

Daniel Denham's  
Review of  
Mac Deaver's  
Present-Day  
Holy Spirit Baptism

This is a compilation of material written by brother Daniel Denham for *Defender* in exposing the Deaver Doctrine of present-day Holy Spirit Baptism. We highly recommend this material for all brethren to study.

—Michael Hatcher, Editor, *Defender*

# Mac Deaver and the Doctrine of Present-Day Holy Spirit Baptism

*Daniel Denham*

This is the first of several articles to address the egregious doctrine being advocated by Mac Deaver and his closest associates relative to present-day Holy Spirit baptism. A separate series is also planned for his “direct help” heresy on the work of the Holy Spirit in the Christian as well. The spread of both errors has become the central focus of the Deaver camp and has been aided and abetted by those willing to turn a blind eye to their obvious destructive implications to maintain fellowship with those in that camp. A number of prominent brethren have sympathies siding with those of Mac Deaver on certain aspects of these errors, especially that of the “direct help” doctrine.

Our plan of attack in dealing with the error of present-day Spirit baptism is to begin with a background and overview of the issue relative to the Deaverites. Next, we shall focus in the serial on the portions of Mac’s book *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy – Basis of Unity)* expressly addressing the subject and finally address the central texts used to try to support its underlying suppositions.

## **The Tale of the Time-Line**

It is a truism that the best place to start is almost always with the beginning. Mac would seem to have us believe that he came to his current views on Spirit baptism after long and serious deliberation and study—that he was the one of his inner circle to come to the *truth* of this new position some years after some of his cohorts. In fact, in his book he gives Glenn Jobe and Todd Deaver credit for convincing him of this *truth* (*Holy Spirit* 291-96). Todd has since run on ahead into the camp of the likes of John Mark

Hicks, Rubel Shelly, and Al Maxey to promote ultra-liberalism and the pan-ecumenicalism of the Emerging Church Movement.

A salient point on this issue is that Mac implies in his book that he did not come to accept the view of present-day Spirit baptism until 2006 and for the first time defended the view in a public debate on the necessity of water baptism April 3-6 of that year against a Baptist preacher (296-97). In fact, he expressly states: “And let me say that between 2001 and 2006, I had seen nothing and had heard nothing by way of evidence that falsified the position taken by Glenn” (*Holy Spirit* 296).

### **Dates Can Be Troublesome When Rewriting History**

Historical revisionism has become stock in trade in liberal circles. On the secular level, Marxist *historians* are daily trying to convince folks that what happened really did not happen and that history actually occurred the way they wish it had. Similarly, liberals, especially of the postmodern variety, strive to rewrite Restoration History and even the records of more contemporary events as it suits their perceived needs. It is not surprising that such things should be practiced among such folks, but it is stunningly surprising to find at least a hint of it in the writings of a man whom I have previously held the highest regards for in his work in the Kingdom. Something does not quite meet the eye relative to Mac’s storyline in the 20<sup>th</sup> chapter of his book as to how he came to accept from Glenn Jobe and Todd Deaver the notion of present-day Spirit baptism.

Mac’s story is openly suspect as to its truthfulness in view of other writings and the dates clearly associated with them. As far back as the October-December, 1999 issue of *Biblical Notes Quarterly* (hereafter *BNQ*), Bob Berard, in an article titled “Behold, I Thought the Spirit Indwelt Christians Only through the Word,” implicitly affirmed that very position in a paper edited by none other than Mac Deaver (14-16)! One of the specific texts discussed by Bob was Colossians 2:12-13, a favorite for present-day Spirit baptism advocates going back to John Calvin and even Augustine. Bob asserted:

Summarizing, one remains spiritually dead until he is baptized even though he has willingly submitted to the Spirit's word and was thereby "indwelt" (as some imply) by the Spirit solely by means of the Spirit's word. The Spirit's word and man's submitted will leave man lost in sin until that man is immersed (Acts 22:16). It is in that immersion that God operates in addition to His word according to Colossians 2:12-13. At baptism (not before by the word alone) spiritual life is attained and this is simultaneously with the Spirit's personal entrance into the heart (Rom. 8:9; Col. 2:12-13). Since spiritual life is a working of God occurring at baptism (Col. 2:12-13) and since the indwelling Spirit is identified as the Divine Person giving life (John 4:10-14; 7:37-39; Rom. 8; [sic] 11, 13), the Holy Spirit is the Person of the Godhead who personally imparts spiritual life in the heart of the person being baptized (*BNQ* 1999/16).

Precisely at this juncture, Mac Deaver, the editor gave the following parenthetical notation to Bob's remarks:

(If the reader would require even more precision, it could be said that the Holy Spirit changes the heart during baptism [Titus 3:5] and then moves into the heart to take up His indwelling after the heart is cleansed [Gal. 4:6], Editor) (16).

Bob completed his summary by writing:

This is a personal work of the Spirit done in addition to (but in conjunction with) what He does through His word and this is precisely what is meant by the term "direct" as defined in the introduction of this article.

While Bob did not explicitly call this Holy Spirit baptism, he nonetheless implied that concept in his description of the action, and Mac endorsed and even clarified that description even more vividly with his parenthetical observations. We shall come back to Berard's and Deaver's comments on this text when we examine the passages used to promote this new heresy in another article.

But for now, we wish to concentrate on the unfolding of it historically. Three years later in 2002, Bob Berard revisited the subject before us in a paper that he circulated while he was in Cambodia. The article was titled, “Baptism with the Holy Spirit and Baptism into Christ [sic] Are They the Same or Different?” He contended that water baptism for the remission of sins and Holy Spirit baptism actually are two parts of the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5. He also maintained that Colossians 2:12-13 concerned Spirit baptism as well as water baptism (cf. *Contending For The Faith* {CFTF}, August 2002, 14-16). He claimed that Colossians 2:12-13 harmonized the position that Holy Spirit baptism and water baptism actually were the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 (15).

Are we to believe that Mac had no clue as to where Bob was headed back in 1999 with his assertions on Colossians 2:12-13? To phrase the question another way: Are we to believe that Mac Deaver had no idea whatsoever as to the common treatment of that text by many Calvinists and Arminians, among the many followers of Augustine’s theories? Are we to accept the notion that the editor of *BNQ*, who has made a recent career of chiding brethren over their supposed naivety concerning the work of the Holy Spirit, was absolutely ignorant of the denominational view of that text? The only difference in Bob’s mishandling of the text in the 1999 piece and that of Augustine of Hippo is that the latter would have called that “operation” the baptism of the Holy Spirit! And Bob later did so claim!

In the February 2004 issue of *The Gospel Journal*, edited at that time by Dub McClish, several articles were published under the heading “Examining a Deadly Holy Spirit Doctrine” and dealing especially with the “direct help” heresy of Mac Deaver and company. I addressed and refuted the new teaching by Bob Berard on Spirit baptism. Later in the Spring of that year, Mac Deaver responded to that issue with his own special edition of *BNQ*. In doing so, he tried to offer a pathetic defense of Bob Berard’s material (14-19). For one now professing to have not been convinced

and on board with Bob and others on this matter until 2006, he seemed awfully eager to vindicate it all the same!

### **Even More Problems For Mac's Story**

But this alone does not supply all of the evidence causing us to question the aforementioned story from Mac as to how he came to accept his new error. He makes reference in his book to the 2001 Robertson County Lectureship and Glenn Jobe's lecture thereat defending the present-day Spirit baptism doctrine (*Holy Spirit* 294-295). He even notes that Glenn had been wrestling with this issue for some time before the lecture, though Mac does not state clearly whether or not he knew of this **before** that event. Yet, he does imply that he was opposed to the notion up until 2006!

Mac states that Glenn "was given the assignment of speaking on the baptism of the Holy Spirit" on that occasion. Mac, later in his book, refers to "the intensity of the initial shock of Glenn's presentation" (296).

Interestingly, in a letter to me, Mac would not identify the brother at Robertson County whom he claimed made the assignment implying that neither he himself nor his father, Roy C. Deaver, had any prior knowledge of the nature of it before Glenn delivered his material. He wrote:

Fifth, you will have to ask Glenn Jobe as to who invited him to speak on the baptism of the Spirit at Robertson County. I didn't do it; my father didn't do it. Some member at Robertson County asked him to do it (December 14, 2004, 2).

Mac Deaver, however, was the director of that lectureship and surely ought to have known who had been asked to speak and what had been assigned as to his topic. Thus, on January 12, 2005, I responded to his statement as follows:

Fifth, so you directed a lectureship that involved a man who was assigned to speak in defense of present day Spirit baptism on your watch, while supposedly you were not then in agreement with that position, is that what you are now positing? Are we to assume that you took him to task on that

occasion or shortly thereafter, or that he so overwhelmed you with his logic that you immediately acquiesced to his view? Neither explanation will not [sic] even pass the smell test, Mac. Who was the brother in charge of making the assignments? Please, forward his name and address. I am sure that the good brethren at Robertson County would be able to help put me in touch with him, especially with your cooperation. Was he one of the elders? Was he Roy McConnell? Did you have any input at all in the program before, during, or after as to who spoke, what was said, and what was done about what was said? And what about that 1999 article [the aforementioned Berard article on Colossians 2:12-13, HDD] that preceded all of this? Strange, indeed, if you have but recently come to your current view (2).

Mac responded with a very brief reply on January 15, 2005, claiming that he would not even read the entirety of the letter after reading my “first sentence.” Actually, it was my fourth sentence that bothered him: “Mac, the very nature of Spirit baptism as described in the Bible demands a miraculous connection, [and] even Baptist and Presbyterian theologians and philosophers who are cessationists relative to the signs of 1 Corinthians 12-13 recognize that fact” (January 12, 2005, 1). To this date I have yet to receive a response from Mac answering the questions relative to his proposed timetable.

### **The Final Piece of the Evidence**

Finally, as to the timeline and Mac’s claims of coming to accept the view in 2006, it will be observed that in a letter from Mac to me dated September 28, 2004, he expressed his willingness, though with some weird and stifling limitations, to defend present-day Spirit baptism in a written debate (3). A number of people have copies of this exchange, including the elders of the Sherman Drive congregation (formerly Pearl Street) in Denton, TX and Malcolm Hill, former President of Tennessee Bible College, and can verify this fact. Now, I may be mistaken, but did not September 2004 come before 2006? But, maybe Mac has a calendar that works



backward. Either that or else we have been simply treated in his book with another example of his “Biblical, ethical deceit.”

### Conclusion

The purpose of this first article is to set the background for the review and refutation of Mac’s new hobby on Spirit baptism by showing that credibility is something woefully lacking in his book on the Holy Spirit. It calls into question his many assertions and textual assumptions at the outset. It also shows that the Deaver doctrine is in a perpetual state of flux and ferment, one so convoluted that Mac cannot even get his story straight as to how and when he came to accept his current teachings.

From the time Mac introduced the phrase “supra-literary influence” relative to the work of the Holy Spirit into the milieu, he has been dodging, hedging, adding, subtracting, modifying, and altering his positions on an ever-growing range of subjects, including the areas of sanctification, salvation, and the Trinity. Todd has evolved into a full-fledged postmodern liberal by way of his special leadings doctrine. Mac and company are headed down the same road. Brethren need to wake up to where it ultimately is taking them.



At the close of chapter 19 in his book *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy—Basis of Unity)*, Mac Deaver, while seeking to answer some objections to his view on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Christian, states: “Sinners become saints by virtue of the Spirit’s regenerating spirit (Tit. 3:5), and then moving inside it to indwell there (Gal. 4:6)” (290). He further states, “Christians are not sons of God by miraculous conception. Jesus clearly was” (290). He elaborates a bit on this point then, by writing:

We, however, are sons of God by regeneration (Tit. 3:5) which takes place at baptism (John 3:3, 5; Eph. 5:26). Conversion involves the supernatural, but it is no miracle (290).

