies and gentlemen because if I were to take this word out of this proposition, Bro Pat would be more than willing to debate that proposition if you just remove the word *only* out of that. And I believe that it is only, and by that I mean only one way, and only way, and no other way. And thus every affirmative argument that I will make tonight and tomorrow night will be in direct contradiction to what our brother thinks is the truth of the matter. And so I want to make that clear distinction. It is *only* through the word of God, the inspired word of God, and that being the instrument or the medium through which He dwells. Now please let me make it very clear, ladies and gentlemen, that I am not affirming that the *person* of the Holy Spirit dwells in the New Testament Christian through the word. Notice I said *person*. Now bro Pat takes the position that at baptism the child of God receives the personal, literal dwelling of deity in the flesh. I do not believe that the Bible teaches that and when I am saying that the Holy Spirit dwells through the word, I am going to explain this in just a few moments. Please understand the question that is before us tonight is not, does the Holy Spirit dwell in us but how? The manner, the medium, the mode, how does the Holy Spirit dwell in Christians tonight? The question has never been, does the Bible teach that the Spirit dwells in the Christian but what we are disagreeing on is the manner in which the Spirit of God dwells in the heart of a Christian. Now friends, and the very nature of the situation in which you and I live tonight, there are only two alternatives that are possible. That is the Holy Spirit either dwells directly, which is the position that my opponent takes, or indirectly. I reject what bro Pat says. I do not believe that it is directly because, if it is directly, my friends, it takes the miraculous power of God. And when I'm talking about a miracle, I'm not talking about something that is unusual. Man today says, though it happens every day, that when a woman gives birth to a child that it is a miracle. No it's not a miracle. When an individual has an accident, which could kill many people and yet they go through a long hospital stay, they say that it is a miracle. No, I'm talking about the power that was manifested in the creation of the world. Thus there is only one way that a divine Spirit can inhabit a human body. And that's only one way, my friends, and that is through the concept of a miracle. When I talk about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, please understand that I mean a *representative indwelling* of the Holy Spirit. I do not believe the person of the Holy Spirit is in me, but that it is a representative indwelling. Let me explain if could please. My father and mother, the remains of both Dad and Mom, lie in the cemetery in Bixby, Ok. Dad has been there, his remains, has been there for over twelve or thirteen. Mother has been gone for over thirty years. And yet, I say today, my friends, that my parents dwell in me. When I make that statement, you understand that I am saying by the concepts, the idea and the principles they instilled in me. This is exactly, the very same idea that I am affirming this evening. I'm sad to tell you tonight that Karl Marks dwells in literally hundreds of thousands of people tonight over in Europe and in other places. Do I mean the person of Karl Marks? No, through his doctrine, through his teaching, etc, etc. And so as we look at this, friends, I want to give an idea of what we are talking about. Let's see chart #42, if you would please, bro Cosby. Notice here on this particular chart, this is of course what Mr. Thayer says about it and I'm going to admit first of all, that this is simply as he sees it, his idea of what the word translated *dwell* means in Rom 7:17, 20, 8:9-11. Does it make it right? That's just merely his view. But I want you to look down here please, that according the MacKnight in his commentary, he says that Hebrews expressed absolute rule or dominion by the figure of dwelling. That's what I'm talking about tonight, dear friends. I'm talking about the absolute rule or dominion by the figure as being how or the

manner or the mode in which the Spirit of God dwells in the heart of New Testament Christians. It is not the person, but it is as one takes the word of God and allows it to rule, to dominate, to actually be that which is the standard by which he lives. And that is what I'm talking about when I talk about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Let's see chart #33, if you would, bro Ron. And notice here some of the passages that MacKnight gave was Ezekiel 43:7,9. Notice here he says, ***this is the place of my throne where I will dwell***, skipping on down, ***and the house of Israel shall no more defile my holy name, now let them put away their whoredom, and I will dwell in the midst of them***. Friends, what does that mean? Does that mean that God himself actually left heaven and there he dwelled, that he no longer possessed heaven, that he no longer lived in heaven? Is that the idea of what we're talking about? Friends, let's look next, if you would, at chart #46, Ron. Here is a statement, and I think this is the idea that I really want to get across. A word is a sign of an idea. It is, notice here, it is a sound or a symbol, which stands for an idea or a concept. It is the idea or the concept that you put within the mind by means of that sound or symbol, word, hence, the word, sound or symbol does not literally or actually dwell there at all, *only* the idea or the concept. Now that's what I believe is the meaning or the basic idea of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Friends, we need to understand that the Bible clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit dwells but the question is how does he dwell? I want to see chart #105 now, bro Ron, if you would please. And here is a passage, Ephe 5:18,19 and the corresponding or parallel passage in a parallel as it were book, Col 3. Now notice as you look at these passage that Paul says, ***And be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit; speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord***. Now notice, if you would please, here in Colos 3:16, ***let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; (now watch the similarity here) teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs,*** (friends, is that not parallel to speaking to yourselves in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs? There we have singing and there we have singing, here we have making melody there it is with grace in your hearts to the Lord) ***singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord***. It is my basic idea that as we look at this that Colo 3:16 is a commentary, an inspired commentary, upon the statement made by the apostle Paul over here in Ephe 5:18,19. Notice he says, be filled with the Spirit. Friends, this is a command. It is not something that is given merely as a suggestion, but as a command. And the apostle Paul says in the other passage, let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. Does he mean one thing here and another thing here. Is he telling us at one time to be filled with the Spirit and another time that we are indeed to let the word of Christ dwell in us richly? You and I need to understand that the word *dwell* as it is found in the Bible is not always to be understood as a *literal* dwelling in. Show me chart #44, if you would, bro Ron. And notice here a very interesting statement found in Rev 2:14 relative to the people of Pergamos I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's throne or seat is, now notice also, where Satan dwelleth. Now do we not understand that he is talking about the evilness and the wickedness that is there at that particular time? Do we not understand that he is indeed not talking about that Satan actually lived there? He does not literally dwell there. There is not a street address there my friends where we can say, this is where Satan dwells and he lives no other place. But he's talking about the rule, he's talking about the dominion, that is being exercised by Satan through and by his various minions. Notice also as we look at this that in Rom 7:17, and I don't think we have a chart on that bro Ron, the apostle Paul speaks that ***'sin dwelleth in me'***. Literally? Is there is dwelling of sin in the physical body? No. It is the idea of one who is under the dominion of that which is opposed to the will of our heavenly Father. Let's notice now, chart #99, if you would please, bro Ron. And let's notice some very interesting things here. Now this could be multiplied three or four times, but notice in this chart please, that I am showing that there is something that is done. One passage of inspired scripture says the Holy Spirit does it and another passage of scripture says the word does it. As I said, that could be multiplied but I do not want to labor you down with a bunch of passages to read, but notice here in Nehemiah 9:30, the Bible says the Spirit did the instruction. And over in 2 Tim 3:16, the idea of instruction from the word of God. Freedom in Christ in Rom 8:1 and there is in John 8:32 And ye shall know the truth, and truth shall make you free. Now good people, as we look at this I suggest that there are two choices, that if it is to be viewed separately then we have the Holy Spirit, for instance making one free on one occasion and the word of God doing that on another occasion. Is that the case, or is it the same action, simultaneous? I am convinced, beyond a shadow of a doubt, and I believe that this proves that we cannot deny it, that it is the Holy Spirit as he works through the word. As the word that has been revealed and confirmed by the Spirit of God is indeed that which a child of God allows to live and to dwell in that particular individual. And so as we notice this, let's keep this particular thought in mind. Friends, does the Spirit of God dwell in an individual? Indeed he does. The difference between bro Pat and myself is not does he, but how does he? Bro Pat thinks that the Holy Spirit, the person of deity

actually, literally, enters the physical body that you are looking at now. I believe it is a representative indwelling, that as one allows the word of God to rule, dominate and control his very life. Well let's go on and notice in 2 Tim 3:16, the apostle Paul made an argument concerning the power of the word of God. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness (now watch this) That the man of God may be perfect (that word does not refer to sinless perfection but it refers to indeed one who is complete. The word of God has that particular power, my friends. It will make one exactly like God wants him to be. What *word* do I talk about? Why it is the word of God my friends, that has or was two thousand years ago, approximately, divinely revealed, Holy Spirit confirmed. I want you, if you would please, to turn in your Bibles, and look please at Ephe 1:13,14. Here the apostle Paul says "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise or the glory of God". Now look, if you would please, at verse 13, you heard the word. Notice in verse 14, *which* is the earnest, it is the guarantee. Friends, grammatically speaking, *which* in verse 14, can only apply to the word that is found in verse 13, the word of truth, and it refers to nothing else. But here is the word that has been confirmed. And the apostle Paul says that you Ephesians having received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit which was the means by which they were revealed, and by which they were confirmed. Now you have that word which is the guarantee of all things that God has promised. God cannot lie. Let's see if you would please, chart #106, very hurriedly, Ron. Notice here in Acts 5:32, the apostle Peter in defense of what the apostles were doing, he said ***"And we are his witnesses of these things*** (the death, burial, and resurrection); ***and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.***". Now what Peter is affirming here is the very thing that Jesus said would happen in John 15:26,27. The Comforter, that is the Holy Ghost, he will send from the Father and he says the Spirit of truth, (now watch) he shall testify, (look at that word). And ye also shall bear (look at that word), testify and witness are exactly the same word, or not exactly the same word, but they are the same word in the original language. But notice if you would here, what the apostle Peter said we are doing here is exactly what Jesus said you would do. The Spirit will bear witness through the miraculous and you also will bear witness. And that's what the apostle is talking about. Read with me please, Heb 2:34 ***"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; (now watch) God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?"*** Jesus said this is what you're going to do, Peter said that's what we are doing, the apostle Paul affirms the same thing. Friends, it is the word revealed by inspiration, confirmed by miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit 2000 years ago approximately, and it is that which stands before us as the earnest as that which is a guarantee. Paul said in Titus 1:1,2, *in the hope of eternal life which God, that cannot lie.* And he has given us his word, he has confirmed it, and it is with absolute assurance that we can stand and look at it. Thus, my friends, the word indwelling in the hearts and the minds of an individual is the means by which God, the Father, God the Son, and God the Spirit dwells in the hearts of New Testament Christians. I can reject it or I can accept it. And we need to look very closely at this because indeed beyond any thoughts whatsoever, dear people, this is the only way and the Bible teaches that the Holy Spirit dwells this way, this is what bro Pat would agree with, or not the only way, but he would agree in a representative indwelling, and so as we meditate upon this, I want you to look very closely at the thoughts that we have presented. My father dwells in me, the Spirit of God dwells in me, the God of heaven, the Father himself dwells in me, thank you.

Pat Donahue: I would like to start where Tom began and the first thing I wrote down, the first argument that he made, besides the preliminaries and some of the things I would endorse 100% if he said if there is a direct indwelling, then it would take a miracle. But we responded to that either Monday or Tuesday night or both, and he didn't respond to my response. And that response is – the personal indwelling would be similar to a lot of things God does today routinely. Like for example, if a thousand Christians were to pray a prayer at one time today, right at one time, simultaneously, God wouldn't have any problem processing that information, hearing, understanding and answering all the prayers at once. Now if I could do something like that, you'd call it a miracle. But with God, he does it routinely. That's because he's God. And that's how he forgives sins, that's how he can look on the other side of the world when he, you know where it's dark and see when somebody sins in the closet. That's how he can do that. I can't That's how Jesus could go through a wall. Of course that was a miracle. But what I'm trying to say is, if I did that, if I were to try to process a thousand conversations at once, we'd call that a miracle, but when God does it, it's not a

miracle, it's just the nature of God. He does it routinely. And that's how he indwells, how he sends the Holy Spirit to indwell in our heart. And then he brought up Eph 5:18b, and paralleled with Colo 3:16. Tom, let me say this, I agree with that chart as far as I could tell, 100%. Put up my #47, Mark. As a matter of fact I have a chart that's pretty much makes the same point. Because as you know, I agree with the representative indwelling in some passages. In Eph 5:18b is one of them. Two reasons, one because it's made parallel with Colo 3:16, as you noted. Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly is parallel to be filled with the Spirit, which is a command, as you noted. Okay. So the word, as the word of Christ dwells in us, in other words as we obey the word, to the extent we obey the word then we could say by definition that the Holy Ghost dwells in us representatively through the word. And I'd also like to point out the concept I went through Monday and Tuesday night in that when you see a command in the Bible like Eph 5:18b, then you are going to know be filled with the Spirit, that's not going to be talking about the personal indwelling because that's a promise to be received, like Holy Spirit baptism. Mark raise it up a little bit. This is out of Marion's debate with Mack Deaver on page 115, and I'm pretty sure you will concur with his statement. Marion Fox who's a friend of these fellows, and a friend of mine, but they know him very well. Marion said the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is a promise and I agree with that. He's talking about what I believe about the indwelling, he doesn't necessarily agree with me, but he's referring to what I believe. Therefore the indwelling of the Holy Spirit cannot be obeyed. I agree with that. Eph 5:18 cannot be a reference to the personal indwelling because it entails a command to be obeyed. Those are my words. But it can be a representative indwelling. You cannot use Acts 2:38 and Eph 5:18b to teach the same thing. That's what Marion says. And the reason you couldn't teach the same thing because I believe Acts 2:38 would be a promise to be received like Holy Spirit baptism whereas Eph 5:18b is a command. I agree with him 100% and I asked him a question about this and said Marion, does that prove that Acts 2:38, cannot be the referring, the gift of the Holy Ghost cannot be referring to the representative indwelling, and he said yes. And Monday night I asked Tom basically the same question and he said yes. So we all agree, all of us any way, that Eph 5:18 is representative indwelling whereas Acts 2:38 is not. Now remember, he's supposed to be proving tonight that you have the representative indwelling through the word and that's the only way. But now Acts 2:38, if you admit is not the representative indwelling and it says if you repent and be baptized you will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. He admits and by the same reasons he would use I would use, it cannot be talking about the representative indwelling. So here's another way the Holy Spirit can indwell. He gives you the Holy Spirit when you're baptized. And if his proposition says only and representatively that means I've disproved his proposition. It's similar to the debate with the Baptists on faith only he can get up here and show a hundred verses like John 3:16 that show that we are saved by faith. But when he's affirming faith only, I will agree with all one hundred of those verses and then say but Mark 16:16 shows that it's faith and being baptized and you shall be saved. So it's not faith only, it's faith sure enough, but it's not faith only. And it's representative indwelling sure enough, and that's not the only passage that would refer to it, but it is also the gift of the Holy Spirit which is not the representative indwelling. It is a promise to be received. And then put up #65. He mentions Rev 2:13, where it says Satan dwelled among those people. You know what? I agree with you, and those definitions you gave. I agree that is a representative indwelling. You were saying that Satan dwelled in these people, was it Pergamos, do I have that right? He dwelled in those folks. What does that mean? Does that mean that Satan personally dwelled in them? No. It meant that they were obeying Satan, they were following him instead of following God. For in that sense Satan dwelled in them, a representative indwelling. But note, everybody turn to Luke 8:27 and following. Here we have something where Satan dwelled in some people literally or personally. We see that in Rev 2:13 he can dwell representatively but Luke 8:27 says "And when he went forth to land, there met him out of the city a certain man, which had devils (other translations say unclean spirits) long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs." And if you read that on through these indwelling spirits, the demons, Satan was causing him to do some strange things and he asked Jesus to please let's get these demons out of here and he said what is your name, and the devils answered Legion. There were many of them there, verse 30. I believe, Marion did, I believe that Tom will agree that this is a personal dwelling of these demons, these spirits, Satan himself I guess, or his messengers, I don't know how to put that. On Jan 14, 1999, I asked Marion on question #3, does Luke 8:27-35 teach that the unclean spirit or devils as the KJV puts it, was or were personally, literally in the certain man? Marion answered yes. I believe Tom would answer yes. Now here's what I'm trying to point out. He's saying that the Holy Spirit dwells in us only through the word and he pulls out a passage like Eph 5:18 or Rev 2:13 and shows representative indwelling. But now we see by the Bible, and I think by your own admission that not only can Satan dwell representatively but he can also dwell personally. You see? So if Satan can dwell both

representatively and personally that shows the possibility that the Holy Ghost can dwell representatively through the word to the extent you obey, and *personally* as a promise to be received when you obey the word. That *possibility* sure exists. So it's not *enough* just to read about a passage that teaches that the Holy Ghost dwells in us representatively through the word, you're affirming *only*. You're going to have to prove the *only* part. If I can show one verse, and I believe I've showed fifteen in the last two nights, one verse that conclusively shows that the Holy Spirit dwells in us personally, then it destroys his proposition because he said *only*. Put up his chart #99. Now I've seen his chart before and many of you have, and a lot of you –the Holy Spirit does this and so does the word and that's right. They do many things in common and I will agree 100% with his chart and even to the extent as far as I know that all these things that the Holy Spirit does, he does through the word of God, as far as I know. Now if you can find a passage that contradicts that, that's fine, I'll believe what the Bible says. But as far as I know the Holy Spirit does all of these things through the word of God. But there's at least one thing that the Holy Spirit does that is not through the word of God for the Christian and that's Rom 8:26,27. The Bible says ***Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought.*** So here's our spirit not knowing what to pray for; some other spirit, not our spirit, is going to help us. ***But the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered.*** Ron that would be things that we can't utter. With groanings which we cannot utter so he helps us. We are unable to utter so he helps us. Doesn't mean that the Holy Spirit can't communicate, it means we can't. And he that searcheth the heart knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit (that's the Father) because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." He, that's talking about the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is all throughout this chapter, Rom 8. That's what that's talking about the Holy Spirit. So the Holy Spirit yes perhaps most or almost all of what the Holy Spirit does for the Christian today is through the word of God. But that doesn't mean the Holy Spirit is the word of God, which he would agree with me on that. We can find at least one thing the Holy Spirit does that the word of God does not do, and here is one. Then really the point of your chart goes down. It does not prove that the Holy Spirit dwells only through the word, because we have found at least one thing the Holy Spirit does that the word does not do. Was that #7? Okay. Now I want to talk about Eph 1:13,14. Don't put up #5 yet. Everybody turn to Eph 1:13,14. He said that it talks about how that the Holy Spirit is a seal and an earnest. And he said *which* in verse 14 in the KJV cannot refer back to the Holy Spirit. Which now the normal rule is that a pronoun goes back to its last antecedent. I'm not saying that rule is there without exception in the Bible but the normal rule and so when you're reading this it said at the end of verse 13 ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which, what would you think that was referring back to? Which is the earnest of our inheritance. Well, it referred to the Holy Spirit. He says grammatically it can't do that. Well let me show you that grammatically it can. It can and it does. As a matter of fact if you look at some other translations, the NKJ it said of *which* there, *who* is the guarantee of our inheritance. Well will *who* refer back to the word God or the Holy Ghost? The NASV, *who* is given as a pledge of our inheritance. Who? Those translators evidently thought it *could* go back to the Holy Ghost. Not to the word of God. But he says it can't, but all these scholars, these Greek scholars who were probably even better than Mr. Hutto. They were part of the translation committee, and they thought it did go back to the Holy Ghost. The majority text, this is the way Mark explained it to me, he has the interlinear and you can look at it. He said it was the majority text, and it has *who* there for the literal translation, where you see the *which* in the KJV. Okay so evidently the word can go back and not only can but it does goes back to the Holy Spirit. And so what we have in Acts, I'm sorry, put up #10 Mark, #10, I believe you have it up, now often we talk about the Greek, he said it can't in the Greek. Now we've shown you some translations and everything like that. Now I want to show you some other verses that will help prove to you that the Holy Spirit is the guarantee, the earnest and the seal. Okay this isn't the only verse we have on this subject, we have two others. 2 Cor 1:22 ***"Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts"***. Is the word of God given as a deposit? Well, if somebody wanted to say that, I wouldn't disagree with them but that's not what that verse is saying. The verse is saying that the Spirit is given as a deposit. What about 2 Cor 5:5 "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit." The Spirit is given as the earnest or the guarantee. Now put up #5, he mentioned Acts 5:32. I'm not sure I caught everything he said, but I want to point out to you Tom, and the audience, that we don't need to confuse things here. This just says, ***"And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost"*** So we are witnesses and so is the Holy Ghost. He's a witness. Okay but don't try to insert witnesses into the third clause. Now on the third clause of the verse of verse he's talking about the Holy Ghost, not necessarily about how the Holy Ghost witnesses or how the people witness. He just has mentioned the Holy Ghost being a witness like those apostles, and then he happens to say, ***"whom God hath given to them that***

