

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Problems for Pentecostals

PETER PYTCHEs

'QUITE OBVIOUSLY anyone who has not had the pentecostal experience cannot fully understand it, let alone reject it. The theological arguments, for what they are worth, seem just about to cancel each other out.' So wrote Mr. David Winter when Editor of *Crusade* recently under the heading 'The NeoPentecostalist Advance' in an important editorial.¹ The first sentence, no doubt, will be regarded by some as open to question. Much depends on what is meant by the word 'reject'. There are many who, like the present writer, have no wish to deny that some of their NeoPentecostal brethren have had some very real and deep spiritual experience. They would, however, wish to question whether such experiences are rightly called the Baptism with the Spirit and whether all Christians should be encouraged to seek a similar experience. This article, however, is mainly concerned with the second statement. Is it really the case that 'the theological arguments of the NeoPentecostal just about cancel out the theological arguments of the NonPentecostal? Leaving aside the apparent disparagement of theology (which one hopes was unintentional), the assertion should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

The present writer has not made an exhaustive study of NeoPentecostalist literature but he has patiently examined the writings of a number of NeoPentecostal authors. He is glad to acknowledge that he has found much which is spiritually rewarding and challenging. However, without intending any offence, he is bound to say that it is the theological arguments of NeoPentecostals themselves which 'seem just about to cancel each other out'. This article is now taken up with an attempt to substantiate this view by reference to NeoPentecostal interpretations of two key New Testament passages. The method is to draw attention to inconsistencies found in one particular author's writings (those of the Rev. Michael Harper) and basic contradictions between two other writers (Dr. J. A. Schep and the Rev. John Baker). Some attempt will also be made to expose the weaknesses of the arguments employed.

1. *Acts 2: 37-42*

(i) Normative Significance

IN his book *Power For The Body Of Christ* Michael Harper affirms 'The norm, if there is one, is best expressed by Peter on the Day of Pentecost when he said, "Repent and be baptised . . ."'² and similarly in *Walk In The Spirit* he states 'The norm is set for us by the words of Peter at Pentecost.'³

These affirmations are particularly welcome because they appear to point to the apostolic word as being of normative significance. This has been the traditional approach, whereas Pentecostal expositors have hitherto tended to regard the experience of the 120 disciples (Acts 2: 1-4) as the norm of the New Testament. One might have supposed that Acts 2: 38-9 would therefore have provided the norm for Christian experience today but, unfortunately, NeoPentecostal writers do not take this view. Thus Mr. Harper says, 'But surely we must be mistaken if we assume that this must be true for us because it was true for them'⁴ and again 'it still does not follow that we can say that all Christians today have been similarly baptised on the grounds that all had then.'⁵

It is important to notice that the denial of the normative significance of Acts 2: 38-9 for today rests on the grounds of experience, not of exegesis. This is clear from the remark 'Only if our experience is the same as theirs will such statements be true.'⁶ In other words it is evident, after all, that it is not the didactic character and authority of Peter's words in Acts 2: 38-9 which led Mr. Harper to speak of these verses as the New Testament norm.

When we come to inquire about the nature of the experience which is characteristic of the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit we find considerable confusion among NeoPentecostals. This confusion is found in the writings of Michael Harper himself. In one book he speaks of 'very compelling evidence that in the early church speaking in tongues normally accompanied the receiving of the Holy Spirit'⁷ and yet in another he writes 'the only scriptural evidence we have at our disposal is a series of incidents in Acts, and even this slender documentation is not conclusive. Larry Christenson also does not believe that a dogmatic case can be made from the New Testament evidence'.⁸ On this point Dr. Schep makes a pertinent comment. 'In Acts we read that many, who were filled with the Spirit, spoke in tongues, but it is not stated of all of them. And even if it were true of all of them . . . then it would still not imply that it must happen this way throughout history.' 'The baptism with the Spirit has been promised, but the promise does not say what outward phenomena are to evidence this experience.'⁹

In modern times the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit has sometimes been described in terms of great waves of electric emotion

sweeping over a person. Charles Finney had such an experience ('I received a mighty baptism of the Holy Ghost'). Concerning this Dr. R. A. Torrey (whose approach to the Scriptures Mr. Harper welcomes) says 'I would ask, where is there a single line of the New Testament that describes any such experience in connection with the Baptism with the Holy Spirit?'¹⁰ Dr. Torrey himself defines the Baptism in or with the Spirit in terms of power for service and declares 'This power will not manifest itself in precisely the same way in each individual.'¹¹