In the very next chapter, he equates this act of regeneration by the Holy Spirit to Holy Spirit baptism. He says:

But before man can be given the indwelling of the Spirit, he must be regenerated by the Spirit so that his nature is changed. And this is clearly when a man is baptized in water. As a man's body is lowered in the water, when it is submerged in the water, the Holy Spirit submerges that man's human spirit within himself to change his nature. And at that precise moment when God considers that man no longer a sinner but now saint, at that precise instant, the regenerating submerging Spirit moves from the outside to the inside of that heart (Tit. 3:5; Gal. 4:6). Less than this we cannot write; more than this we do not know (301).

The fact is Mac does not know even **this** to be true. In fact, it is likely that he has written far more than wishes he had to write on this aspect of things, because he has now opened a whole new "can of worms" for his faction to have to consume. Mac admitted in his book that an alien sinner cannot receive the Spirit and, therefore, cannot have the Spirit. In fact, he states expressly:

Alien sinners can be influenced by the Spirit through his word (Acts 7:51; 2:41). But only Christians have the Spirit himself (Gal. 4:6; 1 Thess. 4:1-8; Eph. 1:13-14) (233).

So, the alien sinner cannot receive the Holy Spirit, yet he must receive the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in Spirit baptism to be cleansed and then regenerated.

### **The Problem of Regeneration**

Prior to regeneration (i.e., the New Birth) the alien sinner is not a Christian. He is not a saint, and is, therefore, not saved. He has not entered into the kingdom or the church (John 3:3, 5; Acts 2:38, 41, 47). But Mac has Spirit baptism as being necessary to regenerate the sinner. Thus, Mac implies direct Holy Spirit contact with the un-regenerated human spirit of the alien sinner to save him! That obviously entails Holy Spirit upon human spirit contact! Thus, in some sense the alien sinner does receive the Holy

Spirit directly, according to Mac's new doctrine. This is clearly then a self-contradiction with his statement on page 233. Already he is in grievous error here. But it is going to get worse—much worse.

Now, Mac certainly may quibble that the alien sinner does not have the indwelling of the Spirit, but that does not avail his case. He nonetheless has the Holy Spirit in direct contact with the human spirit of the alien. The John 14:17 text, however, is not limited to the matter of indwelling only, as Mac would have to assert in that case. But that is not his only problem here, as the following from Bob Berard shows.

In the previous installment to this series, I noted two seminal articles written by the late Bob Berard (one in 1999 and the other in 2002). The former article, at least, was published by Mac Deaver in his paper *Biblical Notes Quarterly* (hereafter *BNQ*), which has functioned of recent as the chief organ for his doctrinal speculations on the Spirit. In the first article, Bob Berard wrote:

Summarizing, one remains spiritually dead until he is baptized even though he has willingly submitted to the Spirit's word and was thereby "indwelt" (as some imply) by the Spirit solely by means of the Spirit's word. The Spirit's word and man's submitted will leave man lost in sin until that man is immersed (Acts 22:16). It is in that immersion that God operates in addition to His word according to Colossians 2:12-13. At baptism (not before by the word alone) spiritual life is attained and this is simultaneously with the Spirit's personal entrance into the heart (Rom. 8:9; Col. 2:12-13). Since spiritual life is a working of God occurring at baptism (Col. 2:12-13) and since the indwelling Spirit is identified as the Divine Person giving life (John 4:10-14; 7:37-39; Rom. 8; [sic] 11, 13), the Holy Spirit is the Person of the Godhead who personally imparts spiritual life in the heart of the person being baptized (*BNQ* 1999/16).

Thus, Bob affirmed that the Spirit directly "imparts spiritual life in the heart" of the alien sinner. It is therefore an operation that may begin on the outside, but it is effected completely only inside

the alien's heart, according to this statement. It also must be the case, if such were true, that the Spirit *influences* the alien sinner in some fashion directly in *addition* to what He does through the Word, despite Mac's proviso on page 233 of his book.

It will also be recalled, as noted in our first article, that Mac Deaver himself endorsed Bob's statements, and, as editor of *BNQ*, even added parenthetically his own comments which were designed to elaborate by purportedly providing more "precision" on Bob's point. Thus, Mac added:

(If the reader would require even more precision, it could be said that the Holy Spirit changes the heart during baptism [Titus 3:5] and then moves into the heart to take up His indwelling after the heart is cleansed [Gal. 4:6], Editor) (16).

It will be observed that Mac does not correct any of Bob's comments, but is actually elaborating on this central point. In doing so, he adds his stamp approval on Bob's teaching that the Holy Spirit directly and immediately infuses ("imparts" is Bob's word) spiritual life into the heart of the alien sinner in addition to what the Spirit does through the Word of God. Thus, the operation moves from the outside to the inside of the heart even in the process of regeneration. Then, according to Mac, that is when the Spirit moves into the heart to indwell the saint. However, the position also implies that the man is a saint prior to be indwelt, if only for the briefest point in time. He is cleansed and then indwelt. The two acts are not, according to Mac's theory, really simultaneous. We shall see in a later article that Mac even implies a distinction in time relationship between cleansing from sin and regeneration. In fact, he will have the alien sinner cleansed of the sins that condemn him but still un-regenerated!

### **The Plot Thickens**

We also noted in our previous article that Bob Berard later equated this operation by the Spirit with Holy Spirit baptism in his 2002 article.

Now, let us bring in another interesting statement from Mac Deaver. In a letter to me dated December 14, 2005, Mac wrote the following:

Fourth, what happens in baptism is, as far as I can understand the Bible, differentiated from what takes place before it and what takes place after it. Do you disagree, brother? What happens in baptism should never be confused with the Calvinistic claim for miracle working in the heart of a sinner in order to bring him to repentance regardless how similar you think the language is! Be careful here. Does God forgive, in baptism, a sinner or a saint? He forgives a sinner in order to make him a saint. God cleanses the heart by the Spirit in order to make the heart a fit dwelling place for the Spirit. **If that is heresy, do what you can with it!** You may think you have a great point here, but I assure you, brother, that you do not. **If you think you have me in a bind over my position, then just sign up for the oral debate or get Dub to run our written debate in his paper. (You never did tell me why Dub will not endorse you and run the debate in his paper). If you could get that done, we could have the written debate. Is this such an ungetoverable hurdle? Or if you can't get that done, then we can have the oral debate!** (emphasis his, HDD; 1-2).

As to his rant at the close of the paragraph, we see that Mac was willing to defend Holy Spirit baptism in debate prior to 2006, which he claims in his book when he really came around to accepting the idea of present-day Spirit baptism. In fact, in the same letter he admits that even then in 2005 he saw “better now how it all fits” with his particular view of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (1). Further, as concerns his demand that Dub McClish publish in *The Gospel Journal*, the paper to which Mac alludes, was simply ignored on my part. Mac loves to call the shots, and is fond of making ludicrous demands utilizing others’ resources while seeming prone to ignore anything that appears to inconvenience him. Whether or not Dub would publish the written debate had no real bearing on whether a written debate could and should

occur. There were many other papers available through which to publish the debate. In fact, there still are—if Mac will agree.

But, returning to the current point at hand, Mac affirmed in his letter that Holy Spirit baptism is the means by which God cleanses the heart of the alien sinner **in order to make him a saint!** Thus, he affirmed that at the point of contact by the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit of the baptismal candidate he is still an alien sinner up until God cleanses his heart and so now considers him a saint, rather than a sinner. Folks, if that is not a direct operation on the heart of the alien sinner, then what is it?

Furthermore, it implies that one can be cleansed of his sins—sins that condemn him—and yet not be a Christian! He has not entered the kingdom or the church, because he still must be regenerated or “born again” by water and the Spirit (John 3:3, 5). He has no sins to condemn him, but he is still an alien sinner—**a sinner without any sins!** Thus, people are saved from their sins without being in the Lord’s church, according to this implication of Mac Deaver’s doctrine of present-day Spirit baptism. The alien sinner is a still a sinner because he is not a saint. Yet, he is a sinner without sins. He is an accountable non-saint who has no sins for which God holds him any more to account, but he is not a Christian. So, he is saved from his sins, but he is not among that class of beings called Christians, who are the disciples of the Lord (Acts 11:26) and are thus those who “are being saved” (Acts 2:47—ASV). Talk about a convoluted mess! A pathetic one, at that! This is what Mac’s error has made of the plan of salvation! Who can believe it? Evidently, those who are among Mac’s sycophantic followers have no problem with this inanity. Or else they cannot see beyond their noses.

Also, that the operation must necessarily be miraculous, despite Mac’s claims, was my precise point in comparing his teaching to some holding the teachings of John Calvin and Jacob Arminius. Those who believe in the teachings of these men at least have the sense to know that such an operation, whether they connect it with water baptism or not, would necessarily involve a mi-

raculous working of the Spirit upon the human heart. This seems to be something that Mac just cannot grasp. There are also many neo-Calvinists and Arminians who, like Mac, believe and teach that **in water baptism** there is a direct operation of the Spirit in which the heart of the alien sinner is immediately cleansed and regenerated. Many of these folks are particularly of the Wesleyan/Arminian branch of Protestant denominationalism, which includes many Anglicans (Episcopalians), Methodists, Holiness, Pentecostals, and Charismatics, including those belonging to the Third Wave Movement. One would think that Mac would be aware of this fact. At the very least, his cohorts in Cookeville's Tennessee Bible College ought to be. If not, then why not? Do they not have any one capable of teaching classes in the area of Systematic Theology? (I have observed a woeful dearth in reasoning from their previous president on the subject of providence. Maybe this dearth has become endemic to their entire academic program.)

But Mac's current view accords with this false doctrinal system. The only difference is that the denominational commentators and scholars who teach it would laugh at Mac's contention that the operation envisioned is non-miraculous. They know what **their** system implies! Mac is deceiving himself, if he earnestly believes that his view does not implicitly entail the teaching of a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit on the alien sinner's heart. His youngest son, Todd, is now partnering with those who believe in present-day miracles, including some claiming to possess apostolic authority. I wonder if Todd now believes that the operation he thinks occurred when he was converted was miraculous in nature? Some within his current fellowship most certainly do!

### **The Underlying Premise to Mac's Theory**

The underlying premise of Mac's new present-day Spirit baptism theory that he does not openly address is the affinity of his view of the sinner with that of Augustine. Mac is more affected by his teaching, than he may even know. The connection is hinted at in Mac's statement:

As a man's body is lowered in the water, when it is submerged in the water, the Holy Spirit submerges that man's human spirit within himself to change his nature (*Holy Spirit* 301).

Mac is now implying that man has a "sinful nature." Shades of Calvin, Luther, and Augustine!

If man's literal nature has been so marred or corrupted as to demand this direct operation, then how so? By sin? If by sin, when? Is it totally or only partially corrupted? How far is Mac willing to go with his doctrine? The underlying assumption involved in Mac's theory is a view of man that closely resembles the notions of hereditary total depravity affirmed by Augustine and codified by John Calvin in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, most commonly summarized as the "T" in forming the acrostic T-U-L-I-P of Calvinism.

To be certain, Mac does not yet accept—or, at least up until the present has not accepted—the doctrine of hereditary total depravity (or at least, the hereditary part), most commonly expressed by Augustine as the state caused by Original Sin, but he is sliding toward it at an alarming pace.