obey him.” Okay, so when a person obeys the gospel he may never do what the denominations say, and witness, teach others, okay, he may die the next moment after he’s baptized but when he was baptized, he obeyed the gospel the Holy Spirit was given unto him. Okay. Now put up #31 and then after that #33. So the last two nights, Tom has been making the point, if I’m incorrect you point it out. Sometimes I get confused because I’ve been listening to the tapes with Marion Fox. But I believe you also made this point that in Acts 5:32 it says that God gives the Holy Ghost to those that obey him. Okay. And he says, well that’s present tense in other words those that were presently obeying him. And because of that, he says that’s just talking about the apostles who were obeying him in that context. But have you ever noticed and you have because he brought it up both Monday and Tuesday night, in Acts 2:41 it says that three thousand obeyed the Lord. Acts 4:4, it went up to five thousand, or possibly eight. In Acts 5:14, it says **“And believers were the more added to the Lord...”** So we’ve got over 5,000 people at this time were Christians, and obeying the Lord. And they didn’t just obey him back then and stop. They were currently obeying the Lord by the time we get to the history, the historical point of Acts 5:32. They were also currently obeying the Lord. Does that mean then, according to Marion, since this is present tense, those currently obeying him that this doesn’t apply today? It doesn’t make sense. All of those at that time, five or eight thousand were obeying him. God gave the Holy Ghost, past tense, to all of those, upwards of five thousand people who were currently obeying him at that time. That’s universal. And you’ve already admitted last night that if I can prove universal even at that time, that would prove that this cannot be talking about the miraculous. But you don’t believe that every Christian back then received the miraculous. This cannot be the miraculous because this is saying every single person obeying at that time did receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Therefore it can’t be the miraculous. It must be the personal non-miraculous indwelling. Now put up #33. Well before we get to that, put that other one back up. Let’s compare this to Heb 5:9. Hold your hand at Acts 5:32 and look at Heb 5:9. **“And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;”** Now that’s exactly in the English and the Greek like Acts 5:32, you might not necessarily understand that it’s present tense in the English but in the Greek it is. That means that in Heb 5:9 that’s talking about those that were obeying, them at that time, present tense. Well according to your reasoning that would mean that Heb 5:9 is not universal because it was present tense obedience. That God only became the author of eternal salvation to those who were obeying him presently or currently at that time. Isn’t that your point? From Acts 5:32? Now we know Heb 5:9 that Jesus is the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him, present tense. That applies to everybody obeying him then and in principle applies to everybody now. That’s the way the Bible is. Acts 10:34,35 says that God is no respecter of persons. That means as a general rule when we read about the Bible of God giving the Holy Spirit to people obeying him then, that would mean that God gives the Holy Ghost the non-miraculous indwelling to people who are obeying him now. You understand that? That’s the way the Bible works, since God is no respecter of persons. It works in Heb 5:9, it works exactly the same way in Acts 5:32. Put up the next chart. And not only that, we showed last night that Acts 5:32 cannot be talking about the miraculous indwelling. It is impossible. Because he gives it to those who obey him, this Holy Ghost, not a gift of the Holy Ghost, not something from the Holy Ghost, not a power from the Holy Ghost, it says the Holy Ghost himself. But you will remember in Acts 10:45 the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit was given to Cornelius before he obeyed the gospel, before he obeyed the gospel. So evidently, conclusively I should say, Cornelius received something different than what we’re talking about in Acts 5:32 because that in Acts 5:32 is contingent upon obeying the gospel and Acts 10:45 is not. And so Tom has to make one of two choices, he either has to say that Cornelius had obeyed Jesus in the sense of Acts 5:32 before he was baptized in water or he has to admit that Acts 5:32 is not referring to the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, one of the two. Peter said that you had to repent and be baptized in order to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. That’s the same that’s in Acts 5:32. He said and just as surely as you have to repent you have to be baptized. Cornelius had not done it. Therefore what he received is not the same thing as what we find in Acts 2:38 and Acts 5:32. Cannot be the same thing, one is given as an earnest or a pledge a down payment we might say, Eph 1:13,14. The other couldn’t be that way because Cornelius received it before he was even saved. How could it be a seal or an earnest, a down payment on salvation or heaven we might say when he’s not even saved at that point? Tom would agree that it cannot. It cannot be the same thing. So Mark let’s put up #2. And so my procedure in this debate will be to answer what he says and then let’s think about what we’re doing, he’s saying the Holy Spirit only dwells representatively, *only*. I agree he dwells representatively, therefore I need to talk about the word *only*. If I can show one passage that talks about how the Holy Spirit comes into the Christian and is not representative then I will have disproved his proposition. We’ve already mentioned Acts 2:38, repent and be baptized for the remission of sins ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

There's one. That should be enough to prove my proposition. It cannot be the miraculous, that would contradict Acts 10:45. It is not the representative indwelling because it's a promise to be received, it can't not a command to be obeyed. He agrees with that. Both of those arguments would apply to Acts 5:32, it can't be the miraculous, that would contradict Acts 10:45. It can't be the representative indwelling because it's a promise to be received not a command to be obeyed. How much time Bob? So turn to Luke 11 and we'll go into another passage that disproves his proposition. Course most of you were here the last two nights so you are probably getting tired of hearing about Luke 11. But Luke 11:9-13 is parallel to Mt 7:7-11. And Luke 11:9 says and you'll find this in Mt 7:7 says, Ask and it shall be given you, seek, and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened to you. He admitted last night that that applies to people today, that that applies to people today. Well, verses 10-13 is simply an elaboration upon that asking. Well, which of you as a father would give your child a stone if he asked for bread? And he goes on and he says, well the heavenly Father will give you even a better gift. As a matter of fact he says the heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. And so this is a non-miraculous context. He admits verse 9 is not miraculous but applies today and at the end on the conclusion, it says you will receive the Holy Spirit if you ask him. Non-miraculous. How do you ask him? By repenting and being baptized just like Acts 2:38 says to do to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Thank you very much.

Tape 4, Side B

Mr Tom Bright: It is a joy for me to stand before you for the second time this evening in response to some of the things that bro Pat has said in his first speech. In our discussion Monday I introduced the word anachronism because bro Pat is guilty of this very thing. I want to explain exactly what I mean by anachronism. Anachronism according to Merrian Webster is an era in chronology especially a chronological displacing of persons, events, objects or customs in regard to each other. A personal thing that is chronologically out of place especially one from a former age that is incongruous, that means inconsistent in the present. Now friends if I were debating a Pentecostal preacher tonight who is affirming the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit present with today, bro Pat is not, as far as I know. I would use this very idea, because they are reaching back to the first century and he is drawing things that had application to a special time period at that very time, the miraculous. And every one of the arguments that he made then relative to the giving of the Holy Ghost etc etc was based upon this very idea of taking something out of its proper time frame and trying to make it apply to the present time. Friends, this idea that bro Pat has presented, I would suggest is indeed that which cannot be. I want to see my chart #60. He introduced Luke 11. Notice in this if you would then. I want to look at this very closely. Notice here if you would, ***"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?"*** Please understand that bro Pat is talking about the idea of the Holy Spirit, himself, and all you have to do is ask and he will give it to you. He wants to define the word ask which is from the Greek word *apao* (?) as *obedience* and he will direct you to Acts 2. But friends that word appears 71 times in the Greek New Testament and not once is it used to refer to obedience. Notice here, look at 1 Jn 5:14. Here's the same word. ***"And this is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask (there it is) any thing according to his will, he heareth us."*** Now friends, if *ask* in Luke 11:13 means *obedience* then *ask* in 1 Jn 5:14 which is of course it means obedience likewise. But notice here he says and this is the confidence that we have in him that if we (now what I'm doing is taking the word ask out of there and I'm just simply putting his definition of ask, he says it's obedience, I say it's not, notice) And this is the confidence that we have in him that if we obey anything according to his will he heareth us. Now friends, is it possible then if we disobey anything according to his will? We'll all agree that doesn't make sense. But anytime a person wants to define or give a specific definition to a word all you have to do is take that definition and put it where the word is used and see if it makes any sense. Notice friends, that if the context or the context of Luke 11:13 is there. Verse #1, the disciples ask Jesus, teach us how to pray, even as John taught his disciples. And then in verse #9 he said, Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. He was talking about prayer. Friends he was saying ask for the Holy Spirit. Now in Acts 8:15, when Peter and John heard that the Samaritans had received the gospel of Jesus Christ, they went down and they prayed, they asked and they laid their hands upon them and the Holy Spirit came upon them in his miraculous manifestation. And certainly therefore the context of Luke 11:13 is indeed the miraculous. That doesn't mean that some principles and concepts do not apply to me. Bro Pat seems to want you to believe that *I'm* teaching *anything* that I say has a *miraculous* context it's *totally* miraculous and *cannot* apply to you and to me

today. Well that's just not the fact of the matter. Let's go to chart #61, if you would please, bro Ron. And let's notice here based upon this particular idea. Notice here, it's the same chapter in Luke 11:2, when they said teach us how to pray. He said when you pray, pray, our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done as in heaven so in earth. Folks, I want to ask you a question, would it be right tonight as a member of the body of Christ to pray our Father which art in heaven? Would it, why certainly it would. Would it be right to say hallowed be thy name? Why certainly it would. Would it be right for me to pray, (Jesus said pray in this manner) thy kingdom come? My friends, if I were to pray that prayer in the twenty-first century, that is an anachronism. It's taking it out of its proper context. We would be praying then for the kingdom to come, thus would by implication be a denial that the kingdom, the New Testament church has been established. Now this shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that he doesn't believe that all of this refers to today. Friends this is something that we really need to think about. Notice, 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? In what way? That is a metonymy my friends. It is a figure of speech which uses one word to suggest another. Now I know bro Pat is going to get up like he did the other night and say, I don't know, I'm assuming, now Tom how do you know that's a metonymy, a figure of speech? Bro Pat the same way that you know it when you debate the one cup brethren and you tell them that when we drink of the cup that it is the container itself. Now how do you know that? Well I think you know the answer to that. And so friends, when he's talking about giving the Holy Spirit, I've already referred you to Acts 8 and there Peter and John came down to Samaria, they prayed to God, they laid their hands upon them, and the Holy Spirit came upon them. Is that the personal indwelling? That's what bro Pat want's you to believe that I'm talking about. It is the personal indwelling of the person himself. But that's not what happens there my friends. It is referring to giving the Holy Spirit in the miraculous. We've already shown that he would not pray back in the previous chapter, scoot that down bro Ron, that there, we understand that is an anachronism so is the whole thing as he brings it out. Now Pat, don't get up here and say I'm saying that you shouldn't pray. That's not what I'm saying. This is a miraculous context, my friends. And to pray thy kingdom come is in response to their question or request teach us how to pray. John prayed just like he preached my friends. Here is an anachronism. It is in chronology. Bro Pat wants to go back two thousand years ago and he wants to bring that forth and say that it's applicable to you and to me and that it is some sort of personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Well I'm convinced as I talk to him and as we exchange questions, I'm not really sure what he believes, my friends. Because the other night, we ask him in a question did any of the Old Testament saints receive the personal indwelling, and he said in some sense. He was talking to bro Cosby and I just before we began and from what I understood and maybe it may be that I am just dense, Pat, I don't know but he says it was the person of the Holy Spirit. Well, maybe he could clarify that for you and for me. Let's look very hurriedly at some of the things that he was talking about the miracle. I said that if there were deity in the flesh that would be a miracle. And he talked about the idea that if God answered the prayer of a million people. Friends, that is operating within the realm of God. We're talking about deity entering into a physical body. He said if I did it today that would be a miracle. Well, Pat you surely don't believe that miracles exist today. Put his chart #44 up, if you will please, bro Ron. Notice, I want to look at this part right here. I think I have the number right. He said that doesn't refer to that. He didn't give any proof. He charged me the other night when I said that it agrees grammatically, he said that's an assertion, Pat you are giving an assertion. And I hope you do come up with that argument that you tried to present the other night. The word which my friend is masculine singular in this particular passage Eph 1:13,14 and notice if you would please that the word earnest in this particular reading is also masculine singular. And it is a fact that according to Greek grammarians, a relative pronoun agrees with its antecedent in gender and number. And then he comes up and says all of these translations. Friends let me ask you a question, do you know what verbal inspiration is? That means that God inspired the very words himself. They are there written originally because the Holy Spirit desired them to be there. If he wanted to express that the Holy Spirit himself was the pledge, the person of the Holy Spirit, why didn't he say it? Why did he grammatically speaking, present the idea that it was not the Holy Spirit. I don't care what the versions say, my friend. I think that we understand that certainly these men are not infallible. But I believe the Holy Spirit was infallible, don't you? I believe Paul was infallible when he wrote Eph 1:13,14 don't you? Certainly we do. And thus the apostle Paul, he put them together because he wrote directly by the Spirit of God, dear people. And we need to understand this. Well, let's go on. Let's look at chart #65 of bro Pat's if you would, bro Ron. Here he is talking about Satan, or the Holy Spirit dwelling in us representatively. Now friends, here's his argument. In the first century, demons, evil spirits dwelt in individuals, therefore it is possible for deity. Now the question is, Pat, do you believe in demons? Physically inhabiting people in the

twenty-first century? If he says no, then his argument falls, because if the inhabitant of a physical body the human body by an evil spirit proves that the Spirit of God can dwell in the body of an individual then that right there proves the same thing. Now friends, that is really no argument at all. Because here is the host of hades realm standing in opposition to the word of God. Do demons prove Holy Spirit personal indwelling according to my good brother's concepts? And he is saying that is Satan himself. No that's not Satan himself. That is or were various demons or devils as the KJV. And friends, if that proves anything it proves that Satan dwelt representatively. And so that proves too – proves nothing. Well, I want to notice with you the idea here that what bro Pat said and Rom 8:16,17. Pat I'm glad you learned the truth on that. He's changed his position from the other night because I asked him, I said Pat if I know and I don't want to misrepresent you, but you are saying that the groanings of Rom 8:16,17 were --- through the Holy Spirit himself, now he has changed that, because Pat I asked you, you shook your head, that is the groanings of the Holy Spirit himself. . .well either it is or isn't, make up your mind, when you get up and say it is and it isn't, either it is the groanings of the human being and the Holy Spirit cannot articulate himself or he can. And so as we look at this, friends, you need to consider, what is the thrust of this. He said that is something that the Holy Spirit does that the word of God cannot do. Friends, listen to this. I don't believe that's the Holy Spirit there, but I'm just going to say bro Pat, you're right, for a moment. That is still something that takes place in heaven. And he has already admitted that it's not a sensory thing, it's not something he can feel or anybody else can see, and thus I would ask you to consider this basic idea. Friends, the Christ of Rom 8:34 is the one who takes our groanings and he takes them as it were, to the Father. Well, do you have his chart #31, I don't believe you do, I didn't tell you to get that, so let's just don't worry about it.

Concerning the idea of only the apostles. Now friends, what he is doing is trying to go back to bro Marion Fox, a very dear friend of mine, that he debated two years ago, I believe this last January, and he's trying to make Marion's arguments my arguments. Well, I do agree with Marion on many, many things but notice if you would on his chart #5, during that particular chart, he says that the Holy Spirit is not the witness, or that he is not witnessing. He's not? Now Pat if I misunderstood you, I'll apologize to you on the next speech, I really will, but I heard you say the Holy Spirit is not witnessing. Friends, turn to Acts 5:32. And we are his witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Ghost. What does and so also is mean? What does that mean? Does it mean that he is or he isn't? Now friends, I've presented the basic idea relative to the thoughts of Acts 5:31. I presented that basic idea. The apostle Peter, he is in conflict, and he brings up Marion's argument again, presently obeying. I don't think I've even mentioned that in this debate, friends. The apostle Peter is arguing in this they have, the apostles have just been released from prison. And now they are standing before the council, evidently the San Hedron, the chief police, and they are charged, don't be teaching and preaching in His name, we've already told you that. And Peter and the apostles said we ought to obey God rather than man, and then he begins to set forth the death, burial and resurrection and the final coronation, as it were in very general terms. And then in verse 32, and we are witnesses of these things – what things? And so also is the Holy Ghost. Can you imagine, friends, in the very next verse Acts 5:33, the very next verse, the Bible said because of what Peter and the rest of the apostles they took counsel to slay them. Now here's Peter, and here's bro Pat, there are standing before the San Hedron council, the chief police, and Pat says, we've got the personal indwelling, it's not sensory, it's doesn't manifest itself, there's nothing that I can tell other than the word of God. And so they are going to take counsel to kill him. Now do you believe that? The apostle Peter said we are witnesses of these things and so also is the Holy Ghost. He said that God had given to them, literally, as Pat says, the all mighty one. Now here's the conflict. Who do you follow the council or God? Peter said here's my witness. Here's the proof I'm going to offer and that is the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Yes Heb 5:8,9 speaks that Christ is the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him. Two minutes. But I would ask you to consider friends, notice this particular idea. Yes it is the same word, I don't have a problem with that and I don't have a problem with the idea of are the obeying ones there going to receive exactly the same thing that those who are mentioned in Acts 5:32. Peter is just giving his defense. The religious leaders are saying, look, we are the authority in town, we carry the big stick, and we told you not to preach in his name. Well I would ask you to look very closely to Peter's response raised the ire of these people. Friends I'm here to tell you that if Pat Donahue was standing there and said, I've just got the person of the Holy Spirit, literally, physically dwelling in my body, but he doesn't do anything other than in a seed, there's no sensory whatsoever, do you think that those people would have taken counsel to slay him? No, they understood the import of that. They understood exactly what the apostle Peter was saying. How much time do I have? He mentioned the idea of Cornelius and he seems to think that there is a conflict. Friends, Cornelius was a special case, relative to God proving to the Jews, that he, God, was going to accept the Gentiles through the gospel. And the Bible

says they received the gift of the Holy Spirit. So let's look very closely, we've got just a few seconds here and bro Pat is going to be back in just a few minutes.

Pat Donahue: Just a joke here, I think Tom keeps bringing that word, anachronism up because he knows I have a difficult time pronouncing it and it'll just trip me up. His definition up there was an era in chronology. You know I would admit that if I'm wrong about this subject, I guess I would be guilty of an anachronism, but if you are wrong, you would be guilty of an anachronism, wouldn't you? And so we are agreed that when you look at the miraculous in 1 Cor 13 teaches that the miraculous, tongues and things like that had ceased. Now if I tried to pull them over to today like the Pentecostals, that would be an anachronism, not just because asserts it though Tom, but because you prove it by 1 Cor 13 and Zechariah 13. So you need to prove that the thing I am contending for in this discussion, the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, is not for today, not just *assert* that it's an anachronism. Now I put the miraculous in its proper time frame but I prove it. Now as a matter of fact, what we are talking about in this debate is something that is not the miraculous. And so 1 Cor 13 doesn't have anything to do with it. And another point I would like to make before I move on, Tom, what I'm talking about, you don't even believe occurred back then. It's not like he agrees with me that the non-miraculous personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit occurred back then but it's not for today. You don't even agree that it occurred back then, so it's not really an anachronism that I'm doing. I'm just flat out wrong according to you. See. You don't even believe that it occurred back then. Now, he brought up Luke 11:13. He says *ask* doesn't refer to *obedience* anywhere else. Well, first of all before I respond to that, let me go to something that he said right after that about what many people call the Lord's prayer, which is thy kingdom come. Tom, I agree, that a lot of those things, that every phrase wouldn't apply today and thy kingdom come, would not. But that's because many passages, Col 1:13, being one of them, showed that the kingdom has already come into existence by this time, and so we wouldn't pray that thy kingdom come in the future. And that's right. And that's what we do with the miraculous. Covet earnestly the best gifts, that was for them, but we don't do that now about the miraculous gifts because 1 Cor 13 teaches they've ceased. You see there so we have a passage that says thy kingdom come, we have a passage that teaches that the miraculous has ceased. We don't have any passages that teach that the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 has ceased. Okay. That the personal indwelling non miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit has ceased. And so he says *ask* doesn't refer to *obedience* anywhere else. He means by that the Greek word translated *ask*. Well, Tom, I gave up a long time ago trying to chase down every little time you've said, well it's a different Greek word. Okay? I could have gone through the tedious process to try to find if that Greek word was ever used to refer to obedience and it *may* have or it *may not*. But why go through all that tedious process, because if I were to have found one, it wouldn't have phased you in the least, would it? If I found a verse where the Greek word translated *ask* in Lk 11:13b referred to obedience, what would that do? It wouldn't prove anything to you, would it? See, all this thing about a different Greek word, I don't mean this in disrespectful way- that's just a smoke screen- because if I found a place where *ask*, the Greek word, *did* refer to obedience, he wouldn't accept it, it wouldn't make any difference, he'd still believe the same thing about Lk 11:13. It wouldn't make a bit of difference. Now I'm going to prove that to you. I'm going to prove that to you. Put up #28. We had a lot of discussion on Acts 2:39 in the last couple of nights, where the promise, Acts 2:39, which refers back to the promise of receiving the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, the call to repent and be baptized. That promise is to you, that's all the Jews there, to your children, that would be their posterity, to all that are afar off, that would be all the Gentiles, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, that would be everybody. That's the same as the call of Joel 2:32 the call to deliverance for salvation. We are going to study more about that later. But now here's the point I want make. First of all, this word children, where it says to you and your children. Last night I gave an example of Acts 7:23, an example of children, where it meant posterity. He said it's a different Greek word. Now to illustrate. Tonight I'm going to give a word *children* that does refer to posterity that's the same Greek word. Now there's about four, five or six of them in the New Testament. But we found about four or five, but we don't have time, but Mt 23:37 "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together". That's the children of Israel, not just the first generation children of each prophet, like Jeremiah, you know first generation children but nobody else, or Isaiah's first generation. It wasn't that. That, the posterity isn't it? That's all the children of Israel, I believe. And that's the same Greek word. Now is that mean he's now going to agree with me on Acts 2:39, because it's the same Greek word? No. It won't do you any good to give you something that's the same Greek word. Why do you keep bringing up that argument then? When I bring up something like prosteleo-i (?) and calleo. How do you