No doubt in the New Testament, and perhaps today, the baptism with the Holy Spirit is sometimes accompanied by extraordinary manifestations but these are not to be confused with the baptism itself. It is arbitrary to suggest that what is the norm in the New Testament is not normative today, especially when, as we shall see, a promise of God is at stake. The Rev. John Stott makes a relevant comment on this point. 'The denial that Christian conversion today is or includes a baptism with the Spirit depends on an a priori assumption regarding what a baptism with the Spirit is like. All the time people have the events of Pentecost at the back of their minds. They forget that the supernatural signs associated with Pentecost are no more typical of every baptism of the Spirit than those on the Damascus road are of every conversion. The wind and the fire at Pentecost, like the light and the voice on the Damascus road, were the dramatic outward accompaniments; they were no necessary part of the essential inward experience. What biblical warrant is there for supposing that people cannot receive the "gift" or "baptism" of the Spirit in a quiet and unsensational way?'¹²

It has thus become clear that it is gratuitous to make experience the criterion of what is normative regarding the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, it is quite impossible to say with any degree of certainty what the distinctive experiences of the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit are. What is normative must therefore be decided on exegetical grounds. But when NeoPentecostals turn to exegesis we find further discrepancies.

(ii) Inconsistent Exegesis

THE thesis that the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit, although a normal part of Christian experience in the New Testament, is not the norm for today can only be sustained by asserting that the Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit is not an essential part of Christian initiation. If, as the traditional view maintains, Christian initiation includes the Baptism with or in the Holy Spirit then all believers have been thus baptised in or with the Spirit.

This clearly places the NeoPentecostal in something of a dilemma in

an exegesis of Acts 2: 37-42. This is very evident in the writings of Michael Harper and, to some extent, of Dr. J. A. Schep.

On the one hand we have a series of statements by Michael Harper which seem to suggest that he considers Baptism in or with the Spirit to be an integral part of Christian initiation. Hence

'In the early Church the blessing was the normal accompaniment of conversion and not a compulsory second stage of spiritual experience.'¹³

'In the New Testament it was part of normal Christian initiation. . . .'¹⁴

'In the early Church as we have seen the baptism in the Spirit was received normally at or very soon after conversion and water baptism—so the repentance necessary before there could be faith in Christ and baptism in water would have sufficed for this blessing too.'¹⁵

' . . . there are no commands in the Epistles that Christians should seek a baptism in the Spirit—for in those days it was part of normal Christian initiation.'¹⁶

'The receiving or Baptism of the Holy Spirit was thus part of normal Christian initiation right from the beginning.'¹⁷

On the other hand we have a series of statements which suggest that Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit was not an essential part of Christian initiation but a second stage of Christian experience. Hence

'In those early days *Christians were deemed ready* for both baptism in water and the blessing of the Spirit after they had believed'¹⁸ (my italics).

'This blessing is a free gift of God—offered to all His children and able to be received by faith alone. . . . It is promised to every believer and *may be received by faith from the moment of conversion onwards*'¹⁹ (my italics).

'And it must always be allowed that God in His absolute sovereignty, may choose to act in the same way today, bringing about the new birth and at the same time baptising new converts in the Holy Spirit. But normally this seems to take place, *as it did in the New Testament in two stages*, however close in time they may be'²⁰ (my italics).

'They (the Apostles) taught that all who repent and believe are justified by faith, and that *all who are justified by faith may receive the Holy Spirit by faith*. The one should normally lead to the other'²¹ (my italics).

Similarly J. A. Schep remarks,

'We have found that the baptism with the Spirit was promised to those who had already come to believe in Christ.'²²

To one reader at least these two sets of statements would seem to be mutually exclusive. Either Baptism in or with the Holy Spirit was, in the New Testament, 'part of normal Christian initiation' or it was 'a second stage of spiritual experience'. It does not seem possible for it to have been both.

Perhaps the root of these serious discrepancies is to be found in his

argument on page 15 of *Walk in the Spirit* concerning Acts 2: 37-42. This is a key passage in this book but one can only describe it as highly unsatisfactory. The more one reads it the more confusing the argument becomes.

He begins by pointing out that Peter said 'repent and be baptised' rather than 'repent and believe'. He then labours to make the points that 'repentance and faith would have needed to be seen to be real before the early Church would have baptised anyone' and that 'baptism takes time, whereas faith is instantaneous'.