### **Conclusion**

We shall see if in his response to my claim (assuming that such will be forthcoming), whether this will continue to hold true or whether he will resort to the hackneyed quibbles of Missionary Baptist preachers like Ben Bogard and D. N. Jackson to try to bolster his doctrine. Mac has asserted that Bogard actually taught the truth on some matters over that of N. B. Hardeman. It would be interesting for Mac to enlighten us a bit more in this regard.

Surely, one would have hoped that no brother in Christ, especially one professing to be a preacher of the precious Gospel of Christ, would believe that man's innate nature as an alien sinner is so tainted with some literal, ethereal filth that it required a direct and immediate scrubbing by the Spirit to clean it up! But, alas, that absurdity is an essential to Mac Deaver's new view on Spirit



baptism. He has premised that doctrine upon it. We shall address this a bit more in our next installment.



As we noted in our previous article on the current Mac Deaver error on present-day Holy Spirit baptism, Mac is affirming a view of man that is dangerously akin to that held by Calvinists and Arminians relative to the false doctrine of total depravity. As I observed, his doctrine depends upon the premise that the alien sinner's moral nature, in fact his very spirit, is so corrupted that a direct and immediate Holy Spirit upon human spirit is called for to effect the latter's cleansing. In other words, there is attached to the human spirit of the alien sinner some form of literal filth that requires direct and immediate (without medium) contact by the Holy Spirit to cleanse it.

Some will, without doubt, deny that such must be the case for Mac's new theory to be true. However, unless such is the case, then Mac has no justification for asserting that the cleansing **must** be direct. In denying this premise, he forfeits his assertion. I suspect that, at least at present, he will not do so.

### **The Problem of Cleansing**

The sad fact of the matter is Mac **does** affirm in his book on the Holy Spirit a view that in some fashion demands that the literal human spirit is substantially, essentially corrupted with some form of ethereal filth. This is the basis for his view of the necessity of Spirit upon spirit contact, as we have stated. Again, hear him:

But before a man can be given the indwelling of the Spirit, he must be regenerated by the Spirit so that his nature is changed. And this is clearly when a man is baptized in water. As a man's body is lowered in the water, when it is submerged in the water, the Holy Spirit submerges that man's human spirit within himself to change his nature. And at the precise moment when God considers that man no longer sinner but now saint, at that precise instant, the regenerating submerging Spirit moves from the outside to

the inside of that heart (Tit. 3:5; Gal. 4:6). Less than this we cannot write; more than this we do not know (*Holy Spirit*, 301).

Further, it is equally clear that he does not treat those passages dealing with man's condition as involving the use of simile, metaphor, hyperbole, or any such figure of speech emphatically depicting the malignity of sin, but takes them as literal. He speaks of the alien sinner's spirit in terms implying that it is substantially (in the sense of its real, actual substance) and thus essentially (i.e., pertaining to its literal essence) corrupted, marred, filthy, et al. This is crucial to understanding the thinking of Mac Deaver on the subject, and yet, I suspect, he has actually devoted relatively little time working through the texts dealing with the constituency of the human spirit. He is more Baptist or Methodist in his theology regarding the nature of man than he realizes! As a result, it affects his view of the work of the Godhead.

It is possible that he came to this view of man in reverse order, by way of his speculations on the work of the Holy Spirit. If so, then he is following a path taken several centuries ago by John Calvin himself. Augustine came to his conclusions by way of the former process. He saw himself, especially due to his own immoral behavior, as being innately incapable of doing good and so concluded that God had to do all of it for him. The former idea he brought over from his days as a Gnostic Manichean. Calvin, who had a severe bent of mind (so much so that his classmates called him, "The Old Objecting Case"), reasoned that God had to control everything absolutely or He was not really sovereign. This meant that even sin had to be something God ordained in His grand scheme of things. If He ordained sin, then He made men to sin and so also made them morally and totally depraved. Augustine's theory of Original Sin suited this concept for Calvin. Arminius and others have modified versions of these ideas within the scope of their respective denominational traditions, but common to all of them is belief in the total depravity and thus utter inability of the alien sinner.

While Mac has not gone quite that far, at least at present, he has gone to the point that: (1) he affirms that the Christian must have the direct and immediate impulsion of Divine power in his human spirit to enable him to do things that he otherwise would not or could not do, and now, (2) he also affirms that the alien sinner must have a direct and immediate infusion or impartation of Divine power from the Holy Spirit—in addition to whatever is accomplished through the Word and sufficient to cleanse and regenerate him. In short, he affirms the need for a direct Spirit upon spirit cleansing for God to cleanse the literal human spirit of the literal (Dare we say “material”?) filth attending it.

What then specifically is Mac’s understanding about the nature of forgiveness itself—where does it take place? He really does not tell us. But this is a key question at the heart of the issue. Mac must have this bizarre scenario of **literal** filth attending the **literal** human spirit of the alien sinner in order to justify the **literal** Holy Spirit **literally** contacting, **literally** exerting cleansing power, and **literally** washing the **literal** human spirit of the alien sinner clean of this **literal** grime on its **surface** (what about the inside of the cup?). If cleansing and forgiveness contemplate one in the same action, simply viewed from differing perspectives semantically, then he removes forgiveness from being ultimately and finally an act in the Divine mind **in response** to man’s obedience to the Gospel to the specific operation of the literal Holy Spirit directly in literally sprucing up the literally nasty human spirit. This is what his view entails.

Thus, Mac writes on page 302:

If to receive the Holy Spirit as indwelling is based on the Holy Spirit’s regenerating the human spirit so as to change its nature, and if at one’s baptism in water baptism in Spirit also occurs, then every Christian has been baptized in the Holy Spirit.

Several questions naturally arise here. Is Mac alluding to Ephesians 2:1-4? If so, is he aware of the proper force of *phusis* here? What does Mac himself mean by *nature*? Does he mean the same

thing that Paul meant in this text? The answer to these by Mac, I perceive, would be most enlightening.

### **Pondering Other Salient Matters**

We also wonder why the cleansing is not done on the **inside** of the human spirit, where one would think such ethereal slime would be more prone to be gathered. Bob Berard, at least, did affirm that the Spirit “imparts spiritual life in the heart of the person being baptized.” So, he implied some sort of reaching into the alien sinner’s spirit by the Holy Spirit to infuse life into him. But this then raises the question of whether or not Bob was headed into the Calvinistic doctrine of “imputed righteousness,” wherein *imputed* is implicitly misconstrued as infused instead of its force of “accounted.” Those who believe Calvin’s error hold that God transfers to or infuses within the heart of the alien sinner the personal righteousness of Jesus Christ. At any event, Bob implied some form of operation of the Spirit imparting “in” the human spirit of the alien sinner spiritual life.

Does Mac disagree with Bob’s supposedly Divinely-given wisdom on this matter? It would be interesting to know that answer. After all, he has not as of yet—as far as we know—accepted the supposedly Divinely-given wisdom of his son, Todd, in joining up with the Emerging Church folks and other rank liberals. We also wonder if the *literal* blood of Christ is supposed to then be *literally* applied in the process. When the Scriptures speak of being cleansed by the blood of Christ, do we not understand that to be spiritual in nature rather than literal? When we say that the blood is applied in the waters of baptism, do we expect our auditors to understand that *literally*?

Also concerning Bob Berard, he believed his doctrine so strenuously that he had himself baptized again, because he believed, on the basis of his exposition of Colossians 2:12-13, that one had to have faith in God’s work through this direct operation of the Spirit on the alien sinner in baptism for one’s baptism to be valid. Now, has Mac been re-baptized? What about all of the preachers, elders, and members in good standing at Pearl Street, Sheffield,

Cookeville, and elsewhere who profess support for Mac's theory? Have they all been re-baptized with this new understanding as part of their belief system? What of Weylan Deaver, Malcolm Hill, Kerry Duke, David Hill, Dick Sztanyo, Glenn Jobe, et al.? What of the elders, preacher, and members, as well as the speakers, who were involved in the recent Holy Spirit lectureship in Tilton, NH? If not, then why not? If so, then why are they so desirous to fellowship all of us who steadfastly refuse to believe their falderal, even despite the fact we refuse to believe it? By its very nature it pertains to salvation and thus salvational issues. It cannot then be treated as a matter of opinion or indifference. In his book, Mac Deaver asserts that to have any future, the church must adopt his nonsensical theories (334, 338). That does not sound like someone who believes these are simply matters of opinion or indifference regarding salvation and fellowship.

### **The Primary Essence of Mac's Spirit Baptism Doctrine**

Brother Mac's new doctrine is really nothing more than what has been termed "Scrub-board Theology," which implies that somehow the Holy Spirit has to put a hammerlock on the human spirit of the alien sinner and personally scrub him up and down in His #2 washtub to clean him up from all of that ectoplasmic goo encasing his spirit. This is where he is on the subject of Spirit baptism. This is essential to his position. By reducing it to its essence we better see the absurdity and the logical fallacies attending it.

Let Mac or his defenders then indulge us just a bit and address the following true/false queries:

1. True or False: The language used to describe the human spirit of the alien sinner as "dirty," "filthy," "scarlet," "black," et al. is to be taken literally.

2. True or False: The language used to describe the human spirit of the alien sinner as "dirty," "filthy," "scarlet," "black," et al. is metaphorical and hence figurative in nature.

3. True or False: The constituent nature (its literal essence) of the human spirit of the alien sinner is corrupted and marred by sin.

4. True or False: The language used to describe the condition of the human spirit of the alien sinner is metaphorical and hence figurative in nature.

5. True or False: The alien sinner's literal human spirit has literal filth or slime attached to it necessitating direct contact by the Holy Spirit to cleanse it.

6. True or False: The alien sinner's human spirit is forgiven in the mind of God when he obeys the Gospel.

7. True or False: Forgiveness of sin refers to the same thing as being cleansed of sins.

8. True or False: Some sort of ethereal filth attends the human spirit of the alien sinner until the Holy Spirit directly washes it away with an infusion of His power.

9. True or False: The alien sinner is inherently a sinner.

10. True or False: The alien sinner is a sinner by practice or habit.

11. True or False: One can be forgiven of his sins without being in the Kingdom.

12. True or False: One can be cleansed of his sins and yet not be regenerated.

### **Conclusion**

We shall see what further inquiry may result from this latter point, if Mac or any of his supporters respond. But suffice it to say that Mac's new present-day Spirit baptism heresy has created a reworking on his part of the Bible teaching on the nature of man as well as the Godhead.

He has most certainly restructured his teaching on the plan of salvation and has added one more step to that plan, whether he admits it or not as we shall see. He also is teaching the direct operation of the Holy Spirit on the heart of the alien sinner in addition to and distinct from His work through the Word of God. Yes,

indeed, this is heresy, and despite our brother's professed bravado, he thus far has been unwilling to deal with it!



### Many Problems for Mac's Error

Among some of the many problems attending Mac's errors on Spirit baptism, especially in view of the "scrub board theology" it entails, is his butchery of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 (*The Holy Spirit: Center of Controversy – Basis of Unity* 305-317). In every case where the idea of receiving the Spirit or the Spirit being poured out upon certain men is mentioned, he asserts that Spirit baptism is directly involved.

He claims that the apostles received the second half of the one baptism when they were baptized in the Spirit on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). He knows that they had already been baptized either under John's baptism (as in the case of Andrew, who had been a disciple of John the Baptist) or Jesus' baptism, as per John 4:2. However, their baptism was not complete, according to Mac's teaching, until Acts 2:1-4. The problem is that Jesus taught that His disciples were already clean "through the word which" He had "spoken to" them (John 15:3), while Mac implies they really were not cleansed until the day of Pentecost when they received Spirit baptism. He also affirms that in Acts 2:38, Peter promised that when one is baptized in water he also receives Spirit baptism that he may receive "the gift of the Holy Spirit."