pronounce those Bob? When I bring up those, is the fact that the called in Acts 2:39 and 1 Thes 2:14, well you say that's a different Greek word in that case, just by the preposition. You act like that means it proves it means something else. But you know if I were to show you the same thing with the same Greek word, it wouldn't do any good, and I've shown it here. Now on this word afar off, let's do the same thing. This word afar off in Acts 2:39 referred to the Gentiles. But you know he thinks it refers to just the Gentiles, a select few representatively here. But in Eph 2:13,17, we have the word afar off, the same Greek word, Tom, same Greek word, and I asked him today, tonight, did that refer to all the Gentiles or just to a representative few? He said all. So in Eph 2:13,17, afar off, the same Greek word in Acts 2:39 referred to all the Gentiles yet here when it says all that are afar off, it has the word all, he thinks its only a few of them. See. And it's the same Greek word. So it doesn't mean anything when you come up here and you really have two verses teaching you the same thing and you say it's a different Greek word, that doesn't mean anything. So if these are the same Greek word, you still think it's teaching something different. In both of these cases, children and afar off. But let's look at that. Put up #69. Now this is a key passage here. In Acts 2:38 it says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto *you*, that's the Jews, to your children, that's the children of Israel, all their posterity, and to all that are afar off, that's all the Gentiles, including us, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. That's just repeating what he said earlier, just saying it again, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. That just repeats it again, the children, all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call. That's everybody including us today. And what is that promise? It's the promise that if you'll repent and are baptized you will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost and the remission of sin. Now that verse argues that the gift of the Holy Ghost that everybody back then would receive it, because it's to the Jews then, all the rest of the Jews, all the Gentiles, as many as the Lord our God shall call. Okay. Now I want to bring up an illustration here, Tom. When you are debating a Baptist debate, and you say repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, one of the first things they'll say is, most of them, is that word for the remission of sins means because of sins that you've already done. They say when you believe and repent you get the remission of sins and this is just saying be baptized because of the sins you've already got. Now there are a lot of good responses to that. One of the first ones I use is this. If for the remission of sins there means because the remission of sins you've already got, then repent would also mean because of the remission of sins you've already got. Now that's not the only argument I would use, but that's a good one and I use it every time. Okay. Because repent and be baptized are connected together with the and both are for the remission of sins, you get it? That's why that argument will work and it's correct and proves its position right. That's right. Now we are going to make the same exact argument with verse 39. Did you notice that when it says this promise is to you and to your children and all those that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call, he makes that is just dispensational for a select group back then. Because that's what he believes about the gift of the Holy Ghost but did you know that promise also includes the remission of sins? The promise is not just the gift of the Holy Ghost, the promise is the remission of sins too. The promise is referring back to the verse previous, verse 38. What is the promise of verse 39? Repent and be baptized so you can get the gift of the Holy Ghost? So that a few of you will? No. Each one of you, individually, repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, and get the gift of the Holy Ghost. The promise is you'll get the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost if you obey. Both of those. Now if Acts 2:39 is only dispensational to a special group at that time, the gift of the Holy Ghost, then that would make the remission of sins also dispensational to a select group at that time. Dispensational, what he means by that is that it's not for today, okay, just for back then, just as fancy word for that. But he believes it was dispensational, not for today, and he believes only for a special group at that time, not even everybody back then. He admitted that last night. Now that's the exact same argument. Do you see that argument, Tom? Repent and be baptized are both for the remission of sins. So the promise in Acts 2:39 is not just a gift of the Holy Ghost. It's for the remission of sins and if you make that dispensational then you've also made repent and be baptized for the remission of sins dispensational, to a select group at that time. There's no way around that. Any more than there's any way around this argument that I use with the Baptist. That if baptism is for the remission of sins then so is the gift. Now the only way he could possibly get around it is to say that the promise is only the gift of the Holy Ghost, not the remission of sins. Now that's not correct, the promise is all of verse 38, and I can prove that wrong. You know a good way to find out if the promise in verse 39, it doesn't specify what the promise is in verse 39, I believe verse 38 specifies it. But you'll remember for the last two nights that Acts 2:39 quotes Joel 2:32. So all we gotta do is go back to Joel 2:32 and we'll see if the promise does indeed include salvation. In Joel 2:32 it says And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall receive miraculous gifts; for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be miraculous gifts as the Lord hath

said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. That wasn't quite right was it? What's he talking about in verse 32? Is he talking about the miraculous gifts or deliverance? I looked up you know in my English dictionary, deliverance, you know what that means in a Biblical context? Salvation. That's what that's talking about. Joel 2:32 doesn't mention the miraculous gifts. Now earlier in the chapter it does, Tom, but Joel 2:32 does not mention the miraculous, and that's what Acts 2:39 is quoting. It's not quoting Joel 1:3, that's what I said last night. It's not quoting Joel 1:3, it's not even quoting Acts 2:17. It's quoting Joel 2, I mean it's not quoting Joel 2:28, it's quoting Joel 2:32. Now the call there, you see the call? We call upon the name of the Lord, that's in the first part of the passage. That's quoted in Acts 2:21 and Rom 10:13, but I'm referring to the last part. Whom the Lord shall call, that's what's quoted in Acts 2:39. And that's the call to deliverance, salvation. So because Acts 2 quotes Joel 2, the promise in Acts 2:39 has to include salvation. It can't just be the gift of the Holy Spirit. Now so let me repeat my argument. The promise of Acts 2:39 includes the remission of sins, salvation, and the gift of the Holy Ghost. And since they are connected like that if you make one dispensational, to a special group, the other would have to also. We all know that's not true. He knows that's not true. Repent and be baptized for the remission of sin is for today, for everybody. Therefore the gift of the Holy Spirit has to be for today, for everybody. And since he admitted last night that the miraculous is not universal, it was only for back then and only to a select few back then, gift of the Holy Spirit *cannot* be referring to the miraculous. It has to be referring to something else. And since it's a promise to be received, it can't be referring to the representative indwelling which is the topic for tonight. The only thing left is the *personal* non-miraculous New Testament indwelling that's spoken of in John 7:38,39. And then he said in, I challenged him last night, how do you know Luke 11:13b that the Holy Ghost is a metonymy? And he said, well, the same way you know that when you're discussing with the one-container brethren that the cup is. Well, last night I told how, I didn't just, when I get into a debate with the one-container brethren, do you think I just get up there and say that's a metonymy and just leave it at that, and just assert it? Like you did on Luke 11? No I didn't, I told last night *how* I know. In 1Cor 11:27, it says to drink the cu-pa. Now we know you don't drink the container. So we know that the container must be *being* used for the contained. And that's a very common figure of speech. You mention the container to talk about the thing that's being contained. Like for example in basketball. You might have some people who are on the bench and you might see in the newspaper that the bench scored 12 points last night for the Hawks. Does that mean that wooden bench went out there and scored 12 points? No. The container for the contained. The bench for the players who sit on it. But how did we know that when we're talking to the one-container brethren, do we just assert it, without any proof like you do in Luke 11:13? No we show a passage and prove it. Ephe 1:13,14. Put up #45. This is what I've been trying to avoid having to do. He keeps *insisting* that *which* in the first part of verse 14, has to go back to word in verse 13. In spite of all the proofs I've given, he just ignores those and keeps saying the grammar, that the grammar demands it. The Greek word translated which that begins Eph 1:14 is masculine in about half the manuscripts, that's Mr. Hutto's --. About half the manuscripts it's neuter. Okay. And Mr. Metcher (?) comments that it's hard to tell if it started out as the masculine or the neuter host or ho (?), it's hard to tell which one was the first one and really got changed by mistake. But what the scholars say is that it either started out to where it matches the Holy Spirit, the last antecedent, the last noun, or I'm not sure I can say this right, or you have an attraction to the word earnest which comes even later. I guess I should just read what Mr. Metcher (?) says. "It is difficult to decide whether-----make it agree with the gender of pneuma, spirit or whether hos became ho by the attraction to the gender of the following,(there's the Greek word for earnest which is, two or three words later), according to the usual meaning." And we made him a zerox of the pages night before last, that shows that this is a valid way of doing things in the Greek. -----that's the majority. This is my summary of what he was saying. The majority thought ---- scholars who thought hos was in the original thinks it connects to earnest two words later, not back to word, which is about 12 or 15 words earlier, okay? So when you look at the grammar and we can talk about the grammar all day long and I will be lost. When you look at it, there is nothing in the grammar that keeps which from going back to Spirit. And so what we should do. . .Mark, put up the next chart.. . what we should do is just look at what the Bible says and thankfully we have some other verses besides Ephesians that helps us on this. Mark raise it up. 2 Cor 1:22 Who also hath sealed us, and given us the Spirit in our hearts as a deposit. (KJV, Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.) Remember the deposit is the word of God or the Spirit, that's obvious. 2 Cor 5:5 he also hath given us the spirit as a guarantee. (KJV, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit) The Spirit is the guarantee or the earnest, not the word of God. And then Luke 8:27 and following. He said the demons don't dwell today and I agree they don't, 2 Cor 13:1-4 that that would prove that the Holy Spirit doesn't dwell today. No that's not why I brought that up. Tom I think you knew

that. I guess I shouldn't say that but that's not why I brought it up. Why would I bring up a passage to try to prove that the personal indwelling doesn't happen today. Here's why I brought that up. You brought up the representative indwelling, Rev 2:13 was an example. What----does when you take into consideration Rev 2:13, that representative indwelling of Satan, then I bring up the representative indwelling of Satan, I mean a literal indwelling of Satan which he would agree, that proves that a representative indwelling of the Holy Spirit is not throughout a literal or personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. You can have both. If you can have both to refer to demons or the devil, then you can have both that will refer to the Holy Ghost. All that it does is prove that it's possible, it doesn't prove that it occurs. It doesn't prove there is a personal indwelling, it just proves that just because you have the representative indwelling of the Holy Spirit that doesn't rule out a personal indwelling. But I've tried to show many passages that prove a personal indwelling. And then he thinks he sees, and I think I probably stated this in a confusing way, and so I can understand why he misunderstands. He thinks I've said that the Holy Spirit in Rom 8:26,27 is what I'm talking about, and one time that the Holy Spirit does the groanings which cannot be uttered and then on the question tonight, I said the person does. Let me give you an illustration to help you understand what I'm saying. Moses said the things that couldn't be said by Aaron. Now who's the person that said the things? Moses. Who's the person that couldn't say the things? Aaron. The Holy Spirit says the things that we can't say. He's the one that says them, we're the ones that we can't. He's saying the Holy Spirit makes intercession with groanings which cannot be uttered by us. That's the whole point of the first part of the verse. We don't know how to say it, so he helps us. We're the ones who can't utter it, and so he does it for us. He intercedes for us with groanings which cannot be uttered by us, but they can be by him. He has no problem communicating these things. That's why he's helping us. We have the problem, we're the ones that can't utter it, he's the one that communicates the things which we cannot utter. Now why would he bring that up anyway? He just likes to bring up problems with my position which does him no good after I explain them. Rom 8, no matter whether I could explain that properly or not, whether I had any idea what that was talking about, it still would prove that the Holy Spirit does *something*, I may not know what it is, it does something that the word does not do because I know that the word of God does not intercede for us with groanings that could not be uttered. Another thing that you found confusing . . . put up #5. You thought I said something that was contradictory on this Tom. No here's what I said. Here's some people that witnessed in the first clause of Acts 5:32, and so was also the Holy Ghost, yes the Holy Ghost is a witness. But the clause #3 doesn't talk about witnessing, whom God hath given to them that obey him. Yes the Holy Ghost witnesses, clause #2. Clause #3 doesn't mention that. Clause #3 is the one I use to prove my position. Clause #3 has nothing to do whatsoever with witnessing. It just says that the Holy Ghost is given to them that obey him. That doesn't have anything to do with witnessing, or the miraculous or anything. So witnessing is in Clause A and B but not in Clause C. Clause C simply says the Holy Ghost is given to them that obey him and I believe that. And really he doesn't believe it. He does not believe, he believes the Holy Ghost is not given to them that obey him. He believes Acts 2:38 the way we should quote that today repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall *not* receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Tape #5, Mr. Bright/Mr. Donahue debate, Side A

Mr Bright: It's a joy for me to stand before you for the final time this evening. I'm grateful for your kind attention. I know that we're a little slow getting exchanged but sometimes it takes just a moment or two to get all of this stuff squared away, so I hope you will bear with us if you would please. The first thing I want to do is look at his chart #45, on Eph 1:13,14. His chart #45. Now friends, I want you to look here and I want you to notice here. This is what Mr. Metcher(?) says. Now I will guarantee you that bro Pat does not agree with very much that this man believes. Now notice he says that it is difficult to decide whether a copiest offers hos or ho, this dealing with the pronoun, that we see in Eph 1:13,14, in order to make it agree with the gender of pneuma which is Holy Spirit or whether hos became ho by attraction to the gender. Well the first thing I want to ask you my friends, how do they have any idea that it is difficult to determine that anyway. How do they know that it does not refer to that? How do they know that it does not say exactly what it says in the text that we're looking at? How do they know this? Notice it says, The majority thought. Now friends, you get into the field of - - - (?) if Pat wants to go that direction, I stand prepared to go that direction, because I know a *little* bit about it, maybe just about that much. But I do know something about it and I want to ask you to consider very carefully, I would ask you to look very closely at this idea. Look at the idea that they are really saying we don't know, it's just supposition and it is just something that we're merely guessing at. That's really what they're saying. The only thing they know here is that it is changed, that at the end it did not come out like it should have been, or as it was literally written. Friends, this impugns the very nature of verbal inspiration. If we cannot be correct about this, if we have to wander around in a world of confusion all of the time, worrying about whether we really have the copies at least of the original word, where are we going to go? We are going to be like a rat in a maze, friends. And this idea here of casting doubt upon that is nothing more than going to indeed inject continually in these new versions those footnotes that constantly cast doubt upon we really have the Bible. And so this is really no argument, my friend. Now if they argue attraction, it's just simply saying this doesn't teach what my doctrine teaches and I've got to get around it, so I'll conjure up various ideas. Now I want bro Pat to get up here and show us what are the rules for attraction. What are the rules that we can look at to know whether it is attraction? And that is that this particular pronoun was attracted to its antecedent. And it's though it's not in the case it ought to be and yet there is this concept. And so I reject that without hesitation, friends, because the idea is that we really can't know what God wants us to know. There's just doubt and confusion. Well, let's go if you would, please, bro Ron to the next chart that he had which we called for. This is on Acts 5:32. Now friends, the fact of the matter is, and the statement the apostle Peter made, he made the statement that "we are witnesses and so is also the Holy Ghost," but he says this idea of witness doesn't have anything to do with this phrase. Friends, it has everything to do with it. Do you want to isolate that particular clause from the rest of the sentence? What was Peter's argument? You, (the San Hedron council, you chief police), have told us don't preach in his name. We ought to obey God rather than man, answered the apostles. They referred to the death of Christ, and the resurrection of Christ. And now remember within the context, here is a conflict of authority. Do I mind the Jewish leaders, or do I obey God? And the apostle Peter called upon something that was absolutely, undeniable, friends. We that is those apostles, and others who might have seen the resurrected Lord, we are witnesses of it, and so also is the Holy Spirit. That's what Jesus said they would do in Jn 15:25,26, that you will testify and the Holy Spirit will testify. Peter is saying in essence that what Jesus said we would do in Jn 15:25,26 was exactly what we're doing in Acts 5:32. Now bro Pat says this third clause here has nothing to do with that. It has everything to do with that. Because Peter used this particular clause right here to show beyond a shadow of doubt, we, we, you can limit that to apostles or collectively as the New Testament church, it makes no difference. We have the miraculous powers. That's what he is saying. And friends, that is a telling argument. They understood it. That's why they took counsel to slay the apostles. I presented a while ago, consider bro Pat and the apostle Peter standing before this group, and they are arguing their case. Then bro Pat says, I've got the personal indwelling, I've got the person of the Holy Spirit in me, there is no sensory perception whatsoever, you can't see anything outside that would prove this. All I have to do is accept it because God's word has told it which is enough. But that's all the Spirit does besides interceding which takes place in heaven according to bro Pat's view. And can you imagine in your mind that these people would become so angry that they would want to kill bro Pat. Now here's Peter saying, we've got the miracles, we've got everything, we're showing it, you can't deny it. And so as we look at that then we need to look very closely at that. So if you would let's get that particular chart. Notice here if you would Acts 5:32 We are his witnesses, Jn 15:26,27 says that he shall testify of me. Who? The Spirit of truth. And ye also shall bear witness. That's what Peter

is arguing in Acts 5:32. He says no that is a personal indwelling, the person of the Holy Spirit -----the twenty-first century. Anachronism, my friends, don't ever forget that. And Pat it's not because you have problems stating that because I likewise do. Notice here in Heb 2:3,4 "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed (confirmed) unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with (watch it please) divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost..." In Jn 15:26,27 Jesus says this is what ye will do, Heb 2 says this is what was done. And in Acts 5:32 the apostle Peter called upon that very concept of miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit limited to the first century. And they took counsel to kill them. I don't know what kind of proof you need bro Pat, but this whole idea, I'll guarantee you that if you would argue what they said, that they would not have taken counsel. Well I want to go to Acts 2:38. I want to notice this particular idea. Notice my friends, that he keeps presenting the idea that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit himself. In fact any time you come across, and there might be exceptions to this, that the Holy Spirit was given, bro Pat thinks that refers to the personal indwelling. But I want you to notice, my friends, we pointed out last Monday and last Tuesday, that the background of Acts 2 is Joel 2. It is a great and fabulous day that was there at that particular time. All prophecies pointed forward to it and everything points back to it, because here Jesus Christ for the first time is proclaimed as the Saviour of the world. And as we look at this then we need to understand that Joel 2 is the background. Your sons and daughters shall prophecy, these men are not drunk as you think they are, but your sons and daughters shall prophecy. Your old men shall dream dreams. Now notice here he gets down in Acts 2:38 and he says, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Pat wants to say that if I take that part, then I cannot say that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the Holy Spirit in his miraculous works. Well friends I could make the same argument in he as he would defend Mark 16:15,16 and following. Where there our Lord is recorded as saying Go preach the gospel and then in verse 17 he will say, and these signs shall follow them, the miraculous manifestations. A Pentecostal preacher is going to ask, Pat why do you stop reading right there? It seems that they are wanting to say what bro Pat is saying today, that they are all as it were universal, they all refer to the same thing. But friends, I'll tell you what, the gift of the Holy Spirit, that phrase is found twice, and it is both found in miraculous manifestations. The working of the Holy Spirit in his miracles. Furthermore as we think of this, I want you to notice, my friends, notice here if you would please, this idea of children. Now bro Pat has referred previously to this, now he goes back and he says, well Tom I found an additional Greek word that means posterity. Pat that's not what I said. I didn't say that. I said find that Greek term that is translated your children in Acts 2:39 and find it in something that refers to posterity. Notice here my friends, for the promise is unto you, that's the Jews, that particular group of people as it were, and to your children. I have argued that your children refers to one generation. Joel my friends, is the background of Acts 2. And let us look at Joel and see what Joel has to say about the use of the children. Would that be too farfetched? Notice. Tell ye your children of it and let your children tell their children, and their children another generation. According to bro Pat's argumentation, this would have to be tell your children of it and let your posterity tell their posterity and on down the line. Friends that's not what he said. You tell it to your children, and let your children tell their children and theirs to another. Now he says the promise is unto you and your children and all that are afar off. Friends that's the Gentile world. Now Pat says all. But Tom you are wanting to limit it. Well let's look at the promise. For the promise is unto you and your children and all that are afar off, as many as, now friends he wants to say that refers to everybody that obeys the gospel has that promise. Anybody that can see anything understands that when you use the term as many as there is a limitation. There is a smaller group as compared to a bigger group. As many as, and he wants to say that refers to everyone who believes the gospel and who responds in an affirmative way. But friends, I'm asking you to look at this, notice, he said, I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and your sons and your daughters, who is that, why it's your children, there. Notice here Jesus turns to these ladies as he is on the way to the cross. And he says don't weep for me weep for yourselves, and your children. There was a great calamity on the horizon, my friends, and as a nation, they were about to, as it were, pass away. Well, considering the idea then, that the miraculous background of Acts 2, the Holy Spirit descends, his power comes, there's the tongues, there's the speaking in tongues, the flame of fire, as it were, and then all of this, and then the apostle Peter told them, repent, and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ. I asked Pat the other night. I said, Pat, what in the sermon, recorded by Luke in Acts 2 would point one to the idea of the personal indwelling according to your view. And he said the whole chapter. Now friends there's nothing mentioned in there. You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, the promise is unto you, your children all them that are afar off, there it goes to the Gentile. Every Gentile? No, not any more than to every single individual

that was there. I keep bringing up the idea John the Baptist said, he, Christ will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and fire. Does that mean everyone of them was baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire also. Well certainly not, it's a synecdoche, a figure of speech, some would be baptized with fire, some would be baptized with the Holy Spirit. And so you, your children, and them that are afar off. Every single Gentile? Absolutely not. How much time do I have? Let's look very hurriedly then, at this idea of Joel 2 and let's look at verse 32. Notice here he says that's salvation. I do not deny that salvation is under consideration in Acts 2, that is the whole theme. Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. Look at Joel 2:32. 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. Who is the remnant? Whom the Lord shall call? Who is that? I believe my friends, notice the idea, as many as the Lord our God shall call, yes deliverance, salvation, I don't deny that, I believe it. Friends, the question under consideration tonight is the manner of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Now bro Pat has brought up various passages as he has in previous times, and he affirms something that he overlooks the obvious, he admitted in the last speech that Luke 11 does contain some miraculous some that are dispensational in nature, thy kingdom come, but he says that is the rest of it. Friends, I want you to think, notice here, here it is, those that ask, think about that, those that ask. Now here we have corrected this, we apologize for this, that is we ask, there's the same word, according to his will. I want to ask you a question, can an individual today ask for the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit and be according to the will of God? Exactly not. And that's why we say that it is dispensational. If ask here, and that's his argument, means obedience, then ask there, means obedience likewise. Now notice the idea he presented, put his definition there friends. If we obey anything (?) according to his will. It doesn't make sense. Pat, that is a dispensational passage, it refers to the Spirit that has been under consideration as he would reveal and confirm the gospel of Jesus Christ. Consider here thy kingdom come. There it is folks. There's the problem that bro Pat has with all of this, is going to give the Holy Spirit unto them that ask him. We've already shown if we ask according to his will, they could in the first century, they did in Acts 8 and the Spirit came upon those Samaritans. And so here again we have this anachronism. Friends, he has not overturned my arguments. It is still true that the Holy Spirit dwells through the word. And we have shown in the various responses that we have given that it is not the person of the Holy Spirit himself, that indeed, that is a dispensational or all those dispensational passages and they refer to a special time period. And to take these promises of the Holy Spirit out of their miraculous context and to put them into the twenty-first century, my friends is an anachronism that certainly is not according to that which is right. Well let's see if there is anything else. Luke 8. He says he didn't bring that up. Pat the idea is that you argued that this showed there was a literal indwelling. Remember what we said relative to Rev 2:13. Satan dwelled. How does he dwell? As a dominating force, as that which is the dominant power of that time. Well friends, if we turn that around and we see that it is God the Father, God the Son and God the Spirit who dwells in us as we allow the word of God to lead us to guide us and to direct us. That's what we are looking at. That my friends is the way the Spirit of God dwells in us, not literally, not personally. I still say there is only one way my friends that deity, the Spirit of deity can dwell in the human body, and that's through the miraculous. That's the only way. And I would like for you to consider very, very seriously that particular thought One other thing, look at 1 Cor 14:39. My friends, passages are dispensational. In this miraculous context, dealing with the miraculous giftstime up.