All this might seem to be leading to a conclusion that some passage of time would normally elapse between *faith* (which precedes water baptism) and baptism in the Spirit (which follows water baptism) but instead the conclusion is reached that 'some passage of time normally would elapse between *baptism* and receiving the baptism in the Spirit'.

However, in spite of the obscurities in his argument, it does seem to be clear that Michael Harper is determined to find a strict chronological sequence of repentance-and-faith, water baptism and baptism in the Holy Spirit in this passage, with a time lapse between each event. If it could be demonstrated that the passage required this interpretation then a major point would have to be conceded to the NeoPentecostals. But that no such interpretation is required the following points will make clear.

a. *Grammatical Considerations rule out this interpretation*

IT cannot be stressed too strongly that the verb employed in the passage under consideration is a plain future indicative (καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος). Even a *ἵνα*-clause using the subjunctive would not, of itself, have expressed uncertainty, but any suspicion of uncertainty is positively excluded by the use of the plain future indicative. Whereas one could imagine someone arguing for the presence of a sense of contingency if the subjunctive were used, no such argument can be used in face of the categorical future indicative.²³ In order to produce the kind of sense which Mr. Harper appears to desire to find ('you will then be in a position to receive . . .') in this passage one would have to invent a completely new sentence using some word like *δύνασθαι*.

This much at least is clear. All ideas of doubt or mere possibility have to be imported into the text. They cannot be read out of it.

b. *Consistency within the passage demands a different understanding*

IF it is insisted that 'the gift of the Spirit' (i.e. Baptism in or with the Spirit) must wait upon water baptism then it could equally be insisted

that 'the forgiveness of sins' must wait upon water baptism. The relationship between forgiveness and baptism in this passage is as close as the relationship between the gift of the Spirit and baptism. If the apostolic injunction had been 'Repent for the forgiveness of your sins and be baptised everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' it might have been possible to argue for a time lapse between forgiveness and baptism in or with the Spirit. But the passage states that baptism is for the forgiveness of sins. Few would wish to quarrel with Michael Harper's comment that the Church 'taught that all who repent and believe are justified by faith'. But if it is impossible to establish a strict time sequence, on the basis of this passage, for faith, water-baptism and forgiveness, it is also impossible to establish one for faith, water-baptism and Spirit baptism.

c. Consistency with other New Testament passages rules out this interpretation

TO demonstrate the arbitrariness of an exegesis which finds delay in this passage one merely has to draw attention to two New Testament passages, among many others, where the future indicative is used.

Acts 16: 31. 'Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved . . .' (σωθήση). No serious reader doubts that salvation is the immediate consequence of belief. All notions of delay or mere possibility are excluded.

Mark 16: 16. 'He who believes and is baptised will be saved' (σωθήσεται) is an even more apposite text linking, as it does, faith and baptism in relation to salvation.

It is well known that this verse belongs to the so called 'Longer Ending of Mark' the authenticity of which is disputed by some on textual evidence. We need not enter into that debate. It is enough for us to note that, on any view, the words are undoubtedly primitive.

It would be unwise to build any far reaching theological structure on the basis of this verse. But the verse may be used to illustrate how writers of a relatively early date (at least as early as Irenaeus) related faith and baptism to salvation. C. E. B. Cranfield's comment sufficiently elucidates the meaning. 'The point of v.16 is that the apostolic message brings either life or death to men; according as they respond to it with faith or unbelief they will inherit salvation or be condemned in the final judgment.'²⁴ It is evident that while water-baptism is indeed the seal of faith, it is the faith which saves.

If then it is that which baptism signified and sealed, faith, which is the instrumental cause of salvation in Mark 16: 16 it is reasonable to suppose that it is that which baptism signifies and seals which is the instrumental cause of forgiveness and receiving the Holy Spirit in

Acts 2: 38. The norm is that the same act of faith which brings forgiveness brings the gift of the Holy Spirit also. Dr. Schep rightly asks 'who could ever doubt that God honours His word?'

But if this is the norm of the New Testament it is also the universal norm of all ages. Verse 39 is explicit and emphatic. 'For the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are far off, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to Him.' To borrow Mr. Stott's incisive comment: 'The promise of God is coextensive with the call of God. Whoever receives the divine call inherits the divine promise.'⁵⁵ An exegesis of Acts 2: 37-42 must lead us to say that the repentance and faith which secure justification normally suffice for the baptism in or with the Holy Spirit too.