But in Acts 8 the Samaritans, he claims, received Spirit baptism sometime after their water baptism **through** the imposition of the hands of Peter and John. He also teaches that the household of Cornelius received Spirit baptism **before** water baptism, and the men of Ephesus in Acts 19 received it **through** the laying of Paul's hands **after** their water baptism. Yet he also avers that John 3:5 teaches that water baptism and Spirit baptism **are simultaneous to some extent and equally essential** to enter into the Kingdom. In fact, he teaches, by some tortured and convoluted thinking, that these two baptisms actually are the one baptism of Ephesians

4:5. So  $1 + 1 = 1$ , according to Mac. He even admits that his position entails “two immersions (one in water and one in Spirit)” (304). He speaks of “the birth of water and the birth of Spirit,” and says these “would always occur at approximately the same moment” (317). So, he affirms by implication two New Births! But they are both the one baptism. He declares, “sinners become Christians today by being baptized in both elements” (297).

That Deaver does not seem to see a myriad of striking self-contradictions in his teaching in all of this is simply astonishing. If John 3:5 teaches, as Mac claims, that both water and Spirit baptism are involved in one’s entering the kingdom, and if the action of both baptisms are simultaneous in large measure, as he also claims, and as the text would demand if such were what was truly contemplated by it, **then** any action or situation involving a time separation that makes them completely distinct from one another in that regard does not fit that model. **But** Jesus taught that “except” one is “born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Except means “if, and only if.” The exception thus **precludes** any other way of entrance into the kingdom of God (or the church). This would necessarily include the time of the action. If John 3:5 implies a close degree of simultaneity, as Mac teaches, then the exception precludes any variance. If this action is simultaneous in large measure, then **it cannot be** the case that those in Acts 8, 10, and 19 received Spirit baptism at times clearly distinct from what is here bound by the Lord in John 3:5—otherwise *except* does not really mean *except*. So, Mac must ultimately forfeit these as examples of Spirit baptism or he must forfeit his teaching on John 3:5. The fact is he is wrong on all accounts.

Furthermore, in affirming what he does concerning Acts 8, 10, and 19, he is teaching that these people were for some period of time half-way born again. Mac’s doctrine implies, for example, the silly conclusion that when the Samaritans were baptized in water they had only half of the baptism of Ephesians 4:5. The same would also have to be true of the men of Ephesus in Acts 19



after they had been baptized in water. The Samaritans would even have gone around for some time in that condition, as it would have taken at least a couple of days before Peter and John arrived to lay hands upon them. The apostles had to receive word from Samaria (Acts 8:14), then Peter and John would have had to travel down from Jerusalem to Samaria—a distance of some 38 to 40 miles (8:15). Even Cornelius and his household would have only received half of the baptism of Ephesians 4:5, as per Mac's theory, when the Spirit fell upon them in Acts 10:45, because they had not yet been baptized in water (10:48). They were thus not members of the church for they had not yet been regenerated and/or cleansed, even though they had half of the one baptism they needed. Were they just *half* born again?

But if Spirit baptism is what provided the cleansing and regenerating element of the Spirit in direct contact with their human spirits, then why did Cornelius and his household even need water baptism? They were already cleansed of sin and regenerated by that direct contact with the Spirit, according to Mac's doctrine. Eventually, Mac will reject the necessity of water baptism for the remission of sins if he follows out his present line of thought. That Todd is willing to fellowship Al Maxey and John Mark Hicks who fellowship those who already reject that doctrine is a good indication of where this will ultimately lead all of Mac's followers if they try to be consistent.

Another problem with this wacky view of Mac's is that it implies that Acts 8, 10, and 19 are not examples of the New Birth that accord with present-day experience and to which we may appeal to demonstrate what that Birth entailed. None of the examples of conversion, according to Mac's teaching, in Acts 8, 10, and 19 apply to our present situation. So, effectively, he has just eliminated all of these as examples for conversion.

### **The Baptismal Process as Described by Mac**

Read Mac's own description of the baptismal process he claims is taught in John 3:5 and elsewhere:

But before a man can be given the indwelling of the Spirit, he must be regenerated by the Spirit so that his nature is changed. And this is clearly when a man is baptized in water. As a man's body is lowered in the water, when it is submerged in the water, the Holy Spirit submerges that man's human spirit within himself to change his nature. And at the very precise moment when God considers that man no longer sinner but now saint, at that precise instant, the regenerating submerging Spirit moves from the outside to the inside of that heart (Tit. 3:5; Gal. 4:6). Less than this we cannot write; more than this we do not know (301).

This implies that when the Spirit first contacts the heart of the baptismal candidate that candidate is still an un-regenerated alien sinner. Thus, according to Mac's new teaching there is a direct and immediate operation of the Spirit upon the naked heart of the sinner.

Mac's error on John 3:5 implicitly takes the construction as **an order of operation** type of construction. He is reading the text in this fashion, "One must be baptized into water and into the Holy Spirit to enter into the kingdom of God." The problem is this wrongly equates *born* with *baptized*. While baptism is part of the New Birth, baptism **alone** is not the New Birth. The New Birth involves **two** key elements here—water and the Spirit. The form of the construction is the same as that given in John 4:24, where worship is said to be "in spirit and in truth." Clearly, that is not an order of operation construction. Jesus is not saying that we must worship first in spirit and then in truth. Neither is He affirming in John 3:5 that we are to be baptized in water and then in the Spirit. That does not follow from the construction. Yet, Mac acts as though it does (298-299). Numerous other examples can be adduced showing the absurdity of his reasoning here. Order of operation constructions involve conjoined verbs. Such is not what we have here. The construction's force must be deduced from other passages bearing on each of the two elements described in the text as part of the New Birth.

Mac also teaches that the specific order of this operation is that the alien sinner is first cleansed then regenerated to become a saint. Mac writes:

Cleansing has to do with forgiveness, and that takes place when one is baptized in water. If we make a claim for the baptism of the Spirit, we are claiming that the Holy Spirit immerses the human spirit, or that the human spirit is submerged in the Holy Spirit. This event is the event referred to as “regeneration” as per Titus 3:5. But regeneration is not cleansing. Regeneration is the act of generating again. It is a spiritual revitalization. It is a coming to spiritual life again, and logically speaking would follow the cleansing. In baptism, the sinner is forgiven or cleansed, he is regenerated, and then he is indwelt. Why this order? Because, cleansing must precede regeneration or a man would be regenerated while yet in his sin. Second, the regenerated person is the person whose nature is changed (Tit. 3:5; 2 Pet. 1:4). He has new spiritual life because he is in a new way associated with God or in spiritual fellowship with God (299).

Evidently Mac is unaware that Titus 3:5 speaks of “the washing of regeneration.” He commits the either/or fallacy yet again. He thinks that either the washing or cleansing must come first or the regeneration must come first. He asserts that the former must do so to avoid the supposed dilemma he proposes. However, the Bible actually teaches that the two are really one in the same and tied to the same event. The construction “the washing of regeneration” means “the washing which is regeneration.” These terms simply look at the **one action** from two perspectives—cleansing and regeneration. Also, *the washing of regeneration* grammatically is tied by a coordinating conjunction to *renewing of the Holy Spirit* in what is called hendiadys, “the use of two words to express a single concept” (Matthew S. DeMoss, *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of New Testament Greek*, 66). This grammatical form involves a type of parallelism that describes the nature of an action from two viewpoints. In this case, *washing* and *renewing* are the key words in the structure. Perhaps, Mac’s special enlightened

insight or brain boost failed him on this point. But he also seems oblivious to the problem having someone who has the forgiveness of sins (and thus is no longer a sinner, by definition) and yet has not been born again as a saint. I guess such a one is somewhere in spiritual limbo. Will Mac now propose a *limbus remissionis* for those who could possibly die in that condition?

But even more bizarre things are involved in this new view of Mac's. He teaches that this Spirit baptism really never ends in this life. One is perpetually immersed in the literal Person and essence of the Spirit. In discussing Romans 6:3-4, Mac states:

The baptism in Roman 6 is viewed as both a burial and as a resurrection. It is a going down into something and a coming up out of that something. Jesus was buried and he arose. He came out of that in which he was buried. We are buried, and we come up out of that in which we are buried.... The passage, while it certainly would entail both elements [i.e. water and Spirit—HDD] involved, specifically refers to an element from which a person arises to walk in newness of life. If the Spirit were the element specifically being referenced, then we have the difficulty of explaining how we are baptized in the Spirit and then that we come out of the Spirit. If we were to come out of the Spirit, we would lose the benefit or the effect of that element (298).

This ridiculous assertion implies that immersion in the Spirit is an ongoing, never-ending process, at least in this life. The further implications of this assertion are staggering.

(1) If this is an ongoing, never-ending process, then it must be the case that the child of God never is severed from “the immersing, submerging Spirit” not even when he sins or else, if he is separated due to sin, then he must be re-immersed or re-submerged in the Spirit every time he is restored. So, he would have to receive multiple Spirit baptisms to function as a child of God dealing with sin.

(2) It implies that the process is not completed until one reaches Heaven itself. Thus, there would have to be no real completion of the

action involved until then. This would, in turn, imply that one is not really cleansed and regenerated until he is in Heaven. He is simply treated as though he already has been. John 3:5 teaches that one must be “born of water and of the Spirit” to “enter the kingdom of God.” He must complete the New Birth to “have been born again” (cf. 1 Peter 1:23). One should carefully note the perfect passive participle showing completed action.

Also, could the Christian ever even sin in such an abiding state of continual immersion in the Spirit? Why this doctrine does not imply the impossibility of apostasy, or even the impossibility of the child of God even sinning, I suspect, Mac’s defenders will not address. Mac most certainly does not do so in his book.

### **Another Pathetic Attempt at an Argument from Mac**

On page 302, Mac attempts to summarize his position in the form of a hypothetical argument. He writes:

If to receive the Holy Spirit as indwelling is based on the Holy Spirit’s regenerating the human spirit so as to change its nature, and if at one’s baptism in water baptism in Spirit also occurs, then every Christian has been baptized in the Holy Spirit.

First, Mac has not proven that the Holy Spirit must change the literal nature of the human spirit to indwell it. He has not even proven that man’s literal nature has been so corrupted in a literal fashion as requiring a literal changing by a direct operation of the Spirit upon it. He needs to tell us the nature of the “nature” that needs changing.

The first half of his antecedent involves an unstated assumption relative to the Spirit, one which Mac not only cannot prove but which is logically fatal to his doctrine. The assumption is that the Spirit must directly, immediately do the work of cleansing and changing the nature of that literally corrupted and sinful nature. He must then come into direct contact with the naked spirit of the alien sinner to do so. Mac cannot prove any of that to be so.

Second, the final half of his antecedent assumes that Spirit baptism occurs along with water baptism. He has failed to prove that as well. Again, it should be carefully observed that Mac's own description of the process involves **two** immersions, **two** elements, and **two** distinct time frames, even though some of the time is overlapping. Mac teaches that one is first immersed (lowered into) the water and then receives Spirit baptism while still in the water. He is then raised out of the water, while he continues to be immersed or submerged in the Holy Spirit so he does not lose the benefits of that element.

Third, he thus implies that Holy Spirit baptism is never completed while one is still living. The candidate is in a perpetual state of being immersed in Spirit baptism, which then begs the question: How could one being so baptized then ever be guilty of sin? If he is every second of every moment of every hour of every day of every month of every year of his life completely and utterly submerged in the literal essence and power of the Holy Spirit, as Mac asserts, then how could he ever commit even one act of sin, much less sin to such a degree as to be lost? Mac's doctrine implies the false doctrine of the impossibility of apostasy.