Pat Donahue: Tape 5, Side A

Sure wish we had a Bible verse that would give us the rule that Deity cannot dwell in the human body without a miracle. Sure wish we had that verse that gave that rule. Of course we already dealt with that, I guess that would prove if we found that rule he would prove that God cannot hear the prayers of a thousand Christians at one time. Because according to his view that would be a miracle because if he can't do it therefore it must be a miracle. Let's talk about what he said about Ephe 1:13,14. He said that what I said caused him to question the Bible. Not at all. Do you realize, Tom, that what I said and what was on the chart was about 50% of the manuscripts had hos, 50% had ho (?). So we can't just carelessly accept one over the other without doing some study, can we Tom? That's not having respect for the Bible, you have respect for the Bible when you try to determine what the original was. You just don't accept something blindly. Which one are you going to accept, hos or ho, if about 50% of the manuscripts have one and 50% have the other, which one? There's no doubt or confusion, those scholars, what they said is they didn't know whether the original was hos or ho. And you don't know either. You don't know either. But you know

according to Metcher (?), if I interpreted his what he said correctly, none of those guys, those scholars, who didn't know which the original was, hos or ho, none of them thought which went back to word, only in the verse, not a one of them. They all said it either went to the Holy Spirit, ----- or it went to the word earnest, which is two or three words later. None of them thought what you thought was right. In other words, none of those scholars thought that you had the right thing grammatically. Some of them thought which went to Holy Spirit, some of them went to earnest. I don't have a problem with either one of those. If it goes to either one of those it teaches my position. None of them thought what you thought. And then Acts 5:32. Everybody turn here. This illustrates, audience, the difference, I think, in Tom and I. Now in Acts 5:32, the Bible says at the end of that verse, ***“so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.”*** Here's what he said, and this is the best quote I could give, he says that's saying, that phrase is saying we have the miraculous gift. So he believes the Holy Ghost that God hath given to them that obey him, he says that is saying we have the miraculous gifts. You know what I think it's saying? I believe that it's saying the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them who obey him. That's what I think it's saying. I believe it actually *means* that, that he gives the Holy Ghost to those that obey him. Not that he gives the miraculous gift, because it doesn't say anything about that, not that he gives them the miraculous gift *from* the Holy Ghost, because it doesn't say that either. It says that he gave them the Holy Ghost. Now if you want to let that decide the debate, let it decide the debate. He says the last part of Acts 5:32 that that is saying that God gives those folks the miraculous gifts. I believe it is saying that God gives the Holy Ghost to them that obey him. You choose who you want to believe. While we are on that subject, again let me repeat, he does think this is the miraculous gift, it can't be. We've already pointed out, and he won't answer the dilemma, we've already pointed out that this shows that you must *obey* God in order to receive the Holy Ghost, or as he calls it the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. But in Acts 10:45, Cornelius received the miraculous *before* he had obeyed, before he had completed his obedience. Now Tom, you are in the hands of a dilemma, either you are going to have to say that Cornelius obeyed the gospel in the sense that Acts 5:32 is talking about *before* he was baptized, or you are going to have to admit that Cornelius received something *different* than what is referred to, the Holy Ghost in Acts 5:32. It's got to be one or the other. And then he mentioned about Acts 5:33 again, which he did last night, and I responded to that, and you didn't respond to my response. Now we have the total of six speeches each night, comes to 24 speeches. What we are supposed to do in a debate, while we have more than one speech each, is you say something and I respond, then you respond to my response. Instead, what you did is go back and repeat what you said before, and ignored my response. Now we could do that with just one speech a night. The reason we have three twenty minute speeches a night is so that you can respond to my response. That's the point of it. Now what I said last night about his point on Acts 5:33, here's his point. Why did those folks want to kill those people? Surely they wouldn't want to kill Peter and the rest of the apostles because Peter said, “well if we obey the gospel we'll get the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit.” Surely they wouldn't want to kill them for that. You were right, I agree with that Tom. They wouldn't want to kill them for that. And they wouldn't want to kill him either, if he just said you'll get a miraculous manifestation of the Holy Spirit. Wouldn't want to kill him for that either. Here's what I said last night that you didn't respond to, the reason they wanted to kill them is because they had told them in verse 29, didn't we command you to quit preaching, and then you went right out and did it again. And not only did they go out and preach again after they'd been commanded not to, one of the things they said would be real troubling. He said in verse 30, you killed Jesus the Son of God. That's why they got mad. Do you remember in Acts 2:37, when Peter said you murdered the Son of God? What happened to those folks? He said that in verse 36, it says they were cut to the heart. Now that's not a whole lot of difference between that and Acts 5:33. Why were they cut and pricked to the heart in verse 37 in Acts 2? Because they said you murdered the Son of God. That would make my heart get pricked, wouldn't it yours? And that's *exactly* why they got mad in Acts 5:33. It has nothing to do with the dispute between you and me. And then he mentions that the background of Acts 2:38,39 is Joel 2. That's exactly why I keep bringing up Joel 2:32 to prove my proposition. It is the background. Look at Joel 2:32. He's had a few things to say about it for the first time in the debate and I'm glad that he did. But he missed it. And it will be easy to show that he missed it. He talked about Joel 2:32 and then he said, well deliverance, certainly that's salvation, it's talking about salvation. So he admitted that. ----my case. Because then he just said well look, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. Who's that? Who's that? Well it's obvious who that is. The remnant. That's Christians. The people who receive deliverance. You see that? And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered. Who's that? Christians. They'll be delivered, saved. For in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, salvation, as the Lord hath said, and in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. Call to what?

Does it say miraculous gifts? No, he admits that it says salvation, deliverance. So the remnant are Christians. Well, certainly it's not everybody, not everybody will receive deliverance. I have some family members that have never been saved, they hadn't received deliverance. You told me you have a brother who's fallen from grace. He had deliverance at one time. He fell away. He didn't receive deliverance. It's not everybody. And you know I think we can agree now that I know what we are talking about. You know as many as the Lord our God shall call in Acts 2:39, I think we agree. I see what you are saying and I think we agree. It is limited ----Just like Gal 3:27 is equal to all of them the ones that are baptized. This is limited --even as many as the Lord our God shall call. It's that number, the ones as many as the Lord our God shall call. Now who does he call? Well he calls everybody in the sense of 2 Thes 2:14 in that he asks everybody to become a Christian. And then if you look at Rom 8:30 it refers to the same calling but it speaks of it in the sense of the successful call. Okay? Who does he call? Who is asked to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost? Everybody. Who does he call successfully? Those who accept the call. Okay. So as many of those who accept that call, that is who repent and are baptized will receive the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. That's what the promise is. If I tell a fellow, if you will cut my grass and pick the weeds in my little garden over here, I'll give you five dollars and a gift certificate to McDonalds. If he does both of those things he'll expect to get both. I will ask him to do this, and if he chooses to do it he'll get the benefits. And if he chooses not to he won't receive the benefits. That's easy. So back to Joel 2:32, who got the deliverance? All Christians. See. Well he thinks Acts 2:39 is talking about is just a select few Christians back then who received the miraculous. And nobody today. But what is Joel 2:32 talking about? Deliverance, salvation. Who was called to deliverance? Everybody, the remnant are the ones who accepted it. The successful calling mentioned in Rom 8:30. And then he said then well the gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38, that's only found in one other place, Acts 10:45. But we've already proven that cannot be the same. In 10:45 Cornelius received that gift of the Holy Spirit before he was baptized. Acts 2:38 says you have to be baptized to get that gift. Sure they're the same phrase. I might say, Ron and Tom, I'm going to give both of you a gift of money. And what if I gave Ron a thousand dollars but I gave you a penny, Tom. Well they're both gifts of money, the same words will describe them. I don't think you'd think you got the same thing, though, would you? He's got the gift of the Holy Spirit, that's the Holy Spirit himself, non miraculous measure in Acts 2:38. The gift of the Holy Spirit, that's the Holy Spirit himself, it's the miraculous measure in Acts 10:45. One you get as an earnest, Acts 2:38, says you can only get it if you obey the gospel. One you don't get as an earnest. God can give that to anybody. In a sense he gave that to a donkey, and caused him to speak in the Old Testament. In a sense in 1 Sam 19 he gave the miraculous measure to Saul, 1 Sam 19 where Saul was laying naked, day and night, plotting to kill God's anointed, David. He wasn't in a faithful relationship with God but he got a miraculous measure. Didn't prove anything. But the one in Acts 2:38 does. It's an earnest, you can only get that if you obey the gospel and are faithful to God. And while I'm at it, on this point about how that they can't be the same, you know Gal 4:6, it says that because you are sons God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying abba Father. That cannot be the miraculous gift mentioned in Acts 10:45 because that says you get it because you are a son, and Cornelia was not a son yet. Put up #68. 68. Now if he emphasized a point. Wes (?) you are not going to believe this. We brought up last night Titus 3. We brought it up both nights but I asked him a question last night, and the reason is for those of you who weren't here, is Titus 3:6 talks about the Holy Spirit being shed on some people. And I believe that's talking about the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Now he thinks it's talking about the miraculous gift of the Spirit. And so whenever he's done this, in my affirmative I've tried to show from the context that we're talking about something universal here. Since he's admitted that the miraculous gifts weren't universal, then if I could show that's it's universal I'd have proven to him that it's not the miraculous, that it's the non-miraculous. Okay. So I asked him a question trying to get the context of Titus 3, I asked him about Titus 3:5,7. I left 6 off because it's ---- the question---. Titus 3:5,7 applies to all, just to a select few of the Christians, or other. You know what Tom checked there, he checked other, and wrote dispensational to a special group. Here's, Wes, here's what he's saying, let's read verse 5. 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. Mr. Bright, Tom, is saying that that is dispensational, just to a special group. What he means by that is only some of them back then does that apply to and nobody today. Now can you imagine cutting out of your Bibles, this is one of the, as I've said, one of the fundamental passages of the Bible showing we are saved by grace and that the works that we do have to do, or we can't be saved, Heb 5:9, those works do not earn our salvation, no the blood of Christ does that. And then in verse 7 he says That being justified by his grace, that's only a few Christians back then, nobody today, we should be

made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. You see, he is in a dilemma. He has two choices. One he could say yeah verses 5 and 7, that's universal, applies to everybody then and today. But if he did that then he would look pretty bad because right in the middle of it he would have to say, that one verse stuck right between those two, that's dispensational. So that would put him in a hard position. And so he didn't choose that. But what you chose, Tom, and I'm not saying you did it for this reason, I believe you really believe this, the choice you chose is even worse. To get up here and tell these brethren that verse 5 and 7 doesn't apply to all the Christians back then and none of us now. That puts your position in a very bad light. And I don't mean that, that it doesn't make sense so we ought not accept it. No God's ways are higher than our ways. If God says it we ought to accept it, whether or not it makes sense to us. What it means is that you, anybody can look at the teaching of the Bible here and when they see that you deny that verses 5 and 7 don't apply to us today, then they can easily conclude that you're wrong about this subject in verse 6. So what does the passage teach? It teaches that people who are not saved by works of righteousness, meaning they don't earn their salvation, but instead they are saved by grace, according to his mercy. People justified by his grace and made heirs according to the hope of eternal life. They can see from this passage that all folks like this, that God shed on them abundantly the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ our Saviour. They can see that. That's not hard to see. That should settle the discussion but I know that it won't. Well for this same reason that I brought up, you remember when you kept saying that this is a different Greek word and then in my last speech I showed that afar off is the same Greek word and the word children in Mt 23:37 was the same Greek word, did it phase him at all? No, he didn't accept it. I gave him the same Greek word and he still said it wasn't the same. So it won't do any good to give you the same Greek word, you'll still say it's different. So the next time I get up here and say something that's just the same in English but not the Greek, and you say it's a different Greek word, remember it wouldn't of mattered if it was the same Greek word, he won't believe it. If it doesn't fit his system, he's not going to believe it. Put up #3. John 5:38,39, He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive, Now who's going to receive the Spirit according to this? Those that believe ---- Does that include me, yeah. I'm a believer. So the Holy Spirit was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified. Put up the next chart Mark. Now we want to show in John what this term he that believeth (how much time?) five and a half minutes – Let's look at this phrase he that believeth in the book of John and see if we can tell what it's talking about, if it's just talking about a select few or it's universal. John 3:18 He that believeth on him is not condemned. Select few, dispensational? Or universal then and now? He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, that's just the apostles and a few others, I guess. He that believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life, He that believeth on me shall never thirst, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life, John 11:25 He that believeth in me, yet he shall live. Consistency of language. Boy. Talk about consistency of language. John 7 He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water, But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive something from the Spirit, no, they would believe the Spirit, that's what it says. Okay, next chart. I believe that's #4, we've been through Acts 2:38 but raise it up. In Acts 2:38, we've been trying to show the last two nights that the gift of the Holy Ghost means the Holy Spirit as the gift, and not a gift from the Holy Spirit as he would like for it to mean, and we did that by comparing it to other passages. Luke 11:13 God will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Notice it's not something from the Holy Spirit but it's the Holy Spirit himself. Then that shows it's not the miraculous measure and it shows that it's not the representative indwelling either because this is a promise to be received not a command to be obeyed. ----John 7 talking about the Holy Spirit, those who believed on him should receive, the Spirit himself. Acts 5:32, the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them that obey him. Rom 5:5 the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. 1 Thes 4:8 has also given unto his Holy Spirit. 1 Jn 3:24 Spirit which he hath given us. Therefore Acts 2:38 becomes crystal clear the gift of the Holy Spirit is the gift, the Holy Ghost himself. That's what's being given. See that. That's clear. Very clear. Next verse, next chart. Now let's go to Rom 5:5. We've mentioned this about God sending forth the Spirit of his Son. Let's talk about the context though. Rom 5:5. Mr. Sutton see if you can find the questions for tonight. Let's begin with about verse 1 of Rom 5:5, Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, now who's that talking about, who's justified by faith and has peace with God through Jesus Christ? Is that everybody or just a select few back then? I asked him tonight—is the context of Rom 5:1-5 dispensational to a special group, universal then and now, he checked other, dispensational in nature, that means it doesn't apply today. Okay. But let's talk about that. These people who're justified by faith have peace with God through Jesus Christ, is that talking about us today? Those who have access into grace, is that just a special group or does it apply to everybody today? Rejoice in hope, has hope that

maketh not ashamed, have the love of God in their hearts, have been justified by his blood, will be saved from wrath through him, will be reconciled to God, will be saved by his life. That's the context, that's who's under consideration. That's all Christians, and God says about all those Christians that he sent forth the love of God in their hearts, because the love of God is sent abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given to us. And this is the us. That shows it's universal. Now he's admitted that if I can show universality, then it can't be the miraculous gift. What more could I do Tom, than that to show the universality of that passage, what more can I do? Put up #8, 1 Cor 6:18-19, a passage we've only got to briefly, but I'd like for you to look at 1 Cor 6:18,19. ***Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.*** Obviously he's talking about the physical body that's what we commit fornication with and we commit it against our body. ***What? Know ye not th own?*** See I believe that, I believe the Holy Ghost is in you, therefore you should not sin, you should flee fornication. He doesn't believe the Holy Ghost is in you. And then don't put up chart #70. Do not put it up, since I'll just, Gal 4:5-7 says ***To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.*** I see I got a little mixed up a while ago. But notice here's the place that said that God sends the Spirit of his Son into your hearts. We showed last night or night before last that's talking about the third person in the Godhead, the Holy Spirit. Who's under consideration? The adoption of sons because ye are sons verse 6, because thou art no more a servant but a son and if a son then an heir of God. What's the context? Everybody, everybody receives this, not just a select few, like the miraculous. Which we mentioned all these points last night. In conclusion for tonight remember, Acts 2:38 is talking about a gift that is given, Holy Spirit that is given, not a gift from the Holy Spirit, since it's a promise to be received, it can't be the representative indwelling. And since it can't be the gift of Acts 10:45 because that came before baptism, it must be the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit. All 15 of my affirmative passages prove this and since only one of them is needed to show that your proposition is not true because you have only representatively. I agree with the representative indwelling but if I can show one passage that shows there's a personal indwelling, then I have disproved your proposition.

Tape 5, Side B

Mr Bright: Bro Donahue, gentlemen moderators, ladies and gentlemen, it's a joy for me to be before you this evening for the first of three affirmative speeches that we are going to be presenting relative to the defense of the basic idea that a man has read in your hearing just a few moments ago. I'd like to take just a moment if I could to define very hurriedly the proposition as we are looking at. The speaking of the Holy Spirit which of course would be the third person of the Godhead. We're talking about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit which of course means to inhabit. We're talking about the idea that it is only through the word of God and I think the word only is where bro Pat and I have our disagreements. He thinks that the Holy Spirit comes into the body, the physical body, into the heart, I'm sure that's what he would say, of the person who is being baptized for the remission of sins, and there deity resides either until death or until that particular person would turn and walk away from Jehovah God. Of course our affirmation is that the Bible is that which sustains that basic idea, that it imparts this knowledge. And by the Bible I simply mean the book that we refer to normally to as the English Bible and that of course would be the books of Genesis-Malachi and it would be in the New Testament the book of Matthew-Revelation. And so if we look at this, I think that that has defined it enough for us to understand exactly what I am saying this evening. But as I emphasized last night, that we are not emphasizing the fact or answering the question, does the Holy Spirit dwell in the New Testament Christian. I think we all will agree that this is certainly taught in the Bible so we are dealing with the manner or the mode. Two alternatives of how deity, the Spirit of deity can dwell in the human being, and that is either directly or indirectly. There is a direct impact of Holy Spirit upon human spirit or it is through a medium. As I stated last night, that I am convinced that the only way deity could dwell in the body of a physical Christian, the human being, is because of or as the result of a miracle. And so for this particular reason, I reject this basic idea. But furthermore, let me explain if I could somewhat in detail and yet not take all night. I want to see chart #46, if I could bro Ron. And notice here the idea that is presented. That by the word of God I'm simply conveying the thought that a word is a sign of an idea. It is a sound or a symbol which stands for an idea or concept. It is the idea or concept which is put within the mind by means of the sounds or symbol hence the word, that is the sound or symbol does not actually dwell there at all, but only the idea or the concept. Chart #42, if you would please. Notice here that according to