Professor F. F. Bruce helpfully points out that 'in New Testament times repentance and faith, regeneration and conversion, baptism in water, reception of the Holy Spirit, incorporation into Christ, admission to Church fellowship and first communion were all parts of a single complex of events which took place in a very short time, and not always in a uniform order. Logically they were distinguishable, but in practice they were all bound up with the transition from the old life to the new'.⁵⁶ A failure to recognise this has undoubtedly led many NeoPentecostals into difficulties. Particularly, as we have seen, has the determination of some to find a strict time sequence of repentance and faith, baptism in water, and reception of the Holy Spirit, caused confusion. The link between these different parts of the single complex is not strictly chronological but theological.

2. 1 Corinthians 12: 13

ANOTHER verse which raises acute difficulties for NeoPentecostals is 1 Corinthians 12: 13. The crucial question is whether the verse gives 'a universal didactic norm for all Christian experience down the ages'. The problem is thrown into sharp relief in the following way. If verse 13a refers to all believers of every age and place then, according to NeoPentecostal interpretation, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (with or in one Spirit we were all baptised into one body) must refer to something other than the baptism in or with the Holy Spirit. Or, conversely, if verse 13a does refer to the baptism with or in the Holy Spirit then, according to NeoPentecostal interpretation, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν does not refer to all true believers of every age and place. It is of critical importance to the NeoPentecostal position that these words be understood as not referring both to baptism with or in the Holy Spirit and to all believers of every age and place. The dilemma for NeoPentecostal interpreters is focussed for us by a comparison of Dr. J. A. Schep's exegesis of this verse with that of John Baker's.

Dr. Schep, surely quite correctly, wishes to give full weight to the initiatory significance of verse 13a. 'Baptism is always an initiatory rite.'²⁷ He accepts, therefore, that it must refer to all believers and not merely to those at Corinth or even simply to Christians of the New Testament age. In order to avoid the conclusion that all believers have received the baptism with or in the Holy Spirit Schep is forced to draw a distinction between 'baptism by the Spirit into Christ' (which all believers have received) and 'baptism by Christ with the Spirit' (which only some believers today have received). The former, he maintains, is what is referred to in verse 13a and denotes the Spirit's work in conversion and regeneration. It describes 'how the Corinthians had become members of Christ and of the Church as His spiritual Body'.²⁸ The latter, he holds, is what is referred to in verse 13b ('and all were made to drink of one Spirit' R.S.V.) and denotes the 'Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit'.²⁹ There seems to be some confusion in Dr. Schep's mind as to whether the baptism of verse 13a is to be understood metaphorically of the Spirit's work ('He it is who makes sinners members of the Body of Christ, by granting them repentance and faith, under the seal of water baptism')³⁰ or literally of water baptism ('They believed in Christ and had been incorporated into Christ's Body by water baptism')³¹ but he is emphatic that there is no reference to Pentecostal Spirit-Baptism.

One welcomes Dr. Schep's recognition of the initiatory and incorporative significance of this verse but the distinction between a 'baptism by the Spirit into Christ' and a 'baptism by Christ with the Spirit' is highly artificial and very forced. Even John Baker, among others,³² pronounces this interpretation to be 'linguistically and exegetically completely unwarranted'.³³ Similarly Michael Harper rejects this view.³⁴

John Baker, on the other hand, having quite correctly established that the verse (including 13a) 'is talking about baptism in the Holy Spirit',³⁵ i.e. the Pentecostal baptism, is at pains to attempt to demonstrate that it does *not* describe all Christians of every age and place. He accepts that 'it is a declaration of what had happened to the believers in Corinth'³⁶ but he is concerned to try to show that the verse does not provide a universal didactic norm. The only way to avoid this conclusion, as he well recognises, is to prove that this verse has no reference to Christian initiation. This is of crucial importance to his Neo-Pentecostal position. If the verse does refer to Christian initiation then the 'all' must of necessity refer to all believers down the ages and not merely to all believers in Corinth at that time.

The difficulty for John Baker lies not in the repetition of the word 'all' but in the words εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν. In an argument as tortuous as it is tendentious he assays to prove that these words have no reference to Christian initiation or entry into the Church.

There are two serious flaws in his argument. Each of them is

sufficient to cast doubt upon his conclusion but taken together they must prove fatal for the argument.

(i) He fails to take sufficiently into account the initiatory significance of the verb βαπτίζειν.