If Mac admits that a child of God, one who is being so perpetually immersed in the Spirit, can sin so as to be eternally lost, then he must admit that either the Spirit goes right on to Hell with the lost child of God when he is so lost, or else the Spirit of God separates Himself from the child of God at some point in order not to do so. Thus, the baptism ceases. But, if Mac affirms the latter, he is met with yet another problem, one which is insurmountable for his case. If the child of God who is guilty of sinning should repent and come out of it short of dying in sin, then the Spirit must come back upon him to baptize him yet again, which would imply two acts of Spirit baptism. Further, if said party periodically lapses into sinful practices and repents, then Mac's doctrine would imply multiple acts of Spirit baptism upon the one candidate in his lifetime. Also, how much sin can the Spirit permit the candidate

to commit before ceasing His immersion of the sinning saint's spirit? The entire system breaks down into an abject inanity.

The antecedent is false. Therefore, it is not the case that "every Christian has been baptized in the Holy Spirit." The argument fails. It is not sound.



### **Some Other Texts Butchered by Mac Deaver**

Mac butchers several other Biblical texts in *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy—Basis of Unity)* in a vain attempt to support his present-day Spirit heresy. He misuses 1 Corinthians 12:13 in particular. He claims that the construction refers to the Holy Spirit as the **element** in which we are baptized. He attacks those who oppose his theory as falsely believing that Paul means here that we were baptized according to or in keeping with the Spirit's teaching. He claims that there is no reference to the teaching of the Spirit in the text (318-324). He ignores the salient fact that the exact **same prepositional phrase** or its equivalent appears several times in 1 Corinthians 12 and indeed refers to the teaching or will of the Spirit in the immediate context of verse 13. It can be shown that the vast majority of uses of the preposition with *pneumati*, the dative singular form of *pneuma* ("Spirit"), involve constructions that are not used to indicate **element** but rather **means, instrumentality**, and/or **agency** with the nature of it to be determined **contextually**. Paul in his writings predominantly employs this form of means, instrumentality, or agency.

Mac also makes a big to do over the language of John the Baptist in Luke 3:16 and Matthew 3:11 (303ff). He asserts that the promise of Spirit baptism was to last throughout the Gospel Age for all who would obey the truth. He resorts to the same feckless quibbles on the language that Pentecostals have long used to promote their errors on the subject. Many Pentecostals even use the same quibble to attach the baptism of fire to their theory—a blunder that Mac at least avoids here. Why he does not see self-contradiction in doing so is another amazing point!

## Deaver Vs. Deaver Debate

Mac's daddy, Roy C. Deaver, answered these goofy asseverations in an excellent article in *Spiritual Sword* edited by Thomas B. Warren some years ago. Warren, in moderating for David Lipe, prepared his charts dealing with the matter in his debate with a UPC preacher, Billy Lewis. Yet, Mac would have us now to believe that he so overwhelmed both men with the profundity of his reasoning on the subject that they were converted to his new theory before their deaths. Maybe Mac needs to address their arguments rather than practicing more historical revisionism concerning men who can no longer speak for themselves. However, we do have their writings and their writings refute Mac's nonsense.

Mac quibbles that John used a plural pronoun rendered "you" or "ye" and so included everyone who heard the promise in Luke 3:16: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost [Spirit] and with fire." Of course, Mac has to apply the latter half of the modifiers to the wicked to conclude that the former half applies to the righteous—those who obey the Gospel. However, to apply the baptism of fire to the wicked, as he does, he has to appeal to the immediate and also the **remote** context bearing on what that baptism fully entailed. **The application was not in the use of the pronoun alone in this regard.** He does not take this approach relative to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He, in effect, ignores the remote context that sheds great light on the scope of the promise. The pronoun is simply a **generic** "you," with the ultimate application and scope to be determined **by further revelation.** It is interesting that Mac elsewhere appeals to this principle of further revelation when it suits his own perceived needs in his discussion on John 14 and 16, where he states, "Obviously, there are a few remarks intended by the Lord for the apostles only in the light of further elaboration and the record of certain events" (278). He even cites John 14:26 as an example of the application of this principle.

Another problem with Mac's treatment of "you" in his attempt to fully parallel grammatically Spirit baptism with fire baptism is the following: He fails to take into consideration the fact that



some of those who obey the Gospel will eventually fall away and be eternally lost. In fact, there have been those who have so apostatized (Gal. 5:4; 2 Tim. 4:10). The linguistic dichotomy he creates then just does not hold up. Furthermore, the baptism of fire is an **end-time event**. It takes place following the Judgment (Mat. 25:46; John 5:28-29; Heb. 9:27; Rev. 20:12-15). Are we to assume that Spirit baptism is therefore also an end-time event to maintain his linguistic parallel?

As previously noted, Roy C. Deaver refuted this silliness to which Mac has succumbed years ago in *Spiritual Sword*. He wrote specifically with reference to Matthew 3:11:

It should be noted first of all that John did not say the Lord would baptize all persons who would seek his favor. We must observe carefully the use of the word “you” in verse 11. John said, “I indeed baptize *you* in water...he shall baptize *you* in the Holy Spirit and in fire.” The pronoun “you” is involved in the statement about John’s baptism in water, and the pronoun “you” is involved in the statement about the Lord’s baptizing in the Holy Spirit. Did *all* of those to whom John was preaching receive John’s baptism? Did John actually baptize all those to whom he was speaking? Obviously, no one could justifiably contend that all these hearers were baptized by John. The Record states plainly that the Pharisees were not baptized by John (Lk. 7:30). Did John baptize “offspring of vipers?” Did he baptize persons who had not demonstrated repentance? Did he baptize persons who were basing their claims to divine favor upon their physical ancestry? We conclude that when John said, “I baptize you in water” that he was using the indefinite “you” and that he was actually saying, “I baptize *some* of you...” The “you” stands for “some of you”—it could not mean all of you.

But, the same word “you” which John uses with regard to himself and the baptizing which he was doing he also uses with regard to the Lord and the baptizing (in the Spirit) which he was to do. If the pronoun “you” with regard to

John and his baptizing meant “some of you,” then obviously, the pronoun “you” relating to the Lord and those whom he would baptize in the Holy Spirit likewise means “some of you.” Some of those to whom John spoke would be baptized in water (some already had been), and some to whom John spoke would be baptized by the Lord in the Holy Spirit (30-31).

One might quibble that John’s baptism was ideally intended for all who heard him, but that ignores the fact that the same pronoun is also used of the baptism with fire. Are we to conclude that God ideally intends the baptism of fire for everyone as well? It also assumes a tendential or conative use for the verb *baptize* (Gr. *baptidzo*) relative to John’s baptism, but such a meaning cannot be carried with the future form *baptisei* used of the Lord’s baptizing with the Spirit and with fire. Tendential or conative force is an idea peculiar to the Greek **present** stem, and only then in the proper contexts calling for such. The future tense does not allow for the tendential or conative. Also, the same future indicative form appears in Luke 3:16. So, the force of the present tense verb is neither tendential nor conative, but, standing in the indicative mood, is simply a general statement of fact. To try to read more into it than is stated is without any textual merit.

### **Works Cited**

- Deaver, Mac. *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy—Basis of Unity)*. Denton, TX: Biblical Notes, 2007.
- Deaver, Roy C., “The Refutation,” *Spiritual Sword*. Ed. Thomas B. Warren. Memphis, TN: Spiritual Sword, July 1973.



### **Mac’s Attempted Argument—Yet Another Dud**

For one who prides himself on being a consummate logician, Mac continues to offer up nothing but duds from his arsenal in defense of his present-day Spirit baptism heresy. For example, Mac offers here yet another syllogism that supposedly establishes his case beyond refutation (303-304).

Mac's hypothetical syllogism is as follows:

1. If (1) the baptism that Jesus would administer following the administration of John's baptism was to be different from John's baptism in that it was not to be a baptism in water only, and if (2) the additional element was to be an element greater than water, and if (3) Christians could later administer water baptism, and if (4) the baptism under the Great Commission was a baptism commanded to be in water and if (5) the other element could not be administered by men as such but was a promised element to be administered by Jesus, and if (6) the baptism to which all men were to submit was a single baptism, and if (7) this single baptism was a baptism of water and Spirit, then the baptism that Jesus was to administer was a baptism in Spirit that occurred at the time of water baptism.
2. The baptism that Jesus would administer following the administration of John's baptism was to be different from John's baptism in that it was not to be a baptism in water only though it was to be in water (Acts 8:36; Luke 3:16), and (2) the additional element was to be an element greater than water, and (3) Christians could later administer water baptism (Acts 8:38), and (4) the baptism under the Great Commission was a baptism commanded to be in water (Acts 10:47-48), and (5) the other element could not be administered by men as such but was a promised element to be administered by Jesus (Luke 3:16), and (6) the baptism to which all men were to submit was a single baptism (Eph. 4:5), and (7) this single baptism was a baptism of water and Spirit (John 3:3,5).
3. Then the baptism that Jesus was to administer was a baptism in Spirit that occurred at the time of water baptism.

It will be noted at the outset that the Minor Premise or premise #2 above is not exactly stated as the antecedent upon which it depends in the Major Premise or premise #1. Mac adds to the first proposition of the Minor Premise (though he fails to number that proposition) the prepositional phrase "though it was to be in water," which implicitly expands the parameters of that proposition.

Despite the structural addition, the proposition itself is still false. The statement presumes that there only has ever been one baptism involving Jesus Christ. Yet, the Bible clearly teaches that Jesus' disciples **prior to Pentecost** baptized others by His authority, despite the fact that He Himself expressly baptized no one. The Scriptures state that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," i.e. John the Baptizer (John 4:1-2). Now did that baptism in water involve also immersion into the literal essence of the Holy Spirit in conjunction with it? Clearly, that is not the case here.

Even concerning the baptism of the Great Commission, we are dealing with a baptism that really is but an extension of that spoken of in John 4:1-2 to the Gospel Age. Whereas the baptism of the Great Commission is premised on the fact that Christ's blood atonement has occurred and that the Holy Spirit had been given (cf. Mat. 28:19; Acts 19:2-4), the baptizing done in John 4 was anticipatory to the atoning work and was prior to the sending of the Spirit. Mac has not proven—nor can he prove—that somehow the water baptism of Jesus became tied to Spirit baptism as an additional element. That is purely supposition on his part to try to avoid the self-evident force of Ephesians 4:5. His proposition, as well as his use of Acts 8:36 and Luke 3:16 together, begs the question that both water and Spirit are in view concerning Christ in the promise made in Luke 3:16. Mac must show that the exact same type of baptism in Acts 8:36 is that contemplated in Luke 3:16. He cannot do so. There is no baptism in water contemplated in Luke 3:16 in connection with Christ. The water that is mentioned had reference to John's baptism, not Christ's. Mac is reading water into the text in connection with Christ. The only word to connect the two verses together is the verb baptize. Is Mac willing to follow where this kind of shoddy exposition on his part ultimately leads?

Moreover, Mac's own wording of the syllogism exposes the failure of his efforts. His own words betray him. He cannot even speak of Spirit baptism and water baptism as being one baptism

without having to use terms **implying two baptisms**, regardless of how simultaneous he tries to make the action of each. As we have shown, he still implies a distinction **not only in element but in action, result, and duration**. He is necessarily contending for two baptisms, and thus by his own admission refutes that very contention. With the first proposition being false, then the Minor Premise is false and the entire chain of the hypothetical is unstrung.