MacKnight in his commentary, presented the thought, that the Hebrews expressed absolute rule or dominion by the figure of dwelling. And that's the way that I am using it tonight. That as one allows himself to be led by the Spirit of God, as he allows himself to be guided, directed by the word of God, that it is in that sense then that the Holy Spirit dwells in the heart of the Christian. And then one is allowing the word of God to lead him, guide him direct him, is that which is dominating him. It is the individual in whom the Spirit of God dwells. It is he in whom Christ dwells and it is he in whom the Father dwells. Let's see the next chart, bro Ron, chart #105. And very hurriedly if I could please just to show here that in one passage he says that be filled with the Spirit. Here he says let the word of Christ dwell in you richly. Now please understand that the rest of this is indeed synonymous. It is my contention that here Paul comments on what he commands here. One is to let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, and the other is to be filled with the Spirit. It is my basic argument that that is exactly how one is filled with the Spirit, when I allow the Spirit of God to direct me. Chart #44, if you would please. Friends, the Bible is very clear that we do not have to have a literal indwelling in order for one to dwell in another. In Rev 2:13, we find there as John writes to the church at Pergamos, that he says I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's throne or seat is, where Satan dwelleth. I think we all understand that basic idea, and I don't think bro Pat is going to disagree with that basic idea at all. Now let's see chart #1. We are going to be dealing now with an argument in sustaining the thoughts that I have presented in the brief introduction that we have given. The three nights prior to this, I have used this particular word because bro Pat in his argumentation, in trying to prove the literal personal indwelling of deity literally in this body, that I am affirming that he is guilty of this very thing of an error in chronology. My friends, he is going back 2000 years ago, he is lifting passages out of their first century miraculous context, and making every aspect of these particular things to apply, I guess I should say, to you and to me today. Now tonight I want to deal first of all with something that transpired in the closing minutes that bro Pat introduced from a question, and by the way that was new material. He presented the question, based upon that he had given me last night, and it was relative to the idea that in the context of Rom 5:1-5. And the question is, is the context of Rom 5:1-5 dispensational to a special group, is it universal then or now, and I think according to what I could gather from the tape, there was probably a third choice, whether I could check other. And I evidently checked other, and then I wrote dispensational in nature. Now you that have been here through the debate, or any other night of the debate, understand exactly what I meant. And he says, then I am arguing that it has no application at all. But friends, I would ask you to consider another aspect of this, because in the same context bro Pat made an argument based upon a question that he had asked me Monday night. And the question was the fifth question. I'll have to go back to the previous question and he says, relative to Luke 11:9-13a, does it apply to all, just to a select few of the Christians, or others. I said it is dispensational to a special group. He then asked in the very next question, if you don't mind please, answer the same question for Titus 3:5,7. Now notice in this, that he said Titus 3: 5,7. Now as I read that, and of course knowing the nature of the debate, knowing of his basic view of what verse 6 says in that particular passage, I am assuming, that I assume that he included verse 6. I did not notice, and I still don't remember answering the question, there's no doubt in my mind that I did, I'm not denying that, nor am I blaming bro Donahue. I'm just simply saying that I misread the question or the statement that was made. Friends, my basic idea concerning what is taught in Titus 3 that all of the blessings, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but by his own mercy he hath saved us. Now bro Pat made quite a, what he thought was a powerful argument, because I answered the question like I did, and because he in the question left out verse 6, he was making the argument that I was saying that all of these things do not apply to New Testament Christians at all. Well I want to show you an example of what bro Pat is doing here. Show me chart #110. Now this is a statement that is made, and notice at the top, and I know that I could have added some words at the end of each of these phrases or clauses, to make it a little clearer, but I did not want to jumble up the chart. Now notice, it is true that Jesus Christ, I then list ten conditions that are to be met. Notice that he existed in the beginning, John 1. Born in Bethlehem, #2. Was born of a virgin, he was placed in a manger after his birth, was physically wealthy according to the standard of the Jews in that day, he was crucified, he was resurrected from the dead, he ascended to the Father, he is the Saviour of the world, he is our high priest. In other words, as I am wording this I am saying it is true that Jesus Christ fits every one of these. But friends, you notice in verse number 5, I have placed there, that the condition that he was physically wealthy according to the standard of the Jews in that day and time. Now friends, nine of those statements that I'm sure everyone of us would agree with. But you see the question as it is asked, #5 makes that statement false. Now I want you to think on that. It is true that Jesus Christ ---these ten conditions, one of them make them wrong. It is false. That statement is false. Now when I say that, does that mean that I do not believe that Jesus was born of a virgin? Does that

mean that I do not believe that he is our high priest? Or #7, that he was resurrected from the dead? Is that what I am saying, when I say that statement, as it is given there is indeed false. Why certainly not. But you see bro Pat in this particular attempt here, is trying or tried to sway the idea of the people's thinking, that I was doing this. But friends, I think you can see that indeed it was not. Yes I made a mistake when I read that question, I don't deny that and I'm not blaming him and I'm not blaming anybody else. It was simply my mistake. Well, let's go to some other things that bro Pat has presented. I want chart #30, if you would please. Notice the idea that is based upon Acts 2:38,39 which is going to be a pivotal passage in this discussion. Here after the miraculous events in Acts 2, the apostle Peter after these people were pricked in their heart, he told them to ***repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins.*** Well as we look at this, we notice that he says, ***for the promise is unto you and your children, and to all that are afar off.*** Our argument has been bro Pat, would you present for us a passage wherein that Greek phrase is used anywhere in the Bible. Notice I didn't say the English word. The other night he presented Acts 7:23, the children of Israel. Notice right there, but it's not even the same Greek word. Well then he comes up last night and he presents the fact of Math chapters 23 and 27. But now I want to notice here, we asked a question -- #2 I, Pat Donahue, have produced a New Testament passage where the exact same Greek phrase that is translated your children in Acts 2:39 means posterity. He says *no, one is enough. And then he says Luke 23:28 is a possibility.* No Pat it is not a possibility, it is not the same Greek phrase, and anybody who can understand that can see that he is admitting that he has not produced the passage. Friend, they are different. Yes, I admitted, and I have admitted that the original word found in Acts 2:39 can be found in the New Testament referring to posterity. I didn't ask for the English word. I didn't ask for the Greek word. I asked for the exact same phrase in the original language. He hasn't produced it thus far. But notice in that particular statement, if your would, or that particular verse, as many as. I want you to look at that folks, as many as. Consider if you would please, this particular thought, as many as. Now bro Pat says that refers to all that are called by the gospel. Now friend if you read that phrase, as many as, there can be no doubt that there is, as it were, a built in limitation. It, of and by itself, suggests there is a group here, and there is another group. Now bro Pat says that it refers to the idea of the gospel call. Friends, if that is the case, the gospel call is indeed limited according to what he teaches. If it is limited my friends, this hints on the idea of Calvinism, of a limited atonement. Do I believe that Pat Donahue believes in Calvinism? No, I do not. I would not charge him with that for one instant. But my friends, this basic idea that indeed Acts 2:39 that the idea of as many as refers to the gospel call is indeed that which is applicable to everybody. Friends, he told them what to do. Repent and be baptized every one of you. Certainly they were to be baptized. Certainly they received the remission of sin. Now friends, don't let him cloud the issue, because when he promised the gift of the Holy Spirit, as we have already stated, that indeed this idea refers to the miraculous. Now I ask you concerning this word, shall call, to produce a word or a passage wherein the Greek word that is translated shall call, is referring to the gospel call. Now friends, that word is a verb. Now Pat I didn't ask for an adjective. I asked for a verb. And he has not produced it yet. Show us #111 if you would please, and consider here this basic idea. It is the thought that Peter said in Acts 2:39, as many as the Lord our God shall call successfully. Now he argued that last night. Now what he is saying is that this idea of as many as the Lord our God shall call, it refers to those who are responding. Well friends, that is understood. In the very context of what he is saying. That's not what Peter said, notice, as many as. That is a limitation. And certainly he admitted last night in Gal 3:27, he says as many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ. He admitted that in that phrase there was some sense of a limitation. But here he wants to say that it is the gospel call. And so as we look upon this friends, I would ask you to consider very hurriedly, or very closely as the time permits, this basic idea. Bro Ron, I want to skip on down to chart #106, if you would please, chart #106. Here is dealing with Acts 5:32, wherein bro Pat says, as Peter standing before the council, is giving his defense on behalf of the apostles, and he says, ***"And we are his witnesses of these things and so also is the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them that obey him."*** Last night bro Pat presented the idea that this last phrase, he says it doesn't even mention the miraculous. Well, friends that's understood. Because he said we are his witnesses and so also is the Holy Spirit. In John 15:26,27, Jesus promised that when the Comforter is come, he said of whom I will send unto you from the Father. Notice the Spirit of truth, that is the Spirit of God, that's the Holy Spirit my friend. He says which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me and ye also shall bear witness. What does Peter say up here, we are his witnesses and then he says so also is the Holy Ghost. No it doesn't mention the miraculous. What was he doing, how was the Holy Spirit witnessing, my friends, that's what bro Pat has to answer. Look here if you would please, in Heb 2:3,4 ***"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; now watch God also bearing them witness how? With signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." Notice here if you would please, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord and was confirmed, what does that mean? It was substantiated, there was the stamp of divine approval. Now pull that back down if you would bro Ron. Notice here friends, there were signs and wonders, and there's gifts and divers miracles from the Holy Spirit. And here the Holy Ghost is one who is witnessing. Now he's either standing up and talking or he is witnessing through the apostles that he says we are his witnesses and so also is the Holy Spirit. My friends in the first century, the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit were over whelming. Those individuals, yes they were trying and they had been charged with killing Christ. But those individuals understood the power of Peter's argument here. He said we are his witnesses and so also is the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them, the obeying ones. The priests at this time, the council was saying we are God's spokesman, Peter is responding, no we have to obey God more than man. And then the idea in verse 33 is, yes they wanted to kill them. Why? Simply because, and I do not want to belittle this, please understand that, but bro Pat says it's simply because they killed Jesus. Well friends, why then did not the apostle Peter just simply leave the idea that I have this personal indwelling, it's not seeing, it's not heard, it's not manifested in any outward visible way as far as other human beings. No dear people, he was affirming the Spirit is working through us with the miraculous and it is being proven beyond a shadow of a doubt who were the obedient ones, the apostles, or was it those who were the Jews at that time in that particular situation. And so as we look at this . . . thank you . . . end of time

Mr Pat Donahue: Everybody turn to Galatians 4:5-7. Now one of the methods I've been using in this whole discussion is showing my proof texts are universal because Tom has admitted in question #1 on June 26 that the miraculous was not universal even then to those people and certainly not now. So if I can show from the context that the passages that I am talking about where people received the Holy Ghost, not something from the Holy Ghost, but the Holy Ghost, were universal then, and are now, then I will have proven they are not the miraculous as he states. So what I'm going to do – you remember Gal 4:6 – I use this as a proof – it says Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. We can look at other passages and tell that this is talking about the Holy Spirit. Now who did he, I mean how do we know that this is universal or not? Well, why don't we just go to the context like we normally do? In verse 5, it says that we might receive the adoption of sons. Then in verse 6 he sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, so he's talking your, and he says we might receive the adoption of sons. Now is that just talking about the apostles and a select few or is that every Christian? Ask yourself, that's the context, that's how we determine something. Verse 6, because ye are sons, that's every Christian isn't it? Because ye are sons, God sent forth his Spirit into your hearts. Is that just the apostles, are they the only ones that are sons? Or a few others that got the miraculous? Of course not. No more a servant, but a son, that's every Christian. An heir of God through Christ, that's every Christian. And so the context shows that every Christian receives this Spirit into his heart. Okay Mark. And then while we're on Gal 4:6, let me remind you, they received this Holy Spirit because they were sons. He claims that this is referring to the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit, Rodney. As you read about in Acts 10:45 where Cornelius received a miraculous measure, sometimes called the baptismal measure, they spoke in tongues. But that can't be so because Cornelius received that gift of the Holy Spirit before he became a son. It couldn't have been because he was a son, he wasn't a son yet. So again, this conclusively proves that Gal 4:6 cannot be talking about the miraculous measure of the Spirit. #68. Now I had this chart up here last night and I can provide where you answered this question, and I think I know what you are saying now, that you probably put 5, up there and it's 5-7. Okay that's fine. And so you answered this as dispensational. Raise it up a little bit Mark. Now Tom correct me if I'm wrong, what I think you are saying, now is that part of this was universal and part of it was dispensational. Right? It includes this part – not by works of righteousness, etc., but verse 6 would be dispensational and then verse 7 again would be universal, is that what you were saying? Tom is that how you would answer the question now? Okay. I think that's what he is saying. First he said when he answered this question he said that it was all dispensational, but he said that he misread this and answered the question wrong, because he misread the question. I think what he tried to just now explain was, he meant that this was universal to all Christians but this part about the Holy Ghost being shed on us, that was the miraculous, dispensational, and then of course this part would be universal again. And I can understand that. I thought that's how he would answer the question when I had asked him the first time. But he's run into another problem here, but it's not as bad as the problem he was in, I'll admit. That's what I said last night. Now look at this. We are going to do the same thing we just did with Galatians 4. What is the context

here? We both see that it is, both verse (Titus 3) 5 and 6, it says the Holy Ghost which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Who is the us? Is that just the apostles, Titus, and perhaps a few others like Marion Fox said, or is it everybody? Let's look at the context and decide who the us is. Not by works of righteousness which we have done. Is that the apostles, Titus, and perhaps a few others, or is that all Christians? But according to these verses, he's saying that's everybody, isn't it? By the washing of regeneration, that's everybody. That by the way is the washing away of sins that happens when you are born again. That's every Christian. That being justified by his grace, that's every Christian. We, there's the word we, we should be made heirs, that's everybody. So when we try to learn from verse 6 who the us is, the context tells us it's every Christian. Therefore this can't be referring to the miraculous. It cannot, because it's universal. Put up #28. Everybody turn to Acts 2:39. This has been a much discussed passage this week. In verse 38, Peter just got through saying, repent and be baptized everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you and to your children, to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Now a question has been raised about your children. And he says, well find this phrase your children ☺ and that's the whole thing, I'm supposed to find whole phrase somewhere else in the Greek. But of course the first time he asked that he just said the word children. So when I found that he added the word your children to it. That was a couple of nights ago when he asked for children. We found some examples so then he changed it to your children. Now he got up here, then we found one that was your children and suggested that as a possibility, Luke 23:28. He said it was different in the Greek than Acts 2:39. Tom when you get up here, tell us what the difference in the Greek between your children in Luke 23:28 and your children in Acts 2:39. Tell us what the difference is. Now – part was universal – part was dispensational – I don't understand my own notes. Now but that really wouldn't matter. When it says your children, I went and found another Greek word, I mean the same Greek word in Math 23:37, where children he agrees refers to posterity. The word your on there Tom wouldn't affect whether or not it's first generation or posterity. It wouldn't have anything to do with it. Children could either be first generation or posterity. Your just simply means belonging to the people he's talking to. Second p--- person, plural, possessive. That's all it means. Your, those Jews he was talking to, your children. Children could either mean first generation or posterity. Thayer defines this word children in this verse as posterity. And Mt 23:37 is the same Greek word and refers to posterity. Then let's go to this expression of to all that are afar off. Now I found the same Greek term over in Eph 2:13,17. It's far off, afar off, it's the same in the Greek. There we agree that it's referring to all the Gentiles. In question #1 on June 28 Tom admitted that afar off in Eph 2 refers to all the Gentiles not just to a representative few. Now we have the same exact Greek term here, all, except the only thing is you've added all, over here you have afar off then over here you added all that are afar off. Now over here where it just says afar he says it's all the Gentiles. Now if that's all the Gentiles and this over here is the same Greek word except it has all in front of it, that must mean all the Gentiles wouldn't it? Again universal. He doesn't think so. He thinks it's just a select few of the Gentiles. You know you talk about his rule of consistency of language – he throws it right out the window as quick as a cat, when it won't suit him. Consistency of language according to your rule would say it means the same as Eph 2 but you reject that. So you only use this consistency of language argument when it suits you. Anybody can read this and tell that all that are afar off here are all the Gentiles. He has to force a square peg into a round hole to make it mean only a few Gentiles. Now what this illustrates, here's another thing this illustrates – a lot of times I'll say well this means this – he'll say well that's a different Greek word. You know it illustrates what I said the other night, it wouldn't do me any good if it was the same Greek word, because if these things were the same Greek word in cases he's talking about

Mr Ron Patterson (?) I'm going to have to call for an order. ----- now there's basically times when you can call for an order and one is when you describe the motive of somebody or teaching. Now I want to say that any time that Pat presents something causes one to believe when he's presented it and saying it is presented. Tom has asked for your children every night. It has been presented. That's what Tom has presented in the first two. Now Pat may have the idea that Tom will not accept what is being taught, but Tom will. So let's not try that thing, okay? **Someone said**, Are you willing to go on? **Pat Donahue**: I'm not sure what he said. What did I do wrong? **Mr. Patterson** (?): You said even if I presented it, the true thing, the facts thing, he's not going to accept it anyway. Tom will accept the truth. Tom is obviously not going to reject Bible truth. Now he rejects your thinking maybe, but not Bible truth. And you said simply put, he's not going to accept it. **Someone said**: Well what he's done, he's done that based on the fact that he presented clear cut things that he asked for without his accepting those. He doesn't ----- on the

facts. **Mr. Ron Patterson** (?) Okay, here's what has been done in the past. Tom every night has put up the chart that has the phrase your children. He has never ever ask for the phrase or word children. Now Pat is using the word children, and Tom over and over and over has asked for your children, and that hasn't been done. Now Pat presented thy children and presented children but he hasn't presented your children and there's a reason for that, and we're still waiting for it. Tom in fact even says he hasn't presented one in the questions, therefore when he presents your children as it is in Acts over and over, you can go over the tape and you can hear Tom presenting your children, when you present your children and ----- I guarantee you Tom will accept it. **Someone said** (?): He's presented it two or three times, your children, in Acts 2:39, and Mr. Thayer defines the word children as used in Acts 2:39 as posterity. **Mr. Ron Patterson** (?) Okay now.....**Someone said** (?): Pat made that point again tonight. **Mr. Ron Patterson** (?) Now were accepting Acts 2:39 so you can't use 2:39 to present it because we know that all passages for your children help define 2:39. So we were asking for passages, not 2:39, but passages that show posterity here. There's -----passages in the New Testament where the Greek word used in Acts 2:39 is translated your children -----translated posterity -----and that's what Tom has been trying to get. ----- **Someone said** (?): Well here's one of the definitions for it. He said he accepted Mr. Thayer's definition. -----Mr. Thayer's definition of the word there as children and you go on down to posterity and you define that posterity as -----we introduced that. -----**Mr. Ron Patterson**: Here's what we will do, don't you agree that Tom, if you presented what he's asking for that he would accept Bible truth? **Someone said** (?): I hope he would. **Mr. Patterson**: okay. Then he ought not be saying that. That's what we're asking. Don't imply that Tom -----he's not going to accept it. Okay. Tom will accept it when he's presented what he's asked for. Do you agree to that? **Someone said**(?): Well I will agree that Pat has presented things that he has not accepted in the past -----what he was asking for. Now there's the technicality like tonight, for example, here's your children that Pat gave, I think he was asking in one of the questions that's found in Luke 23:28. As far as I can determine based on what bro Hutto just told us the only difference in the Greek is the difference in case. It's your in both cases and it's children in both cases. **Mr. Ron Patterson** (?) -----We've been using this Luke 23:28 to show that this does not refer to posterity. Now we have to decide, I know that Tom says that Luke 23:28 is not referring to posterity. -----So -----presented and instead of going to all these other passages, -----Luke 23:28, and we accept that passage so he has presented it okay? Now when he presented Luke 23:28, then Tom will accept, and show why he is saying it is not posterity. Tom will accept the truth. When you agree that Tom will accept the truth when he sees Bible truth. Do you agree with that? **Someone said** (?): I hope he would. **Mr. Patterson**: Okay. **Someone said** (?) I have no reason.. . **Mr. Patterson**: ... he may not be saying he is but he is implying that. **Someone said**: -----**Mr. Patterson**: -----**Someone said**: That's what you are saying ----- **Mr. Patterson**: -----Tom would not accept Bible truth even if you decide -----Now he will accept it. ----- **Someone said**: -----**Pat Donahue**: Ron let me state it again and see if you have a problem the way I thought...I wasn't saying --- what I said was -- alright just tell me if this is objectionable to you that you asked me for the same Greek phrase over here, and by the way I did present Luke 23:28 just a while ago so he can respond to it -- the same Greek phrase -- but on afar off, what I was saying when you interrupted me was that afar off was the same Greek word as in Acts 2:39. But he didn't think they were the same thing, so what good would it do me to fine your children the same in the Greek somewhere else because that wouldn't necessarily prove to him that it was the same thing. He doesn't do it with afar off. That's what I was saying. Now do you object to that, to saying that? **Mr. Ron Patterson**: I object to just what I've heard that even if I presented it you wouldn't accept it. Now if you present what he's asking for, he will accept it. But he might not agree with your perspective -----so if you want -----and Tom will respond to it, he will. Is that fair? **Pat Donahue** ☺ Ah, it's not necessarily fair because what I think he's asking for is really not even germane to the issue. I think he's just trying to get me to chase rabbits as it were because it doesn't prove anything if I go over there. **Mr. Ron Patterson**: I want you to know that Tom believes that that's an important issue. Now you may not. But Tom does. We think other things that you presented are not important but that's beside the point. Would you avoid saying about Tom, he wouldn't accept the truth even if I presented it to him? That's all I'm asking you to do, nothing more. **Someone said**: I have a suggestion to make, that in a situation like this, if you say, I'm afraid you won't accept it -----to say he won't. **Pat Donahue**: Alright, here's what I mean by he won't accept it, not that he wouldn't accept the truth, but that if we found the same Greek word over here, he still wouldn't think that Acts 2:39 meant the same thing as that over there. Not that he would accept my position, but if I found