It is to the credit, as we have seen, of Dr. Schep that he recognises the initiatory character of this verb. No doubt it was Dr. Schep's awareness of this initiatory significance which caused him to adopt another expedient to evade the difficulty which this verse would otherwise present for his basic position.

The *Arndt-Gingrich Lexicon* lays it down that 'the effect of baptism is to bring all those baptised εἰς ἓν σῶμα' (1 Cor. 12: 13).³⁷ However much some may wish to qualify this statement, the initiatory significance is clear. Cf. also *Grimm-Thayer*, βαπτίζω with εἰς is used to indicate the effect 'to unite together into one body by baptism'.³⁸

The strong presumption is therefore that this verse does refer to Christian initiation.

(ii) He fails to give due weight to Paul's normal usage of the preposition εἰς.

John Baker says 'in our submission the Greek word εἰς here translated "into", cannot be forced to bear this meaning when used with the verb baptizesthai (to be baptised)'.³⁹ We should not be misled by this remark. Arndt-Gingrich declares the meaning of the preposition εἰς with the accusative to be that of 'indicating motion into a thing or its immediate vicinity'⁴⁰ and J. Dunn confidently affirms 'we can always assume that in Paul it (εἰς) has the basic sense of "motion towards or into" some goal'.⁴¹ The question then is not at all whether εἰς can be forced to bear this meaning, but whether it can reasonably be made to bear anything other than this basic sense in this context. C. F. D. Moule refers to 'The typical, standard usage as = into' in his rough classification of six groups.⁴²

Attention must be drawn to two grave defects in John Baker's discussion of this point.

a. His discussion is dominated by a consideration of New Testament usage of the preposition εἰς in general rather than Pauline usage in particular. But for exegetical purposes it is always safer to consider the particular author's usage before turning to other writers.

b. When he does turn to Pauline usage he fails to discuss the important Galatians 3: 26-28 passage. It is true that he mentions the Galatians 3: 27 reference but he makes no attempt to assess its significance.

There are, of course, important differences between the two passages but there are also significant similarities. Both contexts include the verb βαπτίζειν used with the preposition εἰς. In both cases people are said to have been baptised εἰς a person. In Galatians 3: 27 it is explicitly εἰς Χριστόν. In 1 Corinthians 12: 13 it is εἰς ἓν σῶμα but clearly it is σῶμα Χριστοῦ (12: 27).

Both contexts refer to that essential spiritual unity which is in-

separably linked with the believer's relationship to Christ. In both passages there is a clear reference to the rendering void of human distinctions—the particular distinctions between Jews or Greeks, slaves or free, being common to both passages.

From this it is clear that no exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12: 13 which fails to take into account Galatians 3: 27 can be regarded as satisfactory. The Galatians passage certainly includes the idea of incorporation. D. Guthrie comments 'The preposition "into" is significant for it almost seems as if Paul regarded the Christian life as located in Christ'.⁴³ F. F. Bruce is in no doubt at all about the incorporative significance of both passages.⁴⁴

John Baker finds 'good warrant for taking εἰς in this verse (1 Cor. 12: 13) as meaning "for" or "with a view to" or "in relation to", rather than meaning "into"'. He concludes 'The verse, therefore, means that baptism in the one Holy Spirit is for the one body of Christ; it has the one body in view, and it is for those who are already members of Christ to enable them to function effectively, and enrich and benefit the fellowship and life of His body.'⁴⁵ It is true that 'there is some discussion whether εἰς in 1 Corinthians 12: 13 should indicate the goal: "baptised so as to produce one body" rather than incorporated into an already existing body'.⁴⁶ So Kittel *T.D.N.T.*, where 1 Corinthians 12: 13 is listed as one of a group of references where εἰς is 'used finally to denote the aim sought and accomplished by baptism',⁴⁷ but exponents of this view have not seriously doubted that it has initiatory significance.

Two observations are appropriate at this point. First, it should be noted that John Baker is not construing εἰς here in either a strictly final or a strictly consecutive sense. 'It has the one body in view' is very different in meaning from either 'with a view to producing one body' or 'resulting in one body'.