The second proposition of the Minor Premise that “the additional element was to be an element greater than water (Luke 3:16)” operates on the same assumption that John was speaking of an element **in addition** to water baptism as part of **but one baptism concerning** the work of Christ. It is not the case that there is “an additional element” involved in the baptism that Jesus would administer. The only element mentioned in that text that would be involved in what He would administer in the Gospel Age was the Holy Spirit. That is a distinct baptism from that which He would have men to administer under the Great Commission. Again, there is no mention of water in Luke 3:16 relative to the baptism that Christ was to administer according to John. John said, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.” Now, where is water in that statement? Mac obviously intends to extrapolate it from John’s statement about himself, “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance” (Mat. 3:11) that, therefore, water must also be involved in the baptism that Jesus would administer, but the construction does not teach that. That is eisegesis not exegesis.

While the third proposition is true that men administer water baptism, it is false that this is a part of the baptism of Luke 3:16 that Jesus would administer. Mac recognizes the problem he has on this point. He is affirming that water baptism is part of the baptism that Jesus was to administer in Luke 3:16, but he can find no text—not one—that has Jesus administering water baptism in the Gospel Age. All of the texts he must use concerning administration have to do with men doing it, even though Mac has to

extrapolate water into the Luke 3:16 text to begin to formulate his theory to try to get around the force of Ephesians 4:5. There are no men in Luke 3:16 to administer this water, and there is not even water in Luke 3:16 relative to the baptisms that Jesus would administer, whether by Himself or anyone else during the Gospel Dispensation.

While the baptism of the Great Commission involves water baptism, the fourth proposition improperly ties that truth to the false supposition that that baptism is part of the baptism in Luke 3:16 as indicated by the use of “and” in the construction.

His fifth proposition begs the question in “the other element.” It assumes what Mac has not proven that there is another element involved in the baptism of the Great Commission besides water. He has not proven that to be so. He also has not proven that this “other element” is the literal essence of the Holy Spirit. Mac has simply asserted it, and then acted as though everything now follows.

His sixth proposition is really devastating to his whole case. He admits that men are obligated to “submit” to the baptism of Ephesians 4:5, but Holy Spirit baptism is a promise. It is not something that folks submitted to but something given to certain parties as a reward. It was given specifically to the apostles to provide them with the power that verified their office and credentialed them as the ambassadors of the court of Heaven (cf. Acts 1:4-8; Luke 24:49; 2 Cor. 12:12; et al.). Nowhere is Spirit baptism commanded for men to obey. It was a “**promise**” (Acts 1:4-8; Luke 24:49-50). Mac himself has referred to the “element” of the Spirit as “a promised element.” He implicitly acknowledges the fact that Spirit baptism is a promise as opposed to a command. Water baptism, however, was “**commanded**” (Acts 10:48; 22:16). It is administered by men “in the name of Christ” (Acts 2:38), which means “by His authority.” He commanded it! It is an essential to salvation (Mark 16:15-16; 1 Pet. 3:20-21) and one’s becoming a disciple of the Lord (Mat. 28:18-20). Spirit baptism is never so spoken about by the Lord or His apostles.

Thus, the seventh proposition is also false. It is not the case that “this single baptism was a baptism of water and Spirit (John 3:3,5).” These propositions do not establish the truth of his conclusion. In fact, his conclusion is false. We have already observed the absurdity of Mac’s handling of John 3:5, but the following shows the linguistic failure of his case on that text.

John 3:3, 5 is, admittedly, describing the New Birth, a **birth** which involves two elements, and **not** *one baptism with two elements* as Mac assumes. He is reading John 3:5 specifically as “Except a man is baptized in water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” Mac is attempting to **superimpose** his doctrine on the text and later its grammatico-syntactical structure. He is being disingenuous in this effort to do so. The Lord is using a very simple but sublime metaphor—that of birth—relative to salvation, how one becomes a child of God, spiritually speaking. The relationship and utility of water and the Spirit in the text are determined “in the light of later elaboration and the record of certain events” (Deaver, 278). The Lord does not provide here a full explanation of the relationship and utility of the elements of the New Birth. Such is to be discerned from the totality of Bible teaching on the subject of the New Birth.

John 3:5 is not an **order of operation** construction. Mac must change the verb *geneethei* into *baptistheis*. He must change the compounded prepositional phrase *ex hudatos kai pneumatos*, which is an ablative genitive construction, into another prepositional phrase *en hudati kai pneumati* used as an elemental dative. A dative of means, instrumentality, or agency would not help him here. In the phrase *ex hudatos kai pneumatos* the idea is that of **source**, especially in view of the principal (some grammarians claim exclusive) use of *ex (ek)* as an ablative marker. Water and Spirit are the elements “out of which” one is portrayed in the metaphor as being born thus “into” (*eis*) the kingdom of God (also called the church or family of God). That is the imagery. That is

the nature of the construction. Remember Mac affirms that one must remain immersed in the Spirit, but this verse teaches that there is a sense in which one is said to **come out of the water and out of the Spirit** in being born again. The **means** of the former is water baptism, because that is what further revelation shows (Acts 2:38, 47; 8:36-39). The **means** of the latter is through the teaching and belief of the Word of God, because it is again what further revelation shows (cf. Jam. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:22-23; 1 Cor. 4:15). The Word of God is the sword of the Spirit through which the Spirit effects moral change (Eph. 6:17; Acts 2:37-38; et al.).

The one baptism is part of the one birth, but the one baptism is not all that is involved in that one birth. The New Birth involves more than simply being dipped in water. One could be dipped so many times in Lake Dallas that every tadpole and pollywog knows his social security number and address and yet that one never be “born again.” He must fully comply with what the Spirit teaches through the Word to experience the New Birth. He must be “begotten again” by the Word of truth (Jam. 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:22-23) and delivered through the water of baptism (3:20-21). The spin that Mac tries to place on the text of John 3:3, 5 destroys the beautiful metaphor and substitutes a crass butchering of the Sacred text.

Where are faith (Heb. 11:6), repentance (2 Pet. 3:9), and confession (Rom. 10:9-10) in John 3:5? Yet, they are essential parts of the process of the New Birth. We learn about their relationship from other texts. The same is true in learning the fuller connections involved in the prepositional phrases “of water” and “of the Spirit.”

As it is the case, that several of the propositions comprising his minor premise are false, the conclusion cannot follow from them. The minor premise in the argument is false. It therefore is **not** necessarily the case then that “the baptism that Jesus was to administer was a baptism in Spirit that occurred at the time of water baptism.” Mac’s conclusion is false. Moreover, even more striking is the fact that Mac falsifies his own conclusion (and thus the



argument) with his definition of terms. Notice his conclusion—“Then the baptism that Jesus was to administer was a baptism in Spirit that occurred at the same time of water baptism.” The nominal phrase “the baptism” is singular in number. It refers to **only** one baptism. Mac has expressly admitted the same under his propositions 6 and 7 in his antecedent expressed also in his minor premise. But watch carefully! The construction “a baptism in Spirit” is one baptism, while the construction “water baptism” implies yet another. Hence, Mac’s own conclusion, which he thinks proves his doctrine, presupposes two baptisms. **This is a self-contradiction in the conclusion that he seeks to prove by his own argument.**

He then tries vainly to quibble around the problem he himself clearly sees in it, but to no avail (304). He states: “The answer starts with John 3:3, 5. Jesus speaks only of one birth. The birth of water and of Spirit” (304). However, again watch carefully as Mac tries to equate the birth with the act of baptism itself! “The one baptism of Ephesians 4:5,” he claims, “must entail both elements. If the element of the Spirit is missing, the baptism is reduced to a mere baptism in water” (304). What is really missing here? **It is the premise that the one birth equals the one baptism!** Mac does not state it, because to do so would be to expose the assumption. He wants his readers simply to adopt it uncritically. He is asserting that if the one birth includes two specific elements, and if the one birth of John 3:3, 5 equals the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5, then the one baptism includes those two elements.

However, even this is not sufficient for his case, because it would prove too much. It would prove far more than he wishes his readers to accept. He must also have as being true the premise that, as “born...of water” refers to immersion in water, “born...of Spirit” must mean immersion in the Spirit. However, that semantically implies two immersions as well—yet another syntactic gaffe. So instead of that he speaks inanely of the Spirit immersing the candidate while he is in the water, or at the same time he is immersed in water, though that implies that the two actions are really but

one action. Yet, he also speaks of one's remaining immersed in the Spirit long after he has been raised from the watery grave of baptism to "walk in newness of life" (Rom. 6:4). So the one immersion continues while the other one ceases.

His problem is compounded by what he writes on page 317. He says that "the birth of water and the birth of Spirit would always occur at approximately the same moment." That is two births, folks! Also, the statement directly contradicts his position on Acts 8, 10, and 19, as we have already detailed. Those texts, according to Mac, involved a clear separation in time. So it is not the case that these two births "would *always* occur at approximately the same moment" as he claims John 3:5 to teach (emphasis added). Either that or he must forfeit his assertions on Acts 8, 10, and 19. Mac's statement also contradicts his assertion that the saint is always submerged in the Spirit. A birth implies a culmination, a completion of process.

### **Sounding More Like Bob L. Ross in Belittling Water Baptism**

While there are many other blunders and errors in Mac's book relative to Spirit baptism, in closing our review of his errors here we need to observe how Mac, in effect, belittles the place of water baptism in salvation in promoting his error. If one does not accept his conclusion, then Bible baptism, according to Mac, "is reduced to a mere baptism in water" (304). Could denomination-ists be any more disrespectful? He sounds more like the Baptist preacher Bob L. Ross here, than Roy C. Deaver's son. While God says not to call that which He has cleansed "common," Mac has chosen to call water baptism, through which new are cleansed (Acts 22:16), without his theory attached to it "common." Such implicit disdain for the action ascribed to water baptism in Scripture is truly appalling and sadly bespeaks of a bigger problem for one, Mac Deaver!

### **Works Cited**

Deaver, Mac. *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy—Basis of Unity)*. Denton, TX: Biblical Notes, 2007.

# Mac Deaver's Present-Day Holy Spirit Baptism Heresy in *Biblical Notes* *Quarterly*

*Daniel Denham*

In a "Special Issue" of *Biblical Notes Quarterly* (Spring, 2011), Mac Deaver, preacher for the Sheffield, TX church, attempts to answer one article from a series in *Defender* by this writer exposing Mac's present-day Spirit baptism heresy. It should be noted that Mac completely ignored the first three articles in the series, which addressed many of the points that he claims I did not discuss in my fourth article. He also did not deal with my lecture at Spring, TX or its manuscript, both of which were available to him prior to his *BNQ* publication. Instead of examining the material in each of these, Deaver rushed his article into publication chiding me for supposedly not answering things that these materials do indeed answer. At the outset there is a measure of marked deceit involved in Mac's article. But we shall observe many other examples of such in it.

## **The Bogus Safe Place Charge**

Claiming that I have chosen to criticize him "from a safe place," Mac bemoans the failure of the debate in Denton, TX scheduled for the summer of 2010 to materialize. He states: "Denham passed up a wonderful opportunity to take us on in public discussion some time back when we were still living in Denton" (1). Mac, however, fails to inform his readers that the debate did not occur due to his own childish temper tantrum upon being confronted for not having expeditiously carried out his promised duties to secure a venue for the event.

In point of fact, Mac sabotaged the debate. He will have to content himself for the time being of answering me "from a safe

place.” As Michael Hatcher has detailed these matters with the supporting documentation, including the email exchanges with Mac, I simply note here that Mac’s version is a lie and pass on to his attempted defense of his error.