the same Greek phrase, your children, he still would not think that your children in Acts 2:39 would refer to posterity. That's what I said and that's what I meant. Not that he wouldn't accept the truth but that it would not help in this discussion. It would not prove to him, if I found your children, the same in the Greek somewhere else, where it definitely referred to posterity, it would not change his mind about what it referred to in Acts 2:39. **Mr. Patterson:** Do you understand that if you presented the truth to Tom, he's -----enough to receive the truth, is that agreed? **Pat Donahue:** As far as I know **Mr. Patterson:** okay. **Pat Donahue:** And so if it's not objectionable the point I was making is, is that he's asking for this Greek phrase over here, the same Greek phrase, for your children Acts 2:39. We've given him a possibility, Luke 23:28, and I asked him what's the difference. Okay. But even if we found one with the same Greek phrase, he wouldn't b---and necessarily concede the point and say Acts 2:39 your children is talking about posterity. We've already proven that because he went to afar off showing somewhere else in Eph 2, same Greek phrase, he agrees it's all the Gentiles and it's the same Greek word, yet he doesn't think afar off in Acts 2:39 means all the Gentiles. So it won't do us any good to go over here and chase this rabbit every time and find the same Greek phrase, because he will not agree that Acts 2:39 is the same as that, even if I find the same Greek phrase. So really it amounts to being a waste of time and that's why I said it's really not germane to the issue. Now let's mention as many as the Lord our God shall call. Now again let me go back to Joel 2:32, all of you now realize that this is a quote from Joel 2:32, and we got Tom to admit that deliverance in Joel 2:32 is talking about salvation. Alright? So the passage talks about salvation, whoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered. Who is that? That is the call to salvation. Tom you can say it's not the gospel call, if you want to reject that term for it, that's fine. It is the call to deliverance, though. The call to salvation, that's what it's talking about. As many as the Lord our God shall call, shall be delivered. That's found in Acts 2:21 in our immediate context, whosoever shall call shall be saved. I mean whoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. So the deliverance and the saved are the same thing. And then at the end of Joel 2:32 it says in the remnant whom the Lord shall call. So that's the Lord calling us. And it's a remnant. The Christian. And what is it a call to? Verse 32, it's deliverance or salvation, which is proved by Acts 2:21, not the miraculous gifts. That's what the end of Acts 2:39, you want to say as many as is limited to something, well it's limited to even as many as the Lord our God shall call, it's limiting to all those the Lord would call. What is that call? It's the call to salvation, Joel 2:32 proves that. It is not the call to miraculous offices. It is the call to salvation, deliverance. And so that gets everybody. That means that God asks everybody to become a Christian. Some don't. Those who repent and those who are baptized receive the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost. That is the problem. Promise, some take advantage of that and some do not. Oh by the way, and this is another example of asking for the same Greek term – Ron, he asks when does proskaleomi (?) which is found in Acts 2:39, would ever refer to the gospel call, I think is the way he said it, I guess I better not use that term lest you object to it but it refers to the call to salvation in Joel 2:32 in the Septuagint. If you use the word our God shall call in Joel 2:32, it is proskaleomi and you admitted that was salvation. So that's the call to salvation in Joel 2:32 and it's proskaleomi. Now let's choose by the text, you've asked for this same Greek word, proskaleomi, where does it ever refer to this call, this call to salvation? I found it in the Septuagint, not in the New Testament, it may be in the New Testament, I hadn't looked, but I heard on the tape when I was driving, Tom, Marion pointed out that proskaleomi was in Joel 2:32. So, and I got Bob to check it and it was. And so there it is, there's your Greek word, for the call to salvation. And it happens to be in the Septuagint for Joel 2:32. Put up #69. And then we put up this chart last night about our common proof argument we use against the Baptist. We say we could be baptized for the remission of sins. They say that being baptized because of the remission of sins and we say wait a minute it says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, so the remission of sins -----both therefore being baptized for the remission of sins means because remission of sins that you've already received then repent would mean, repent because of the remission of sins you've already received. Tom would agree 100% wholeheartedly with that argument. Now I want to make the same argument with this. In Acts 2:39 we are talking about the Lord calls, and you get the gift of the Holy Spirit. What is that call, what is the promise there I should say? What is the promise? We both agree that it has to do with the gift of the Holy Spirit. But you know it also has to do with the remission of sins. Don't overlook that. Don't overlook that because it says this promise is to you and to as many as the Lord our God shall call – when you tie that, the call, God's call back to Joel 2:32, it's the call to deliverance. So the promise has to at least include deliverance, salvation, and we mentioned the sins. Now let me just read it off my notes here. Joel 2:32 shows that the promise call of Acts 2:38 has to include salvation, the remission of sins, so if Acts 2:39 is only dispensational, then the dispensation of the Baptist is right, baptism for the remission of sins was true back then for some but not for us today. It's the exact same argument. The

promise is both of those things. If it's dispensational on getting the Holy Ghost, it would need to be dispensational on the remission of sins. And so the guy I'm talking to over email right now, he would say if the baptism for the remission of sins is just for the Jews, back then, and not for anybody today, he would be right if we believe your reasoning. Put up #21. So what we've been through, is we've just shown from Acts 2:39, that Acts 2:38 is universal. It's to you, those standing there, your generation, Thayer defines that as posterity, to all those that are afar off, all those that are afar off, the same Greek phrase in Eph 2, he says refers to all the Gentiles, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. That's a quote from Joel 2:32 which is a call to deliverance, or salvation. Obviously that gets everybody. Acts 2:38,39 is universal. That's promised and we've proved it. And then furthermore, Acts 2:38 cannot be the miraculous because Acts 2:38 conditions the gift of the Holy Spirit upon repenting and being baptized. Now Tom I think you agree with that. Because in Marion's book on page 254, Marion makes a chart, and the only thing different is-----the laying on of hands. But he says repent, confess and be baptized, you have to do all those to get the gift of the Holy Ghost. So according to Marion, to get the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to Acts 2:38, you have to repent and be baptized. You have to. Even during that special time as you call it, Marion says Acts 2:38 taught that you have to be baptized to get these gifts. But Cornelia received the miraculous gift before he was ever baptized. See. The miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost of Acts 10:45 was received by Cornelius and his household before they were baptized in water. Therefore the gift of the Holy Ghost in Acts 2:38 cannot be the same as the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost in Acts 10:45. So it refers to the non-miraculous measure. Rodney, you hadn't been here – do you understand that argument? I can repeat it if you need me to, you hadn't been here, but that's easy, Acts 2:38 says you have to be baptized to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. Tom says that's the same as the gift of the Holy Ghost, the miraculous in 10:45, but Cornelius received that before he was baptized. Even during that special time, Peter said you had to be baptized to get that gift, so they can't be the same. They cannot be the same – can't be the miraculous. And so #24. You know, what Tom is teaching is a field day for the Baptist. And I don't mean you should accept my position Tom, so it would make it easier to debate the Baptist, I just mean that if what we've been saying in debates against the Baptist is true then your position is wrong. When the Pentecostal finds out that Marion believes, or that Tom believes, excuse me, that the gift of the Holy Ghost refers to the miraculous, but that repent and be baptized for the remission of sins still applies today, what's the first thing he's going to say. The Pentecostal's next thought would surely be that miraculous still applies today also because it's right there in the same verse. And then the Baptist is also going to have a field day, the Baptist is sure to make the point -- if Cornelius could receive the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost which is conditioned upon water baptism, in Acts 2:38, before water baptism, why couldn't somebody receive the remission of sins which is conditioned before water baptism, in Acts 2:38, before water baptism? You know in Acts 2:38, both those, both benefits, the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost were conditioned upon baptism. Well, it seems to me that if Cornelia could receive one of them without being baptized, why couldn't he receive the other, the remission of sins? You'd never be able to answer that with the Baptist. Now put up #31. We want to show now that Acts 5:32 is universal. Why? Because he's already committed that if anything is universal at that time, and even now, it cannot be part of the miraculous. Now, first of all, that's the wrong chart. Just look at the verse and leave that up there. That's the chart that I want but I didn't get the other one. Let me say this again Tom in response to what you said in your last speech. Verse 32 says, We are his witnesses of these things. Alright, they were witnesses. Alright. So was also the Holy Ghost – he was also a witness. Now the third clause does not mention about the witnesses. Clause a and b do, c does not mention about witnesses, nor the miraculous. It says, the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them that obey him. That's what I'm trying to prove in this discussion that God gives the Holy Spirit to them that obey him. And now, you remember from last night that I showed from Acts 2:41, 4:4, 5:41 that above 5,000 were obeying, present tense, this verse. I asked him tonight, in question #5, I said, Tom approximately how many people in the world were presently or currently at that time obeying God at the time Peter spoke Acts 5:32 (tape seemed to skip) over 5000 were obeying God. Now that's -----my argument. That means that this verse proves that God gave the Holy Spirit, the Holy Ghost, to over 5000 people at that time. Because he said over 5000 were presently, present tense, obeying him at that time. And this verse says that God gave the Holy Ghost past tense to those that were presently currently obeying him, that shows a ----- in the argument. Tight as a drum. But before we leave that, let's compare this verse, you look at Acts 5:32 and I'm going to read Heb 5:9 for you. Heb 5:9 Jesus became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. All them that obey him, that's present tense, those that were currently obeying him. Now we would understand that that verse teaches that Jesus will save all those that obey him, then and now. Now, it's the same is Acts 5:32 in the present tense, those that are obeying him. All of these

Greek things are the same, then why wouldn't we understand that in Acts 5:32, that God would give the Holy Ghost to all those then and now who are obeying him? Why would we interpret the Heb 5:9 differently, it's the same? And so Acts 5:32 is universal, therefore it cannot be applied to the miraculous gifts. Put up #46. No, I'm sorry, I meant to go to #33. Before my time is up, the gift of the Holy Spirit in 5:32 is conditioned upon obedience, to them that obey him. But Cornelia and his household had not obeyed him. So Tom you have one of two choices, say that Cornelia had obeyed consistent with Acts 5:32, before he was baptized in water, or admit that Acts 5:32 is not referring to the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. You see the point? He had not obeyed God like Acts 5:32 is talking about, yet he received the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. Therefore Acts 5:32 can't be talking about the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit.

Tape # 6, Side A, Donahue/Bright debate, Indwelling of Holy Spirit

Mr. Tom Bright: It's a joy to be able to stand before you for the second speech this evening, relative to the affirmation of the argument that I have presented. I would like to draw your attention to something that bro Pat has presented concerning the idea of a field day. The only way that I know how to respond to this particular idea of the Pentecostals would have a field day with me is to go to our web site. Click on our archives and go to the debate that I had with the United Pentecostal preacher back in, I believe it was 1994. And I'll just let you decide whether that particular individual had a field day with me, bro Pat, simply because I hold the position that I hold. Now friends, bro Pat still wants to smear the difference between the idea of this concept that he says is universal and then he wants to pull this out and say, well now Tom, you're saying it's universal. Friends, please understand if you would please, that when I speak of the New Testament period, the miraculous period of time, it is by the very nature of the things, that certainly all of the blessings that Christians were to receive were present there. But there was a special manifestation of the Holy Spirit that cannot be applied to people today. And so when bro Pat uses the idea of the universality that he keeps talking about, you need to understand what is he saying? Is he saying that I am saying that there is not mercy, there is not grace, etc, etc. I believe the chart that I have presented in the first speech relative to the truth concerning Jesus Christ and the ten items, with only one of those being false, and I want you to keep that particular thought before your mind if you would please. Because that shows beyond a shadow of a doubt that I do not reject any of these particular things. But Pat is wanting to blow this, he is not wanting you to remember that yes, there was a miraculous age, and certainly all spiritual blessings, Eph 1:3 are in Christ Jesus and they had those in the first century and they have those in the twenty-first century. But friends, there is a period of time in which some of the statements, some of the promises that are found in the Bible cannot be carried forward until today or unto today and say that we have application. Bro Pat is taking many of the passages of scripture that refer to the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. For instance, if you want to search on word Holy and Spirit and various forms of the word give or gave or has given or received, you're going to find that many instances, if you'll remember the charts that he has presented, but the basic idea that we are looking at here, friends, is indeed this fact that it is referring to the Spirit of God. I want to notice something if you would please, he asked me concerning children, what's the difference? The difference between singular and plural. Now Pat, if you don't think that is very interesting or very important, I ask you to go to Gal 3 where Paul made an argument distinguishing between singular and plural. It is indeed most interesting. Well, so as we look at this, friends, I draw your attention back to Acts 2:38,39. And certainly I believe Pat and I both understand that this is a crucial area that we really have to look at. Now Pat seems to have in his mind some idea that somewhere in this debate I have denied the basic idea that afar off refers to the Gentiles. Now if I had time to look at this and to look at all the tapes, I believe that I could produce several occasions, at least 2, and maybe more, where I have admitted the afar off ones that are in Acts 2:39, refer to the Gentile. But friends, notice what is the context. The gift of the Holy Ghost is promised. It was promised to them, to you, those that are here, your children, that is that next generation, I've already shown that from Joel 1:1-3, where Joel which is the background of Acts 2, is setting forth the idea of the definition of the word children. And so as we look at this in Acts 2, he says the promise, the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit, is to you and your children and those that are afar off. I presented the thought the other night. Bro Pat, all you have to do is look at 1 Cor 12,13,14 where Paul discusses many of the problems that the Corinthians were having over the spiritual gifts. I admit that. And the gift of the Holy Spirit, not his definition, but my definition, went to the Gentiles. In Acts 19:1 and verses following, Paul laid his hands upon some individuals after he had taught them the truth relative to the Great Commission baptism and he bestowed to them the miraculous. In Eph 4, to what we would call a Gentile church, Paul is certainly mentioning there the spiritual gifts. Friends, there can be no doubt, the afar off, but Pat seems to think that that has to refer to the gospel call in some way or another. But certainly I have admitted that, and I will continue to admit that. The promise is to you and your children and all that are afar off. And certainly then, there is beyond any distinction at all, or discussion at all that that applies, Pat, maybe I'm missing something in your argument. He says that I don't accept that. I've always accepted that. I have taught that for years, my friends. And I don't know what I have said that led him to believe that I don't believe that. And so I want it clear, everybody listen to me, the afar off in Acts 2:39 refers to the Gentile people. And Paul, one of the apostles of Jesus Christ went to the Gentiles. He was in fact referred to as the apostle of the Gentiles, Gal 2. And so whatever his argument is, friends, but the fact still remains, there is as many as. Now I want us to turn if you would to Joel 2 and let's look at the passage that he is presenting here. Joel chapter 2. Well he says Tom has admitted that there is deliverance. I have admitted

and I believe that the deliverance from sin is under consideration. But notice if you would in verse 32 of Joel 2, it shall come to pass that whoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered. Now Pat is that salvation? I think you will admit. Now let's go on down and let's look at the passage. Shall be, notice, delivered, for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance. Who is denying that? As the Lord hath said, and in or among the remnant whom the Lord shall call. Now is he saying there is going to be deliverance, and there is going to be deliverance? Friends, I would suggest that we need to understand that certainly this idea of deliverance is there. But I want to ask a question for your consideration tonight. Is the miraculous found in Joel's prophecy chapter 2 that Peter quotes? Is it there? Now is it or is it not? Peter says this is that. Now was it Joel's prophecy? Was the sons and your daughters prophesied? Was that according to Joel's prophecy or not? I will pour out from my Spirit said the apostle Peter. He didn't say he would pour out the Spirit. I will pour out from my Spirit. And it is that which flowed from the Spirit, the power that was manifested. Friends, if you will read Acts 2:31 and verses following, the apostle Peter said, these things which you see and hear. Were they seeing the Holy Spirit? No they were seeing the manifestation that came from the Spirit. They were seeing the results of this Spirit coming, and they were hearing these things. These men were speaking in tongues that they had never studied. And so the question is, is the miraculous in Joel 2? Did Joel prophecy of miraculous manifestations that were evidenced specifically in Acts 2? Now either he did or he didn't. Either Peter told the truth or Peter told a lie. And so I think we can see beyond a shadow of a doubt. Well notice if you would, concerning this idea, another thought that I want to present concerning the Gentiles, concerning Pat's saying that I do not believe. I want you to turn to Acts 15. Here's Peter with others, at this so called Jerusalem conference – they are trying to discuss this and find out, do the Gentile converts to Christ have to be baptized and keep the law of Moses. Now if you would, let's notice in verse #6, the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, ***Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the – who? – Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.*** I want to ask a question folks. Pat is pressing this idea – the afar off – that refers to the Gentiles, that refers to the Gentiles – and I admit it – and I want to ask Pat, did Peter himself go to every single Gentile that ever obeyed the gospel? Why we know that he didn't. And so Peter is saying here, I went to Cornelius, he was a Gentile, he stood as a representative of that. And so the idea, I think, is very clear – the afar off ones are the Gentiles. Now last night, Pat in his last speech said there is a horn of dilemma that Tom is on. And he cannot see the correlation between Acts 5:32 and Acts 10, the events at the house of Cornelius. Now watch his particular reasoning friends. He is saying that the one to get the gift of the Holy Ghost, Acts 2:38, he must repent and be baptized. Well friends, I do not doubt that no person received the laying on of apostolic hands, now Pat I didn't say didn't receive the miraculous, I said the laying on of apostolic hands, by which except for one occasion at the house of Cornelius, was always as far as we are able to tell the method by which the miracles were given. And so as we look at this, notice if you would please, that the apostle Peter went to the Gentiles, and there was a miracle that transpired at the house of Cornelius. Now Pat says I've got a dilemma. Well, what is the dilemma? He said Acts 5:32 refers to all Christians generally – we are witnesses of these things and so is also the Holy Ghost whom God hath given to the obeying ones – and he says that's everybody obeying. I have explained that friends, time after time after time. Now he's got the audacity to stand up here and say, Tom in the third clause of verse 32, there is not a mention of the miraculous. Well, if you will read Acts 4:31 and following, you will find that with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection. The miracles are not mentioned there. Does that mean they were just shouting loud or making a lot of noise? Is that what that passage means? No, the miracle as a word is not mentioned. But he says Tom you've got a dilemma there, because you see it was the obeying ones. And Cornelius received the baptism of the Holy Spirit before he became a Christian. Now watch it folks. Watch what he's doing. He is not tying the two together based upon my definition of the obeying ones, but upon his definition. There is no problem between Acts 5:32 and the house of Cornelius if you understand that the apostle Peter was saying, the Holy Spirit as he is working through us and others is confirming the truth. We are bearing witness as it were together. And at the house of Cornelius it was a special event, very special. I want to ask a question. Friends, the Jews and the mindset they had, do you ever think that they would have gone to the Gentiles except for a miracle? Peter saw a vision, Peter, kill and eat, no I'm not going to, I've never eaten anything common or unclean, what God hath called clean, call thou not unclean. You can find that in Acts 10. And finally then we find that he went under the guidance of the Spirit unto the house of Cornelius. And we find that as he was preaching there the Bible says, as he began to speak, in Acts 11, as he explains that, the Spirit came upon the Gentiles, upon the house of Cornelius. Now friends, the only thing that I have ever said is

that the phrase gift of the Holy Spirit is found twice and both is in a miraculous context. I have never said that the same thing of Acts 2 is that which is exemplified in Acts 10. I said it was the miraculous. I've never said it was exactly the same thing. I don't believe that. But the events at the house of Cornelius was very special. And that was to show that the Gentiles would be accepted. And so friends, I would ask you to consider. Let's turn very hurriedly, if you would please, to Titus 3, Titus 3. Now we've dealt with that, and I want to look at it again, Titus 3. Read with me please the statement of this man, the recipient of the letter and Paul is saying here in verse 4, ***But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, 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, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*** Now notice here, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost which he shed forth or out from. And that's where I had the problem. Yes Pat you were right. I just misread it, there is no excuse for that. But friends, here is the idea of a reference to the shedding of the Spirit or the pouring forth. And that verb that is presented there as I've already stated has the ---Greek preposition which denotes source or origin or out of. And so I ask you to kindly consider, friends when we are looking at idea of the miraculous of the first century, let's keep it there. Does that mean that every single statement is curtailed by the miraculous? No, but it does mean that we have to consider the statements as they are made, put them in a proper context, don't be guilty of anachronism and taking them out and applying them to today. And that's what bro Pat, and I must say this kindly, is doing, as he looks at this particular thing. Friends, the Spirit of God dwells in us through the word. I have proved that. He admits that. He argues that the Holy Spirit is that which is, the person of the Holy Spirit is that which is poured out. But friends, that cannot be the case, that cannot be the case. Because he does not say there is anything other than the so called seal which is not seen. There is nothing of this that he calls the earnest which is not seen. It is not heard, it is not felt and in no way does it manifest itself. It is just simply based upon the word of God which my friends, the miraculous manifestations confirmed and substantiated in the first century. And so let's place these in their proper context. Let's look at them very closely. Friends, consider. I ask you. I beg of you to consider very carefully that bro Pat is smearing this, he is trying to put up here a cloud and not distinguish between the miraculous of the first century and the promises pertaining to the miraculous, and putting them in the twenty-first century. Well, then, there are other things. In Gal 4:4-6 notice here he says again, ***But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons,*** well notice here, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son. Now he says that's the Holy Spirit. Now he's going to go I think to Rom 8:9, but friends that's not the Holy Spirit, it is the Spirit of his Son. It is the spirit of adoption. Read on in Rom 8:15, we don't have the spirit of bondage again up here, but the spirit of adoption, whereby, look at it, both places, crying Abba, Father. That's not the Holy Spirit that is under contemplation there. It is the Spirit of the Son of Him. It is. . . .thank you.