Second, John Baker's gloss on this verse shows that he really requires εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἑβαπτίσθημεν to be taken as an ellipsis. If, for the moment, we allow his indefinite interpretation of εἰς we are still faced with the problem of knowing what words should be supplied in order to translate the resulting elliptical construction. There are a number of different possibilities. It seems preferable to avoid this problem by taking εἰς here as typical, standard usage meaning 'into'. John Baker himself concedes that 'into' 'accords well with the Christian's standing of being ἐν (in) Christ' in Romans 6: 3 and Galatians 3: 27.⁴⁸ J. Dunn, after reviewing all the relevant Pauline references, comments 'Paul is talking about the operation and effect of Spirit baptism, not the place of its performance. In no case can βαπτίζεῖν εἰς bear the sense of "to baptise (as *already*) in". Nor can we take εἰς as "for" here.'⁴⁹

If the Baptism in or with the Spirit really is, as John Baker affirms, 'for those who are already members of Christ to enable them to function

effectively, and enrich and benefit the fellowship and life of His body' then it is almost incredible that Paul should have omitted any reference to it in Romans 12:3ff and Ephesians 4:4-16. This omission is perfectly understandable on the traditional view.

We may readily grant that Christian initiation, or entry into the Church, is not the main topic under discussion in 1 Corinthians 12. But to say, as John Baker does, that it is not to be found in the context at all is quite false. Before proceeding to discuss the diversity of spiritual gifts Paul wishes to stress the unity of the Spirit, the Giver. He enforces this by reminding them that they had all been incorporated into Christ by means of their baptism with the one Spirit.

In conclusion we may say that the difficulties which NeoPentecostal exegesis of the two passages under consideration raises are far more serious than any which the traditional exegesis encounters. The NeoPentecostal position is fraught with inconsistencies and contradictions of the sort we have discussed. It is greatly to be desired that the traditional interpretations of these passages, which avoid the problems mentioned, should be expounded more widely and studied more closely than appears to be the case at present.

- ¹ September 1971 edition.
- ² 1st Ed. 1964 (Fountain Trust) p. 29.
- ³ First published 1968 (Hodder and Stoughton), p. 15.
- ⁴ *Power for the Body of Christ*, p. 44.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 34 cf. also *As At The Beginning*, 1965 (Hodder), p. 99.
- ⁸ *Walk in the Spirit*, pp. 20-1.
- ⁹ *Spirit Baptism and Tongues Speaking*, 1969 (Fountain Trust), p. 98.
- ¹⁰ *The Baptism With The Holy Spirit*, 1903 (Nisbet), pp. 49-50.
- ¹¹ *Op. cit.* p. 15.
- ¹² *The Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit*, 1964 (IVF), p. 24.
- ¹³ *Power for the Body of Christ*, p. 11.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 38.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ¹⁷ *As At The Beginning*, 1965, p. 98.
- ¹⁸ *Power for the Body of Christ*, p. 30.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- ²⁰ *Walk in the Spirit*, pp. 14-5.
- ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- ²² *Spirit Baptism and Tongue Speaking*, p. 28.
- ²³ Professor F. F. Bruce has confirmed this point in a private communication dated February 5th, 1972.
- ²⁴ *St. Mark* (Cambridge Greek Testament), pp. 473-4.
- ²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 10.
- ²⁶ *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, 1961 (Pickering and Inglis), p. 79.
- ²⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 24.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 15ff.
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 53-4.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 17-8.
- ³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ³² See J. Dunn *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (SCM), pp. 127-8 and J. R. W. Stott, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-9.
- ³³ *Baptised In One Spirit*, pp. 7-8.

- ³⁴ *Power for the Body of Christ*, p.45.
- ³⁵ *Baptised In One Spirit*, p. 8.
- ³⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 6.
- ³⁷ Arndt-Gingrich *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Art. βαπτίζω), p. 131.
- ³⁸ Grimm-Thayer *Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament* (Art. βαπτίζω), p. 94.
- ³⁹ *Baptised In One Spirit*, p. 17.
- ⁴⁰ *Greek-English Lexicon* (Art. εἶς), p. 227.
- ⁴¹ *Baptism In The Holy Spirit*, p. 128.
- ⁴² *Idiom Book of New Testament*, pp.67-8.
- ⁴³ *Galatians*, 1969 (New Century Bible), p. 115.
- ⁴⁴ *Acts*, 1956 (New London Commentary), pp. 76-7; *Ephesians*, 1961 (Pickering and Inglis), p. 79; *1 and 2 Corinthians* (New Century Bible), 1971, pp. 120-1.
- ⁴⁵ *Baptised In One Spirit*, p. 20.
- ⁴⁶ Professor Kenneth Grayston in a private communication, February 2nd, 1972.
- ⁴⁷ *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. I, p. 539.
- ⁴⁸ *Baptised In One Spirit*, p. 19.
- ⁴⁹ *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, p. 128.