### **The Indwelling and Direct Help Issue**

Mac spends a considerable portion of the first few pages of his article recounting in a self-serving manner his supposed triumphs over Marion Fox, Bill Lockwood, and Jerry Moffitt in debate regarding the subject of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit especially as pertains to Mac’s direct help theory. Mac frequently attempts to turn the discussion in that direction, as he is obviously uncomfortable with his own affirmations relative to the real central issue of my article, his present-day Spirit baptism doctrine. Much of what Mac writes in this regard (as with his boastings on other matters) is to play to the gallery and thereby to give a sop to his most ardent supporters.

One special point should be noted here in this regard is that Mac tries to hedge his bet on the matter of Spirit baptism by contending that “regardless what Denham subsequently attempts to do in attacking our position on Holy Spirit baptism, he cannot successfully disprove our position on the work of the indwelling Spirit” (2). Despite Mac’s childish taunts, his direct help doctrine has been disproved many times over by others as well as by me. However, what is especially striking here is the implicit admission of Mac that his Spirit baptism doctrine just may not pass muster. One thing is certain: he is definitely not comfortable defending it which may reflect the actual discomfort of some of his direct help supporters in his even attempting to do so.

But having hedged his bet on Spirit baptism, Mac tries to tie the two doctrines so inextricably close together that the one **entails**, according to him, the other. He thus writes:

And since our “Direct” argument proves that the indwelling Spirit works personally in the heart of the faithful saint, then whatever else is implied by that indwelling work is true as well. And if the baptism of the Holy Spirit is implied

by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, then if any man is a Christian today (and thus has the indwelling Spirit), then in becoming a Christian he was baptized in that Spirit. I will attempt to prove this very point later (2-3).

Such amazing hubris from Mac! Observe how on one hand he affirms that the direct help of the Holy Spirit inside the saint is **not** essentially tied to his doctrine of present-day Spirit baptism, but the latter doctrine is necessarily true because the former **implies** it. However, if a doctrine A implies a doctrine B, and doctrine B is false, then does it not follow, friends, that doctrine A must be false as well? If the doctrine of salvation by faith only implies that repentance is not essential to salvation, and if it is false that repentance is not essential to salvation, then is it not reasonable to conclude that the doctrine of salvation by faith only is a false doctrine? Mac cannot logically affirm that the one doctrine implies the other and yet is itself not falsified by the falsity of that which it implies. He forfeits any claim to rational thought on the subject.

### **Mac's Assertions On Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19**

Mac takes exception to my description of his discussion of these texts which he affirms all involve examples of Holy Spirit baptism as being asserted by him (3). He sniffs:

It is not exactly fair to say that I merely assert such. After providing elaboration on each case, I finally provide the logical argument that proves that each case entails Spirit baptism as well as water baptism. This argument is given on pages 303 and 304 of my book. Does Denham anywhere in his article mention this argument? Does he attempt to show that it is either invalid or contains false elements [sic]. No, he does not. So, as far as the reader of Denham's article is concerned, unless he has read my book, he can well accept Denham's claim that I merely assert whereas in my book I do not merely assert; I provide logical argumentation. I give logical conclusive proof. After all the cases are discussed in detail, I give the syllogism that supports the conclusion that I have reached. Denham does not and cannot dismantle that syllogism! (3).

Well, I guess that settles that! Or does it? The article that Mac is attacking is but one in a series on the subject. Because I did not address in that one article the specific syllogism, Mac concludes that I cannot and have never refuted the argument. In fact the argument was answered in the Spring lectureship manuscript on Mac's book. It was already in print before Mac ever went to press with his *BNQ* article and he had relatively easy access to it. Also, the June issue of *Defender* carries my answer to his syllogism as part of the serial whose three earlier articles Mac ignored.

Nevertheless, it is also cogent to note that his supposed argument does not even address proving that these were all cases of Holy Spirit baptism. **Some of the texts are not even mentioned in the text of the syllogism or shown how they logically are entailed in the propositions** that comprise the minor premise to it. **Others are only cited in part with no real argument being made on the texts.** Mac does not deal with their **syntax**. He does not **analyze their structure**. He does not even summarize their basic teaching in any coherent way in the syllogism. **Assertion** is a very accurate term for the case he tries to make concerning them and Spirit baptism.

### **The Case of the Apostles**

Mac takes umbrage with my response to his error on the case of the apostles in Acts 2. He admits that I rightly said that he claims "the baptism in water that the apostles received under John's commission was not a complete baptism whereby they could be initiated into the kingdom or the church" (4). Their baptism under John the Baptist and that which Jesus had administered during His earthly ministry was sufficiently valid to bring them the remission for which purpose they were designed (Mark 1:4). While it is true that the actual forgiveness was realized by virtue of the atoning work of Christ, it does not mitigate the fact that they had the forgiveness prospectively on the basis of their baptism. Otherwise, their sins "had to have come back upon them," as Mac's own father, Roy C. Deaver, so forcefully explained to Dan Billingsly (in Mac's presence no less) at Memphis, TN in 1976 at the Spiritual

Sword Lectureship, after Dan had affirmed that the apostles all had to be re-baptized to enter the kingdom. The forgiveness was based on the atonement of Christ; no one ever contended that it was not. While the forgiveness was prospective in a certain sense, **it does not follow that there was no forgiveness at all as Mac implies.**

Mac then gives a series of true/false questions (4) that supposedly establish his case. Some of them are not precisely stated. For example, the second question is: “T F 2. Those who rightly received John’s baptism received remission of their sins prior to the Lord’s death and resurrection (**False**—Rev. 1:5; Heb. 2:9; Rom. 4:25).” Forgiveness can be viewed **in two differing senses**, and is so in the Scriptures. (1) It can be viewed as being fully realized, which of course ties their forgiveness directly to the atoning work of Christ, which work actually **preceded** the day of Pentecost. (2) Forgiveness can also be viewed as **prospective** but nonetheless factual, which is exactly what Jesus indicates in John 15:3 by implication. The disciples were already clean in some sense. They were in the state of being clean. This is the force of *katharoi este* (literally, “clean ye are”). Or does Mac need a lecture on the stative signification of the **present plural copula** (stative verb) that his father gave to this student of the Greek testament so many years ago?

So, the question can be answered **either true or false depending on the sense** in which *received* is used by Mac. Mac’s doctrine denies there was any forgiveness in any real sense at all until the apostles were overwhelmed by the Holy Spirit. Thus, his entire line of argumentation is unstrung and his follow-up questions are moot at this point.



### **Mac’s Butchery of Acts 8**

Mac asserts that the receiving of the Spirit in Acts 8:14-18 by the Samaritans was an act of Spirit baptism. Of course, Mac does not prove that such is the case. He sees the words *Holy Spirit* and

notes that the Spirit was received in some sense by these folks after their water baptism and so concludes that it just had to be Holy Spirit baptism they received. He conveniently ignores the fact that miraculous manifestations immediately attended the action. He also ignores the fact that the reference to the Spirit simply involves a common literary device called **metonymy of the cause**, where the cause or source is spoken of in place of the effect produced. Thus, the text refers to the reception of the miraculous powers, which are clearly demonstrated in the text, by way of its cause, the Holy Spirit.

Not content with this simple explanation, Mac writes concerning the case of the Samaritans:

But briefly the basic point is that the Samaritans were practicing sinners who stood in need of conversion. They needed to get out of their sins by being baptized in water for the remission of sins (cf. Acts 2:38). Their baptism in water was the baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts 8:16). However, to become a Christian one had to be baptized not only into the name of the Lord Jesus but into the name of the Father and into the name of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 28:19,20). Beginning on Pentecost the baptism in water preached by the apostles was the baptism into the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. The baptism into the name of the Father and the Holy Spirit was the baptism in the Holy Spirit himself (6).

First, Mac elsewhere contends that in the majority of cases Holy Spirit baptism is received **at the time the baptismal candidate is in the water of water baptism**. In fact, he says this is the way it is today. This he contends is the basic rule founded on John 3:5 and Acts 2:38-39. Nevertheless, he implies that the apostles and the 120 in Acts 2, the Samaritans in Acts 8, the household of Cornelius in Acts 10, and the twelve men of Ephesus in Acts 19 are all **exceptions** to this basic rule, though he decries the use of *exceptions* to describe these cases. He knows that if he admits that they are **exceptions**, then “except” in John 3:5 cannot properly



mean “except.” Mac knows that an exception with so many other exceptions would be semantically meaningless.

Second, what Mac says about the moral condition of the Samaritans as justification for this exception is actually true of all alien sinners. Why would not the exception then hold for alien sinners today? The rule is thus reduced to an absurdity.

Third, the participle translated “baptizing” in Matthew 28:19 is actually **a second person plural**, thereby indicating that the **disciples** are the one who are to do the baptizing. Spirit baptism, as Mac himself has often admitted, is something administered by Jesus Christ and not men. Mac needs to reread his own statements to this end on pages 303-304 of his book. In fact, part of the argument that he gives therein reads, “**the other element could not be administered by men as such but was a promised element to be administered by Jesus**” (emphasis added). However, in Matthew 28:19 Jesus uses a form that indicates that the baptism contemplated is one administered **by the disciples**. Throughout the text the second person plural is used along with the second person plural pronouns *humin* and *humon*. Clearly, these refer to the disciples of the Lord. Thus, the text of Matthew 28:19 cannot contemplate Holy Spirit baptism according to Mac’s own argument on pages 303-304, which refutes his attempt to strain Acts 8 through that verse.

He must now decide which he is going to reject—his newest quibble on Acts 8:16 in his *BNQ* article or his syllogism teaching that Jesus is the sole administrator of Spirit baptism in his book. He must repudiate part of his supposedly unanswerable syllogism from pages 303-304 to maintain that Matthew 28:19 contemplates Spirit baptism.

Fourth, Matthew 28:19 reads, “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” The Lord is in the middle of that series of phrases modified **by the very same preposition**. To be baptized *into* the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (or some equivalent) as in Acts 8:16 is simply a shortened way of saying the same thing as “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and

of the Holy Spirit.” The preposition *eis* (“into”) expresses the idea of **entering into** a relationship with the members of the Godhead that previously the one being baptized prior thereto never had. He is reconciled to the Godhead. That is the force of the **same** preposition in Acts 8:16. The Samaritans were now in a special relationship (being reconciled) to Christ. If they were thus in fellowship with Christ as the construction indicates, they most certainly were also therefore in fellowship with the Father and the Holy Spirit. Or does Mac say otherwise?

Fifth, if one has the Son, according to Bible teaching, then he has life (1 John 5:12). So, Mac implicitly admits, on the one hand, that the Samaritans **were saved prior to receiving Spirit baptism**, even though, on the other hand, he states that they were not yet Christians. The prepositional phrase indicates that they were **in fellowship** with Christ. If so, then they, according to Mac’s teaching, were saved without having been born again. Mac also thereby implies that they were already in the kingdom, where only the saved are (Acts 2:47), without ever having been born again, even though the New Birth is absolutely essential for one to enter into the kingdom of God (John 3:5).

Sixth, Mac, as noted, says that the Samaritans were not yet Christians (*BNQ* 6). So they really did not have Christ, even though they had been baptized into the relationship with Him. They thus had Him, **but they did not have Him** in the same sense at the same time. So there is a self-contradiction inherent in Mac’s comments on the significance of the preposition in Matthew 28:19 and his statement that the Samaritans were not yet Christians in Acts 8:16.