Pat Donahue: Tom said about afar off. He said why I've always admitted afar off refers to the Gentiles. Tom that misses the point. What I asked you on June 28, question #1, does afar off in Eph 2:13,17 refer to all the Gentiles, just a representative few Gentiles, that's what you think of Acts 2:39, I believe, or other. You checked all the Gentiles. Now the question is not does it refer to the Gentiles, all the Gentiles, he said it refers to all the Gentiles in Eph 2:13,17. Now we have the same Greek word over in Acts 2:39. There's only one difference, you have the same Greek word, which is all the Gentiles according to him, and I agree, in Eph 2. In the case of Act 2:39 it puts the word all in front of there, so it would be all, the all the Gentiles, Okay? But you think it's only a few of them. That's the difference between us two. Now here's another example that I keep bringing up about he Greek. You see we have the Greek over there and it's the same Greek in Eph 2, and you said it's all the Gentiles. Yet over in Acts 2, even though it's the same Greek word that you say is all the Gentiles over here, same Greek word, plus the word all, you don't think it's all the Gentiles do you? So even if you show him the same Greek word phrase over here, he still won't believe it's the same thing. That's what I was saying Ron. Alright? That's the question. Now here's what really, the whole point of this is, is not to get into an argument about, what is the value in finding the same Greek expression. Okay? Here's what it is. What is Acts 2:39 talking about when it says, to all those that are afar off? Well what does afar refer to in Eph 2:13,17? All the Gentiles. So what would all that are afar off refer to in Acts 2:39? Just what you thought it meant when you read the English. Here's basically how this discussion goes. We read the English, the KJV, we believe it. He says, no it's wrong. The Greek says this. We take Bob and Mr. Hutto, who knows a whole lot more about the Greek than he does, and they, we show them beyond a shadow of a doubt that he's made a mistake on the Greek, just like we did with Marion.

Marion made lots of mistakes, some of which he admitted to. We show them along with the Greek and we prove that the English of the KJV and the other standard translations are right. So you can have confidence in the KJV. It means exactly what it says in Acts 2:39 and 2:38. He may say the Greek is different but we've proven him wrong. It means exactly what it means in Eph 2, that Greek phrase. So it means exactly the way you read in English. It proves my proposition. And then he asks the question. Now these are the kinds of things I don't understand, why he would ask this question, Ron. He said is the miraculous in Joel 2? Well, that doesn't have anything to do with the point. Is the miraculous in Joel 2? He's brought that up before. Yes, the miraculous is in Joel 2:28 and that's quoted in Acts 2:17. The question is, where is the miraculous in Joel 2:32? That's the question. Why is that the question? Because the passage under consideration here is Acts 2:39, and it quotes Joel 2:32, not Joel 2:28. Joel 2:28 is quoted in Acts 2:17. We both agree that's the miraculous. Just like he keeps bringing up Joel 1:3, like it has anything to do with this discussion. No it's not quoted, it's not any kind of background passage for this. ☺ ☺ Not at all. Acts 2:39 quotes Joel 2:32. Where's the miraculous? Acts 2:39 says even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Now the call is to what? Doesn't have anything to do with Joel 2:28. The call is in verse 32 of Joel 2. The call to deliverance or salvation which he's admitted. That's the call to salvation. Tom is the call to salvation to everybody? Or just to a select few that received the miraculous? The call to deliverance is everybody. We all know that. The English is right. The Hebrew's not any different than the English. The Greek's not any different than English in Acts 2:39. That's everybody. As many as the Lord our God shall call to salvation. Joel 2:32, deliverance. That's who is promised remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost if they'll repent and be baptized. Acts 2:39 makes it clear that that is what it's talking about because it quotes Joel 2:32. And then he got up here and said on the fourth night of this discussion that he never said Acts 2:38, the gift is the same in Acts 10:45 gift. But notice question #1 I asked him on June 25. Question #1 on June 25, do you agree with the following quote from Marion Fox in his debate with Mac Deaver on page 229? Here's the quote from Marion. We would argue then that the expression, gift of the Holy Spirit, in Acts 10:45 has the same meaning in Acts 2:38. That's the quote. I asked, do you agree with that? You said yes. Now he's saying tonight, that he never said it meant the same thing. And he gave some argumentation to try to prove that it was different. Well first of all, I'd like to say, Tom, that down again goes your consistency of language argument. Because you've already said over and over again that the reason they're the same, you've said this more than once, it's because gift of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38 and gift of the Holy Spirit are the same in the Greek in Acts 10:45. Now he says they're not the same. And so your consistency of language where two things are the same in Greek, they have to mean the same thing. Now you're saying these two things which are the same in the English and the Greek are not the same. And you know that's the reason my position for this whole debate, that's what I've been trying to prove that they're not the same. You know I experienced probably at least two thirds or three fourths of every speech trying to prove that they're different and now he's admitted it. They are different. And since they're different, Acts 10:45 refers to the miraculous measure. 2:38, now he admits is different, therefore it can't be the miraculous measure. That's what I've been trying to prove the whole debate. Put up #60. You know this consistency of language thing has messed ya'll up in a good many things. We can show a verse like what Marion says on Blue 135 (?), says it's the same Greek word translated Comforter Jn 14:16, and Advocate 1 Jn 2:1. —these two words must be the same. I guess he's talking about the Pentecostals. They must think they're the same because -----word. He says this is used in the sense to prove that the two different persons in the Godhead can occupy the same office or work. The work of the Comforter of Jn 14:16 is miraculous and the work of the advocate is non-miraculous. He's saying their argument is incorrect. The same Greek word. People use that to prove that they're the same work or office and he's saying that's incorrect. And when I debated Marion he agreed with that quote. Of course he did. He wrote it down. So now Tom's admitting that the gift of Acts 2:38 is different than 10:45. So Acts 2:38 then you can mark it down in your notebook it is not equal to the miraculous gift of 10:45. And that's what you said. And then he brought up Gal 4:6, that I've been using to prove my position. And he said that's parallel to Rom 8:15. You know Gal 4:6 says he sends the Spirit of his Son into your hearts because you are sons, crying Abba Father. Look at the similarity of that to Rom 8:15. I agree that it looks like in at least a lot of respects they're talking about the same thing. Says ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. He says now this is not talking about the Holy Spirit. Now it doesn't prove anything, but first note that the KJ translators evidently thought it was the Holy Spirit and they capitalized Spirit. Now that doesn't prove anything but I want you to note that first. Now we are going to prove it refers to the Holy Spirit. Look in verse 14, **For as many as are led by the Spirit of God**, is that, what's that? That's the Spirit of God, **they are the sons of God**. Then he says in verse 16, **The Spirit itself beareth witness with our**

spirit, that we are the children of God. So by the context we've proved that the Spirit of Gal 4:6 is the Holy Spirit. And then I guess I'm going to chart #71. We're going to talk about Eph 1 again because if I don't bring some of this up now I won't be able to bring it up in my last speech. Let me give you the history of Eph 1. First we showed on the first night that the Bible, the fifth verse proves our proposition in the Bible. When you read the KJV, turn to Eph 1 and if you just accept what the KJV and the other standard translations like the AS say, then it would prove our proposition. So his recourse was, knowing that you know if you read it like it is, it would prove our proposition, he went to try, brought up the Greek on it, and tried to say well if you look at the Greek, it doesn't mean that, see. Of course he made a mistake in the Greek, and we tried to show that. We showed other translations of this verse. And we showed other verses that talk about the earnest, and we'll talk about that in a minute, that proves that the KJV was right on this. And then we had, he kept insisting so we handed him some tangible documentation, too technical to put it in a speech, to show he was wrong in the Greek. He came back didn't say anything about that technical documentation, didn't reply to it, all he did he ignored everything that we have said, and just said these folks don't have confidence in the Bible. You know we don't have confidence in the Bible because we accept what the KJV says, what the AS says, what all the Greek experts say about this, and we haven't found a single one, a Greek expert, that thinks that which goes back to word truth. Not one. We accept what all the English translations say, we accept what all the Greek scholars say about the Greek, but we don't accept what Marion Fox says, because when he makes a mistake in the Greek. And because of that, because we don't accept Marion Fox's mistake in the Greek, we don't have confidence in the Bible. Now brethren, here's the problem, let's go on to Eph 1:14 where you see the word which, very first word in verse 14. Some manuscripts have hos (?) some have has(?). Ho (?) is the neuter, ha (?) is the masculine. That's the problem. So the problem we have is the manuscript agree on what that word should be (?). But we've pointed out that no matter which one it is, hos or ho, it does not refer back to the word at the beginning of verse 13. Okay. If it's neuter, ho, it refers to the Holy Spirit, saying the Holy Spirit is the earnest. If it is hos, which is the masculine, then by attraction it would, hos because it was attracted to earnest which comes up three words later in verse 14. Okay. Now we have an example of that. Everybody hold your hand here and turn to Gal 3:16. Here's another example of this exact same thing, Ron. In Gal 3:16, it says, ***Now to Abraham and his seed where the promise is made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ.*** Now this which here is that same exact pronoun we find Eph 1:14. And by the way it is masculine, it's exactly the same in all respects. I think Bob told me that. Now what is the antecedent for the pronoun? What is the antecedent of which there? Well you learned in English grammar that antecedent that means prior to. When you use a pronoun its antecedent refers back to the noun that it refers to, not forward Tom. Doesn't refer to forward. You name the person first like Bob Hutto knows a little about Greek. He has red hair. He refers back to Bob Hutto. It doesn't go forward, it goes backward. Antecedent, backwards. You name the person first because if you name the pronoun first, they wouldn't have any idea what you are talking about. The antecedent of which here is seed. Everybody can see that. But you know seed is neuter just like Holy Spirit of Eph 1:14. Which is masculine. Okay. It's this little word ho, in all the texts I believe in this case. Now what happened here? Doesn't the pronoun have to match its antecedent in gender? Yes, that is the general rule but there's an exception that we gave them, technical documentation we handed over to them, where a pronoun can be attracted in gender to something in front of it. In this case you see how it says which is Christ? Evidently when Paul was writing that, he was trying to say the pronoun which is Christ and so instead of making which the same gender as seed, its antecedent, he decided to make which the same gender as Christ. He decided to do that. Now that doesn't follow the general rule of grammar. But it is something that happens in grammar. Which is the same pronoun, ho, its antecedent is seed, but which is masculine, seed is neuter, the reason which was made masculine was because it was attracted to Christ. It is perfectly parallel to Eph 1:13,14. Now when he needed Eph 1:13,14 he went and took which, which is the first word in verse 14 and since it was masculine he went all the way back and found the first noun that was masculine and it turned out to be word toward the beginning of verse 13. Now if you do that in Gal 3:16, if you are going backward, which the next noun is that is masculine, its Abraham. Now in Eph 1, see what he did was, he said well which has to go back to word, word which is the earnest. And so he made word the earnest. If you do that over in Gal 3:16 if you take which and go all the way back to Abraham, you'd have Abraham which is Christ. If you have which going back and its antecedent is Abraham. See that? Do the same thing that you did in Eph 1 and its exactly parallel, if you do the same thing, you would get Abraham which is Christ. That's not what it's saying. It's saying seed which is Christ. Now what we've done is we implored you at the very beginning, please just accept the English because the English is a good translation of the Greek in Eph 1. But because he knew it

would prove my proposition, he came up with this Greek argument. Of course Marion made the same argument. It's an incorrect Greek argument. He should have just believed the English to begin with. The KJV was exactly right. We now, we had to waste time doing this, but we now had to show you on two different nights that his Greek argument is incorrect, that the English is right all along. You can trust your KJV translation. The Greek and the English both prove here that the Spirit is the earnest. And so that disproves his proposition. Put up #2. Oh before you put that up, would you put up #10. You know what we should have done, what we should have done, is just look at some passages like 2 Cor 1:22. You know instead of going to the Greek Tom, instead of doing that and messing that up, what you should have done is, if you weren't sure about what was going on in Eph 1 and you weren't sure in teaching that the Spirit was the earnest, instead of going and messing with the Greek, what you should have done is found some other passages, which clearly tell us the Spirit is the earnest. 2 Cor 1:22 ***Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.*** What is the earnest? Spirit. 2 Cor 5:5 ***Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit.*** And so these verse confirm that the KJV and the Greek of Eph 1 are correct. That your rules and things about it do not prove that they are wrong. And then put up #2, Luke 11:13b. Tom admitted in question #4 on June 26 that Luke 11:9 applies today. Everybody turn to the context. Luke 11:9. Remember that if I can show the universality of this passage, then it can't be the miraculous. Because he's admitted in a question that we referred to in my first speech, that the miraculous was not universal to all the Christians even then and not now. He admitted that verse 9 was universal. Well verses 10-13 is simply an elaboration upon verse 9 which says Ask, and ye shall find and verses 10-13 just talk about things you can ask for. What about asking your human father. Well the human father knows how to give you what you ask for. Certainly the heavenly Father would know how to give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him for that. And so it's non-miraculous, it's universal, that's everybody. Now Luke 11:13b, now get this, I haven't made this point before, that cannot be asking or praying for the miraculous. It cannot be. It would be impossible. You want me to tell you why? Because that would mean that you would have to, he said ask here refers to prayer, okay, and so your heavenly Father will give when you ask in prayer the Holy Spirit if you ask him, the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. But let me ask you Tom, did Cornelius, did Cornelius ask in prayer for the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit, did he? No he didn't. He did not. I'm very confident that you will agree with that. This, if you interpret it the way Tom says it, you only get the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit if you ask God in prayer. That's an absolute condition. He says God gives the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. That is why if you don't ask for it in prayer, that's what he thinks, that you won't receive it. Cornelius didn't ask for it. I believe Cornelius was as surprised as all get out that he got it and so were the apostles. They didn't ask for it. ☺ God gave it to them. So it would be impossible for this to be referring to the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit. And then I asked him question #3 tonight. I asked him, and this is about Acts 8 and Acts 19 where they received the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit through the laying on of the hands. I asked him in light of Acts 19:1-6 and Acts 18:14-18 did an individual Christian during that time always have to ask in prayer in order to receive the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. And I'm making a similar point from this as I did with Cornelius. He says we have no record of the exercise of the miraculous being exercised always preceded by prayer – no record of that. In other words if you look at Acts 19:1-6, you don't see any record of them asking in prayer for the Holy Spirit? I don't think he will say that they did it and it wasn't recorded. I don't think he'll say that. That they did ask for it in prayer but it's not recorded. Therefore your interpretation of Luke 11:13b cannot be true because you are saying to receive that they have to ask in prayer. But in Acts 8 and 19 they didn't ask in prayer for the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. They didn't. The apostles laid hands on them and they received it. They didn't ask in prayer. And then put up #6. Rom 5:5 is universal. Raise it up. In Rom 5:5 ***And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.*** Not something from the Holy Ghost but the Holy Ghost is given us. Now from the context, who is the us? Mark raise it up. Those who are justified by faith, those who have peace with God through Christ, those who have access by faith into grace, those who rejoice in hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, have the love of God in their hearts, having been justified by his blood, will be saved through him, reconciled to God by his death, shall be saved by his life. He says this is the miraculous in Rom 5:5. I say it's not. How do you determine? You would have to determine from the context or some other passage wouldn't you? He just gets up here and he asserts it's an anachronism. He doesn't prove anything. He just says that's the miraculous, it doesn't apply today. Doesn't he have to prove that's the miraculous. Wouldn't you think so? Or can he just say, anachronism and that proves it? I think he should be obligated to prove it. I think the way you tell if this is the miraculous measure or not is you look at the context. And we just did. You ask,

ask it to yourself, is that all Christians? Or just a select few that received the miraculous? You know Tom said in question #4 on June 28 that the context of Rom 5:1-5 was dispensational in nature. That's what you said. I hope you didn't misread the question. The context of Rom 5:1-5 and that's what that is was dispensational in nature. Can you believe *that*? ☺ Let's put up #52. I already know what he's going to say on the time over there but 1 Jn 3:24, everybody read that, 1 Jn 3:24 ***And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.*** There it is again, he gave us the Spirit. If you examine the context of this and perhaps we will have time to do that in my next speech, you will see that the us there is all Christians, not just a select few.

Tape 6, Side B:

Mr. Tom Bright: Well, it's good to stand before you for the last time in this particular debate as we wind this particular discussion down. I appreciate everything and everybody that has been in any way involved in this. Ron I want to see his chart #71. Notice in that, if you would, friends, now the argument that he is making is in response to my basic argument in Eph 1:13,14. And keep in mind that what he is saying and what the idea of attraction, and it is a, well I've got to admit it is a technical argument. But here's the point friends, that we want you to ask you to consider. What is the rule when this is applied? That's something that I personally have never read. Now if it's out there I haven't really read it. And it's interesting as we look at that that if you'll notice here he presents the idea of Nestle's (?) 22th (?) Edition. Notice that he has that it used ho, but it's interesting that in the 21st they had hos. And then they changed it in the 22nd. So why the change? Well they're looking at the evidence supposedly. But friends, the idea is that certainly we look at the manuscripts and we need to understand that, yes there are variations of readings. And I do not want to get very technical in this, I do not want to bore you. And so we look at this and try to determine but I think that it is interesting here that as we notice the basic idea that the Stevens text used hos over here, and certainly the majority texts did but friends, what about these texts that are here? What about the Reced (?) text? What about Weston Hort(?) text? Now I'm not going into a long discussion this evening of trying to show the things that are wrong with Weston Hort (?) and their very theory that they had, that Bible way (?) has pretty well been overturned. And so let's go to what he's saying here. Let's go to Eph 1 if you would please. Eph 1:13,14 ***In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, Which is the earnest of our inheritance.*** Well let's look at that, friends. What is the antecedent of the pronoun which? As it is presented here, it has to refer back to word. Now that doesn't agree with what some are teaching and so they have this attraction. I want to remind you that there is no rule that tells us when this exception is there. When we are to recognize it. There is no rule. And that's the interesting thing my friend, when is it and how are we to know? That is what nobody has been able to tell me. And so here, he is saying which is the earnest of our inheritance. Now last evening, this chart that bro Pat presented it was the idea that it might refer back to that seal. But notice if you would, the seal of the Spirit refers to the stamp of authority. Indeed the seal referred to the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. It is not the seal which is the Holy Spirit but it is the Holy Spirit's seal. And it was the confirming miracles. And they confirmed the word that the apostles and other inspired individuals preached. And thus the word became that guarantee. You remember, do you not, in Titus 1:1 and following, the apostle Paul referred to the idea of the hope of eternal life which God that cannot lie promised before the world began. I only know what God has promised because of the word. I only have confidence in the word because of the evidence that was given. And so as we look at this friends, I would suggest for your consideration, that indeed, this particular passage is looking at the guarantee, the signing, the sealing and as it were the delivering. You take a document to a court house or to some person's place of business and you get a stamp of authority. You get the notary public to stamp that thing. That's what the sealing was and then we find that the ultimate result of this was the confirmed word. Yes I understand there are variations in this and bro Pat asked the question last night, well if that's the case Tom, he says about fifty percent of the manuscripts look one way and one the other and why are you making an argument upon fifty percent? Well why Pat are you refusing that? I admit there is a variation there. But certainly my friend, if it even referred to the Holy Spirit that would not do away with my position at all. Because it would still be the Spirit in the work of sealing. It would still be the Holy Spirit as he moved according to Acts 5:32 in bearing witness through the miraculous. And but bro Pat says that it has to be, it has to be the Holy Spirit himself. And so if indeed that which I have chosen, which I am convinced is the correct reading, which refers back to word, even we were

to give him that. That would not prove that it is the person of the Holy Spirit that is under consideration. Because friends, it is the sealing that is under consideration and it is the earnest of our inheritance. And so I would ask that each of us consider this very very closely. Do you have his #6 there? I don't think I told you. That's okay we don't need it that's fine. It's interesting that bro Pat referred to the idea, I want you to turn to Rom 5 very hurriedly please. Rom 5:1-5. And notice if you would the particular idea and consider that idea that is presented there. It is that we are justified by faith and he presents the idea that we have access by this grace, so on and so forth. Verse #5 the love of God which is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Well I want to ask you to consider this particular thought. I'm reading questions for bro Pat on the 28th, last night. #5 we asked him, according to your view of Rom 5:5, notice his argument is, it is a Spirit which sheds abroad in our hearts the love, the question is according Pat to your view of Rom 5:5, how is the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost in the 21st century? Now his view demands that the Holy Spirit sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts in the 21st century. Now here is his answer. God expresses his love for us by giving us the Holy Spirit. Now friends, that is no answer. I asked him how does the Spirit of God or how is the love of God shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost? And he said it is when God gives you the Holy Ghost. It is not sensory, you don't feel it, you don't see it, and in your life there is no visible manifestation that you have. It's just the idea friends, that because God expresses his love for us by giving us the Holy Ghost. Now that's how the Holy Ghost sheds abroad in our hearts the love of God. Friends, the Holy Ghost sheds abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ through inspired men in the first century. And those inspired men who confirmed this message by the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Here we understand that the Holy Spirit, beyond a shadow of a reason of any doubt whatsoever, it is the preaching of inspired men by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, ultimately the confirmation of this. And it can be said in that sense that the Spirit of God still sheds, it still tells us about the love of God in our hearts. But friends, it is not the Holy Spirit himself, but it is the Spirit of God through the inspired word as he works today. I want to see my chart #60, if you would please. Interestingly enough, I asked bro Pat, and this is not on here, but I asked bro Pat tonight, I took the passage or the same question that he asked me, was this dispensational, and I was referring to Luke 11:1-13. Now you remember, do you not, that we pointed out here he says the Father gives them the Holy Ghost, or give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Well we have presented some arguments that indeed it is asking. Now he left you with the impression that I am referring to prayer alone. I said it is translated prayer, it also means the basic idea of summoning or asking or entreating, and I have made that statement more than once in this particular argument. So I want to see the next chart if you would please bro Ron. We presented this idea here, and he said yes all of this was dispensational except this phrase here. And I agree with him. He understood the dilemma if he would take the responsibility of saying that, indeed all of it. Well my friends if I were to follow in his path I would have to say well bro Pat you don't believe all of that. You are saying that all of that is dispensational. Now friends, I understand bro Pat understands. Indeed Rom 5:1-5 is dispensational when it refers to the Holy Spirit in his revelatory and confirmatory office. But that doesn't mean that every thing else in Rom 5:1-5 just as this. Bro Pat would not pray for that, I know that he wouldn't. Now if we were to remove that particular phrase, I think we would both agree that that applies certainly to the twenty-first century Christian, but it is this and it is also this idea of giving the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Yes some prayed. You remember, turn back to chart #61, please, bro Ron. We show beyond a shadow of a doubt how this was done. It is the idea that in Acts 8:15 their request is an example of Luke 11:13. You are to ask for the Holy Spirit. I maintain that that is the miraculous gift that is under consideration. And the Holy Spirit by metonymy is put for that miraculous. Now we understand in Acts 8:15 when the people in the city of Samaria had obeyed the gospel than then the apostles came and laid their hands upon them. They prayed and the Holy Spirit in his miraculous power was bestowed upon them. And so this idea, must everyone who had the spiritual gifts pray every time? Friends, I don't know exactly how the individuals who enjoyed miraculous manifestations, I don't exactly know how in day to day to day life these particular things functioned. I do know that in one occasion the apostle Paul wrote and he says, Timothy I have left in Meleta sick, I do know that. And I have often asked the question, 'Paul why didn't you heal Timothy'? I assume, I cannot prove it, it's simply because it would not have fulfilled the office of confirmation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. And so, friends, as we look at this, if you ask, now bro Pat is saying the Holy Spirit himself is given to the twenty-first century Christian as abiding person of deity in the play (?). Well, I want to notice something else and we have made this argument. Notice here, ***and this is the confidence we have in him that if we ask,*** (there's the word,) ***anything according to his will, he heareth us,*** 1 Jn 3:24. Well, if ask here, means obedience, and that's the argument that he is making, then it also means the same thing in 1 Jn 5:14. And that would make that

passage read, this is the confidence that if we obey anything according to him, he heareth us. And so the idea here of asking and receiving the Holy Spirit is summoning and requesting. 1 Jn says if we ask according to his will. In the first century they could ask for the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit. Would it be right for a man today to ask for that? I think you understand the basic thought that we are presenting here. Let's see Jn 14:16. The Comforter and the advocate. Well friends, what the Greek word simply means is that famous word you've heard from the Pentecostal world, the *peraclete*. Well the idea is presented now I haven't had time to read exactly here, but it is the same word, but the question really remains, does it refer to exactly the same results? The Comforter here is the Holy Spirit coming upon the apostles, and that's what happened in Acts 2. And the Spirit was that as it were who stood beside and helped them. Well, we refer here to 1 Jn 2:1 we find here that Christ is our Advocate. Does he advocate in the same way? Why absolutely not. Sure it's the same word but it doesn't mean the same office in respect to the same power and the same ability. One referred to the miraculous on the apostles in Acts 2. But as we look at 1 Jn 2:1 that certainly that is the Advocate. Well friends if he takes issue with the idea that 1 Jn 2:1 is non-miraculous, if he takes issue with that and says, we have the advocate today, then the alternative is he is claiming the miraculous. One is non-miraculous. Yes he's an advocate but how does Christ function as an advocate? That's the question? How did the Holy Spirit function? Well that takes us to Acts 5:32. That's the very thing that Peter spoke by inspiration and he claimed that indeed it was the Spirit as well as these individuals who were bearing witness. Okay let's look at Chart #60. Now friends he's presenting the idea here and I have to go over this and I have to go over this, I don't know why, why he is not picking up on this. Friends I maintain that the events at the house of Cornelius, and he is saying that Cornelius didn't ask for it, it just happened and said they were probably surprised. Well I know some of the men there, six men who came with the apostle Peter, I know that they were amazed. Well let's notice this idea then. Asking – he said Cornelius didn't ask for it. Friends, that was a special, special thing. And it was to convince not Corneliu, not the Gentiles, but to convince the Jews that God was going to accept the Gentiles. That is a one time thing. Yes, it was the gift of the Holy Spirit. That's what inspiration says. Did they have the same power and authority in Acts 10 that they had in Acts 2? I have never maintained that. And if I left that impression, then certainly it was my mistake. But I have never argued that. I am just arguing friends, that the gift of the Holy Spirit, that phrase, is found two times in the Bible and both of them are in the realm of the miraculous. That's the point that I have made. Well, let's look at Gal 4:4-6 is the next one I want to look at and hold your finger at Rom 8. Gal 4:4-6. Notice here, if you would, that the apostle Paul is presenting the idea that Christ came to redeem those that were under the law, and he said, ***because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.*** That's Father, Father. Now the apostle Paul says the same thing is done over in Rom 8:15, Yes he says For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the sons of God. But notice in this thought, if you would please, dear people, that indeed ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, and by that spirit of adoption, ye cry Abba, Father. It is the spirit of sonship that is under consideration. It's not the Holy Spirit dear people. Yes I understand the KJ translator did translate this with a capital S and I have found other occasions that I do not necessarily when they did not capitalize when maybe they should have. And certainly that's their idea. Bro Pat and I disagree with who the Spirit is here. But I want you to understand beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the spirit that is under consideration here, I maintain is not the Holy Spirit, it is not he who cries, but it is the one who has the spirit of sonship. Thank you.

Pat Donahue: Tape 6, side B: We certainly appreciate the men who are doing the charts. Mark is doing a very good job for me. Even after what I said ☺ Tom still went back to Eph 1:14 and said which, the very first word of verse 14 goes all the way back, I didn't count, but 12 or 15 words earlier, and the antecedent is word in verse 13, even though, hold your hand there and compare it with Gal 3:16. We showed that it is exactly the same word which, third from the last word in Gal 3:16, which, I believe it's *hos*, I don't know how to pronounce that for sure, it's masculine. What is the antecedent? Seed which is neuter. Why then did Paul use the masculine? Because of attraction to Christ. Okay that's exactly the same as over in Eph 1:14, which, is masculine. Holy Spirit just before it the last noun before it, is neuter. That's still the antecedent. Why is the which masculine? By attraction to earnest which is two or three words later just like Gal 3:16. Again, when you come up with this consistency of language argument, he won't accept it, if it goes against his position. This is exactly the same. According to your reasoning on Eph 1:14 if you can make the antecedent of which that far back or 15 words earlier then the antecedent of which in Gal 3:16 would be Abraham, which is 12 or 15 words back and is the next word going back which is masculine noun. So according to your reasoning in Eph 1:14, you take his exact reasoning in Eph 1, that would make

Abraham, which is Christ. See he's taking word which is the earnest, you do that over in Gal 3:16 that would be Abraham, which is Christ. Tom why didn't you just get up here and after I did that and admit that you are wrong on that Greek argument? You were clearly wrong. Marion, when he was wrong about an argument, he admitted he was wrong. Why don't we just admit after the evidence just piles up and piles up, we show them something that is exactly the same. Would he take which as going back to Abraham in Gal 3:16? You can bet you bottom do ☺ llar that he wouldn't. Why? It's the same reasoning. Why wouldn't he? Why did he do it in Eph 1:14? It's the same. ☺ Why won't you just read the KJV and accept what it says? There's no problem with it. We've shown he's tried to bring up the Greek to try to refute the KJV. We've shown that he's wrong in the Greek, that the English is right. Which refers to Holy Spirit. That's the antecedent. The Holy Spirit is the earnest. The reason that which is masculine is because of attraction to the earnest. Put up #10. Now after all that I wish we didn't even have to deal with the Greek. Because all we do is, we waste probably about 30 minutes of the whole debate talking about this when we could have just looked at the English of 2 Cor 1:22 and seen for sure that the Spirit was the earnest. ***Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.*** Who has also given us the Spirit as a guarantee. Now I suppose we've talked about the Greek in Eph 1 in about six or eight, four or five of his speeches, perhaps even more, six or eight, but not one time, he's had three speeches a night, four nights, out of his four speeches, not one time has he addressed these two passages, to try to say why they don't prove that the earnest is the Spirit of God, the Holy Spirit. Not one time. Instead he chose to delve into the Greek, which is something that no body here, except probably Bob Hutto knows. Mr. Hutto's not here tonight. He chose to do that instead of just ignoring the plain English which tells us for sure that the Holy Spirit is the earnest. I don't know why. I've brought this up every time we've talked about Eph 1. I've mentioned those passages. And he chose not to bring it up. And then again he mentioned Gal 5:5 and still has a problem with my quote how I understand it. What is that? Rom 5:5 I guess. Wrote the wrong thing down I guess. Everybody look at that. You know what you need to do instead of just trying to find problems with my position. That doesn't prove me wrong. That would be like God telling Abraham, you are going to have a lot of descendants through Isaac. Then he said, now go kill Isaac. Abraham saying, well, I see a problem in that. I don't have to do it. That's what you are doing. You don't believe it because you see a problem with it. What you need to do is even if I can't reconcile the problem, why not just believe what it says and then say there's some things about that I don't understand, but since it says the Holy Ghost which is given to us, I can believe that. Now I may not understand how that the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by that, I can't understand that, and I don't think Pat's explanation for that is very good, well fine, it doesn't matter, don't believe my explanation for that. That's not important. What's important is to believe what the text says. The Holy Ghost which is given unto us. Doesn't matter whether I can explain the other part. But while we're on that subject, what if I were to say this phrase – *the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the death of Christ*. Would anybody have a problem understanding that, what that is saying? That when Christ died, God showed his love toward us. Nobody here would have a problem in understanding that. Then why do you have the same problem understanding when God gives us the Holy Ghost. It says the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us. I don't understand. Then back over to Luke 11:13. He says ask doesn't just mean pray. It means summoning, etc etc, okay that's fine. I don't have any problem with that. Where did Cornelius ask for the Holy Ghost? Okay you said it doesn't just mean pray – then throw that way. I'm not asking now, of course he won't be able to answer it, but he can talk to me later about it. Where did Cornelius ask for it, not pray for it? Where did he ask for, pray or summon for it? He didn't. He didn't ask for it any way. Whether it was prayer or not, he didn't ask for it. Neither did the apostles ask for it. None of them asked for it. ☺ God gave it to him because God decided to give it to him. Not because anybody asked for it. Exactly like you said, God gave it to him to show the Jews that the Gentiles could be saved. Cornelius didn't even know it when he received that. God did it. And where did those who received it ask for it in Acts 8 and Acts 19? You mentioned about the apostles prayed for it in Acts 4 and Acts 8, I didn't that. Remember in Luke 11 it says those who are going to receive it have to ask for it, not somebody else. Where did those who received it in Acts 8 and Acts 19 ask for it? Not the apostles, I'm talking about the ones who received it. Remember after all, he did say the Father will give the Holy Spirit to the people that the apostles ask for the Holy Spirit for. No he didn't say that. He said the heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him, the ones that ask. But you know in Acts 8 and 19 the folks that received the Holy Spirit didn't ask for it. Now why do I bring all this up? Because this proves that Luke 11:13b is not talking about the miraculous measure of the Holy Spirit. Luke 11:13b is talking about the Holy Ghost that you'll receive if you ask for it. Cornelius didn't ask for it. Those who received the miraculous measure in Acts 8 and 19, they didn't ask for it. That's not what this is talking

about. Not what this is talking about. We've been to the context and shown from Luke 11:9 that this is not the miraculous under consideration here. That all the way through it's not the miraculous and so when a person becomes a Christian, he receives the Holy Ghost. How does he ask for it? Now if God has told you – if you want to receive the Holy Spirit, you repent and you be baptized, and he said that in Acts 2:38, repent and be baptized for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. If he's told you that's how to get it – well let's say you are a non-Christian and you pray to God, Please give me the gift of the Holy Spirit – like Luke 11:13 is talking about – What do you think God's response would be? God would say, why are you asking me, I've already told you what to do to get it? Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins, you'll get the gift of the Holy Ghost. So how do you ask for the gift of the Holy Ghost? The Holy Ghost himself, Luke 11:13? Repent and be baptized. That's the argument we've been making with the Baptist all through the years. We say, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved, Acts 2:21. Oh, they say, you pray to receive salvation? No, verse 38 says repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. That's how you call upon God to give you the remission of sins, Acts 2:21. Verse 38 explains that. Hadn't you made that argument before? That when you're talking about Acts 2:21 with a Baptist and he says so you pray and you'll be saved, whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. You say, verse 38 tells you exactly how to call for it. That's all we're saying here. And then he said not everything, Pat, is dispensational in Rom 5:5. You know I would of thought that's what you believed, and you explained it in that speech. But I'm confused because I asked you in question #4 on June 28, is the context of Rom 5:1-5, not 5, 1-5 dispensational to a special group, universal then and now, or other? He checked other, and he wrote dispensational in nature. Now I asked you about Rom 5:1-5 and you said it's dispensational in nature. If I were answering that question and I believe like you, I would have said, well most of it's dispensational but that phrase about receiving the Holy Spirit, I mean most of it's not dispensational but that phrase about receiving the Holy Spirit, that is dispensational. That's the way I would have answered that if I believed like you. Why did you answer that question, is the contents of Rom 5:1-5 dispensational in nature, I don't know? My chart #60. Tom you missed the point of this. I was talking about the consistency of language argument and Marion used that consistency of phrase argument and I brought this up with Marion, to prove in him that this consistency of language thing will not work. I was not disagreeing with Marion here, I was agreeing with what Marion said. Now you missed that. So you think this same word, this Greek word translated Comforter of John 14:15, same Greek word translated Advocate in 1 Jn 2:1. Well the way you and Marion make arguments on other passages, since it's the same Greek word it would have to refer to the same thing. Like you did with your children in Acts 2:39 and Joel 1:3. Those passages don't have anything other, whatsoever to do with each another except for the fact that both of them contain your children. So that's the only thing that I can think that you must be doing is both of them are saying your children. So Acts 2:39 had to mean the same thing as Joel 1:3. Marion is saying here just because these are the same Greek words some people said they refer to the same work or office. He's saying that's not true. He said the same Greek word does not refer to the same thing. That's the point he is making. And so that contradicts the consistency of language thing that ya'll are coming up with all the time. And then he said well ask and then Cornelius, that was a special thing. Cornelius was a special thing. Well Tom if Luke 11:13b is referring to the miraculous, that would be a special thing too. So why would they be different? You know that's my point. It is not the same thing in Luke 11:13b as Acts 10:45, because Cornelius didn't have to ask for what he received. But Luke 11:13b you did have to ask for that Holy Ghost. You did have to ask for it. It's a different thing. So you have to ask for Luke 11:13b, you don't have to ask for Acts 10:45. And then he said Rom 8:15 is not the Holy Spirit. Well, I made some arguments to try to show that it was the Holy Spirit. I don't know why it's that important but I happen to believe it's the Holy Spirit. And I said look at verse 14. We're trying to find out what the spirit of adoption is in verse 15. What does it refer to? Well right there in the context, Spirit of God, verse 14. Then the very next verse, the spirit itself bears witness with our spirit. I don't know why it's so important, but it looks like to me verse 15 is referring to the Holy Spirit, doesn't it to you? Put up #52. So if you turn to 1 Jn 3:24, we want to show that this is universal because when it says that people receive the Holy Ghost and he's already admitted that if it's universal, it can't be referring to the miraculous. Because the miraculous was not universal, not even then and certainly not today. 1 Jn 3:24 **Hereby we know that he abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us.** Raise it up Mark. Let us try to find out from the context who is the us. Verse 14 we know that we have passed from death to the life. Is that only the apostles and the inspired folks? Or is that all Christians? Hereby perceive we the love of God because he laid down his life for us. What about that? My little children. Who's that? Let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth. Is that only the apostles and the inspired or is that all Christians. God answers our prayers. What is the context showing

here, everybody, meaning universal, or just a few. We need to **believe on the name of Jesus Christ**, verse 23, **and love one another**, is that all the apostles and the inspired, **as he gave us commandments**, only the apostles and the inspired? **We know that he abideth in us**. That's every Christian. Now brethren, that's all I can do to show that this is the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit is to show that it's universal. That's my job, that's what I must do in this debate. In 1 Jn 4:13, a passage that's very similar says, **Hereby, know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit**. Who is the us there? Why don't we look at verses 9-11. It says, **In this was manifested the love of God toward us** (that's the same us) **because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we should not perish, but that we might live through him**. Is that all Christians or just a select few? **Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us**, (that's the same us) **and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins** (there's the us). **Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another**. So who is the us? Verse 13, where it says the Holy Ghost, it says, **he hath given us of his Spirit**. Who is that? Just a select few, as Tom would maintain, or everybody. I think it's rather obvious. And then Jn 7:38,39, turn in your Bibles and we'll read that and we've done that many times in this discussion. **He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)** This says that the Holy Ghost will be given to believers. Be given to believers. Put up #61. Let's look at this phrase about the believers. Remember that John 7 said that the Holy Ghost would be given to those who believe. Now look in Jn and see what he meant by that expression. **He that believeth on him is not condemned**. Just the apostles and the inspired or everybody? **He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life. He that believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life. He that believeth on me shall never thirst**. All of those refer to all believers, not just the apostles and the inspired. **He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. He that believeth in me yet shall he live**. It always refers to this. Consistency of language, Tom. Every time you see this phrase in the book of Jn, **he that believeth on me**, it refers to the people who become Christians. Now let's look at Jn 7:38,39. **He that believeth on me**. What's the difference between that and these? **Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water**. That doesn't say anything about inspiration. That's referring to the Holy Spirit. Says **but this spake he of the Spirit**. They said that refers to inspiration. The Bible says it refers to the Spirit. **Which they that believe on him should receive**. Would receive the Spirit. Who is that? **He that believeth on Me**. Who is that? All Christians. Put up #11. Everybody turn to 1 Thes 4:8, it says **He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God, who hath also given unto us his holy Spirit**. Who is promised the Holy Spirit by 1 Thes 4:8? The apostles, that's what it says. No those who are not to despise man, verse 7, that's everybody, all Christians, but instead to show brotherly love, is that just the apostles, for God has not called us, just the apostles, unto uncleanness but unto holiness. That's all Christians. That should be obvious to you. And 1 Cor 6:18,19 says, **Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body**. Obviously our physical body. That's what we commit that sin with. **What? Know ye not that your body** (that's referring to the Corinthian's body) **is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?** Now notice, the Bible says that the Holy Ghost is in you. That's something that Tom does not believe, he doesn't believe the Holy Ghost is in you, but I do. And then Rom 8:26,27 (#7). The one thing that the Holy Spirit does that we know about that the word does not do, it says, **Likewise the Spirit** (that's the Holy Spirit) **also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought** (now that can't be our spirit because this is somebody else helping us because we don't know, that's our spirit, our spirit does not know what to pray for, so another spirit helps us) **but the Spirit** (the Holy Spirit) **itself maketh intercession for us** (that's our spirit) **with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God**. The word of God does not make intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. The Holy Spirit does that. Put up #4. How much time, Bob. So we started this discussion by, with looking at Acts 2:38 and we noticed that the gift of the Holy Spirit could refer to a gift from the Holy Spirit which would fit his position, the miraculous gift, or the gift could be the Holy Spirit himself, which would not fit his position. He doesn't believe that. That fits my position. I believe that we receive the Holy Spirit himself. As a matter of fact, to let ya'll know on this, he does not believe a single person in the history of the world, if I've got this right, ever actually received the Holy Spirit personally, literally, not even Jesus, not the apostles in the baptismal measure, and certainly not people today. But now here's how we show that this is referring to the Holy Spirit as a gift himself, raise it up Mark. We went through all these passages that we've been going through over and over. Luke 11:13 says that God will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Not a gift from the Holy Spirit, not miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, that's not what it says, the Holy Spirit himself. That cannot fit your

position, because you believe it's powers or miraculous gifts from the Holy Spirit. That's not what it says. This fits my position. God says it's the believers that the Holy Spirit which they that believe on him should receive. Not something from the Spirit, not a gift from the Spirit, but the Holy Spirit himself. Acts 5:32 The Holy Ghost whom God hath given to them that obey him. He admitted over 5000 were presently obeying him at that time when Peter said that verse. We've said that to say this. So the Holy Ghost was given to at least 5000, then. And if you compare that to Heb 5:9 I believe anybody can see it's universal today. Heb 5:9 is the same phraseology, consistency of language. Rom 5:5, the Holy Ghost which is given us. 1 Thes 4:8 has also given unto us his Holy Spirit 1 Jn 3:24 the Spirit which he hath given us. And so tonight he was supposed to prove that that we have the representative indwelling only, but I agree with the passages like as Eph 5:18 about the representative indwelling but I don't agree with that only. Because the personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit, Acts 2:38, 5:32, and these, they are a promise to be received. They are not a command to be obeyed, therefore they can't be the representative indwelling and I think, I know that Marion agreed with that and I believe Tom has too. They cannot be the representative indwelling, these passages, because they are a promise to be received, like Holy Spirit baptism. Not a command to be obeyed like Eph 5:18. So we've shown that it's not the representative indwelling, we've shown that it's not the miraculous, because they're universal, we've shown they're not the miraculous because two or three of these you have to obey God in order to receive them. But you don't the miraculous, Acts 10:45. Why not, instead of going to all this work to get around what the scriptures plainly says, why not just accept what they plainly say. God gives the Holy Ghost to them that ask him. God gives the Holy Ghost to those that obey him, Acts 5:32. God gives the Holy Ghost to those that repent and are baptized, Acts 2:38. Why not, why not just believe the passages as they read. Thank you very much for your time.