Seventh, Mac necessarily indicts Philip as messing up the baptism of the Samaritans. He was the one who had been teaching them the Gospel, and he was the one responsible for whatever they knew concerning the nature of New Testament baptism. All that Philip really needed to do was re-baptize them, this time “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” if Mac were right. Had Mac been there he could have told

him so, and Philip would not have had to wait for the apostles to come straighten the mess out. What a help Mac could have been! Also, all the apostles would have had to do was send word to tell Philip to re-dip the Samaritans and that would have taken care of the problem. Instead, Philip appears so messed up, according to Mac's theory, that Peter and John had to personally straighten it out. Why, isn't it so wonderful that we have Mac today instead of poor, ole messed-up Philip?

### **The Hands of the Apostles**

Mac's new theological meat clever continues to whack away at New Testament texts with a recklessness that causes one's head to spin. Another case of this is in his handling of Acts 8 relative to the role of Peter and John concerning the receiving of the Holy Spirit by the Samaritans. Mac writes:

As far as Denham's critique of my position as it involves the "hands" of the apostles is concerned, just here I will simply say that the "hands" of the apostles (Acts 8, 19) identified the ones upon whom the Spirit was to come. The apostles were not the ultimate source of the Spirit's coming. In fact, Acts 8:15 shows that the Spirit came in answer to prayer.... This helps us further to see that the laying on of apostolic hands does not mean that the apostles were the source of the Spirit's being given except in the sense that in Acts 8 and in Acts 19, their hands provided the identification of those to receive the Spirit from God (6).

If by *source* Mac meant only that the ultimate Source of the giving of the Spirit here, he would be correct. However, Mac means that the Spirit was not given **through** the laying on of hands by the apostles **in any real sense other than just identifying who was to receive** the Spirit. Thus, their hands were not the means by which the Spirit was in some sense received. In this he is dead wrong.

While Peter and John did pray for them to receive the Holy Spirit (i.e., the miraculous gifts), the laying on of hands most certainly was involved as the **conduit** through which the Spirit (in

the sense described) was given. Mac seems so forgetful these days for one who claims to have the Spirit bringing to his remembrance things on a regular basis. Verse 18, with special reference to Simon the Sorcerer, states expressly: “And when Simon saw that **through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Spirit was given**, he offered them money.” He wanted to purchase that same power. The preposition translated “through” is *dia* with the genitive stressing the **means** by which the action was accomplished. This is the exact same construction used by Paul in 2 Timothy 1:6 regarding the miraculous gift he had imparted to Timothy by the laying on of his hands. In Roy Deaver’s notes on 1 Timothy 4:14, brother Roy stated unequivocally that “only an apostle could impart spiritual gifts, Acts 8:1ff.” He observed that 2 Timothy 1:6 showed that Paul **bestowed** the gift that Timothy possessed while 1 Timothy 4:14 taught that the presbytery (eldership) simply laid hands “with” the action of Paul but imparted no gift (*First Timothy*, 79). The difference is in the prepositions with the respective cases in the Greek text. The latter uses *meta* with the genitive simply meaning “with,” while the former uses *dia* with the genitive meaning “through” in a properly instrumental sense. It expresses the **means** by which the transaction occurred. Thus, whatever is contemplated by the receiving of the Spirit in Acts 8 and Acts 19 necessarily involved the imposition of the hands of the apostles as the means of reception. Mac cannot escape that fact, which is deadly to his assertions concerning his doctrine of present-day Spirit baptism.

In Acts 19:6 the text reads: “And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.” The construction here involves the aorist participle as a **genitive absolute** showing that the laying on of hands was the means by which the action took place (cf. Max Zerwick & Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 415; A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, III:313; Mikael C. Parsons & Martin M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, 361). Mac should have paid closer

attention when studying the nature and purpose of the genitive absolute in his daddy's Greek classes. It would have prevented him from committing such an egregious blunder.

I learned about the genitive absolute over 30 years ago from Mac's daddy. In this type of construction the circumstantial participle has a **causal** relationship with the main verb (cf. Hardy Hansen & Gerald M. Quinn, *Greek: An Intensive Course*, 322-323). It thus expresses the means by which the action of the main verb occurs. H. A. W. Meyer, a Greek scholar of the first rank, in his analysis of the Greek text of Acts states: "After the baptism the imposition of the hands of the apostle became the vehicle of the reception of the *pneuma hagiou* on part of the minds opened by the apostolic word" (*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles*, 367). It was obviously more than "only...identifying" who was to receive the Spirit involved in the laying on of hands by the apostles.



### **Mac's Butchery of John 3:5**

In a special Spring 2011 issue of *Biblical Notes Quarterly*, Mac assaults both the Scriptures and common sense relative to John 3:5, by writing:

Now finally, when Denham says that I teach that water baptism and Spirit baptism "**are simultaneous to some extent and equally essential** to enter into the Kingdom," he misrepresents me because although he correctly declares that I teach the essentiality of baptism in water and Spirit in order to enter the kingdom, he is asserting, if I understand him correctly, that I believe that baptism in water and in Spirit have always been at approximately the same time. I do teach that *today* the baptism in Spirit takes place at approximately the same time as water baptism does. That is, when a person is baptized in water today, while he is yet in the water, the Lord baptizes him in the Spirit. The person thus baptized comes up out of the water and yet remains in the Spirit. (BNQ 6).

This is yet another example where Mac blunders by having not read the preceding articles in my earlier *Defender* series on his heresy, as well as the manuscript from my lecture at Spring, TX, before deciding to answer me. I had already noted in these materials (in fact the fourth article to which he is responding in some measure does so as well) that he contends for differing time frames in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 on the subject.

Mac's problem is that he has affirmed that John 3:5 teaches that Spirit baptism is received **in conjunction with** water baptism. He has affirmed that while one is in the water he then receives Spirit baptism. His own syllogism implicitly makes this claim on the basis of John 3:5 in his book (*The Holy Spirit*, 303-304; cf. *BNQ* 18). Yet, he also affirmed that the specific events in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 all involved cases of Spirit baptism for the purpose of regenerating the baptismal candidates therein and were fully compliant with the teaching of John 3:3, 5. He does the same in his *BNQ* article. It does not dawn upon Mac that this entails a self-contradiction. John 3:5 was spoken **before** these events in Acts. Whatever it teaches now, it taught when it was first spoken. It also taught the same thing when these events occurred.

If John 3:5 teaches, as Mac has claimed for us today, an order of operation that involves one receiving Spirit baptism **while he is in the water**, then these events cannot be fulfillments of John 3:5. According to Mac, the 120 received Spirit baptism right along with the apostles in Acts separate and distinct from water baptism, because they already had received John's baptism in water. Also Mac asserts that the Samaritans in Acts 8 and the 12 disciples in Acts 19 did not receive Spirit baptism until after the laying on of apostolic hands sometimes **after** water baptism, while Cornelius and his household received Spirit baptism to regenerate them **before** their water baptism. **In fact, there are no specific examples of conversion in the book of Acts of any detail that we can read of that corresponds to the formula he invokes for John 3:5.** Not even the 3000 on Pentecost completely corresponds

with this formula, as we shall see in a future article. So there is no example in Acts corresponding to it! None!

So, his quibbling on these texts as to some transition in “time frame” is nonsensical gibberish designed to please his supporters without providing anything of real substance to support his case. Mac implies that there were many exceptions to the lone exception in John 3:5. Thus, he implies that “except” does not mean “except,” as we rightly charged. His “amens” that John 3:5 must cover all the cases of conversion in Acts (*BNQ* 8) only show how confused he is by his own teaching.

Furthermore, I have not claimed that Mac taught that “baptism in water and in Spirit have **always been** at approximately the same time” (emphasis added). Rather I stated that Mac’s application of John 3:5 to us today as a pattern showing that the two “are simultaneous to some extent” with one receiving Spirit baptism while in the water **directly contradicts** his teaching relative to the different time frames or orders in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 noted above. John 3:5 predates these texts, and would have to have been true for them just as much as for us today. It would have taught the exact same thing in all of these cases as it teaches for us today. If Mac admits that John 3:5 entails no order of operation wherein we receive Spirit baptism while we are in water baptism, then he forfeits his entire present-day Spirit baptism doctrine. He has no text that can establish the pattern he claims for us today. This is his problem. And so he is led to the silly conclusion that “except” really does not mean “except,” even though he has expressly admitted that it really does (*BNQ* 7-8).

The simple point is this: On the basis of what text does Mac teach that today we receive Spirit baptism while we are in the water as he claims? He has only two to which he can possibly appeal and only then by reading Spirit baptism into them. John 3:5 was spoken **before** the events of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, and so the real dilemma posed above exists if he uses this text, as he has done. Acts 2:38-39 was spoken **before most** of the events in these texts,

and so it does not aid him one whit either. If these texts teach that Spirit baptism is received today at approximately the same time one is in the water, then they taught it when first spoken. That eliminates any supposed transition period in Acts as envisioned by Mac Deaver.

### **A Surprisingly Desperate Quibble**

Still groping for a breakthrough on this point, Mac quibbles parenthetically: “(If he does not remain in Spirit, he is not and cannot be a member of the church, for a Christian is one no longer in flesh but ‘in Spirit’ (Rom. 8:9-11)” (*BNQ* 6). Mac will come back to this in greater detail. He is arguing that one’s being “in Spirit” means that the faithful Christian is perpetually in the literal essence of the Holy Spirit Himself.

We will address this more fully in another article. What suffices at present is that we note how he takes “in Spirit” as literal to justify his Spirit baptism theory but does not take “in flesh” in the same text as literal. If “in Spirit” refers to the literal Spirit, then it must be the case that “in flesh” refers to one’s literal flesh. If not, then why not? Let Mac and the gallery to whom he plays chew on that question a while. Perhaps, they will enlighten us with some of their Divinely-given **direct** wisdom here on the matter! I, however, will not hold my breath waiting for their reply. Mac, in particular, has the tendency of ignoring those points he considers most problematic if he cannot find some way to obfuscate around them.

### **The Pattern of John 3:5 According to Mac Deaver**

As we shall see, Mac equates the verb “born” in John 3:5 with “baptized,” so the text, in his teaching, reads for us today: “Except a man is baptized first in water and then in the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” If Mac rejects this depiction of his understanding of the construction, he can say so, but if he does, he knows, as well as I do, that he forfeits the very pattern he says applies to us today. He in effect gives up his entire doctrine.



If he, however, endorses the quotation, then he implicitly admits that the events in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 did not correspond to this pattern. So, he forfeits his supposed transition. Let him take either horn of the dilemma he wishes to ride upon.

### **Modus Tollens and Its Affect On the Deaver Doctrines**

It will be recalled by the reader that Mac stated that the truth of his doctrine of present-day Spirit baptism is implied in his direct help for the saint by the Holy Spirit doctrine. He said:

And since our “Direct” argument proves that the indwelling Spirit works personally in the heart of the faithful saint, then whatever else is implied by that indwelling work is true as well. And if the baptism of the Holy Spirit is implied by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, then if any man is a Christian today (and thus has the indwelling Spirit), then in becoming a Christian he was baptized in that Spirit. (BNQ 2-3).

Mac, however, earlier had emphatically claimed that if one could refute his Spirit baptism doctrine: “he cannot successfully disprove our position on the work of the indwelling Spirit!” (BNQ 2).

Has Mac so soon forgotten the implicature entailed in a Modus Tollens hypothetical syllogism? If A implies B, but B is false, then it must be the case that A is also false. If (A) Mac’s doctrine of direct help of the Holy Spirit for the saint **implies** (B) Mac’s doctrine of present day Holy Spirit baptism to regenerate the baptismal candidate, then if (B) Mac’s doctrine of present-day Holy Spirit baptism to regenerate the baptismal candidate is false, then (A) Mac’s doctrine of direct help of the Holy Spirit for the saint is also false. Thus, it is self-contradictory for Mac to contend that the one doctrine implies the former implies the truth of the latter, but if one refutes the latter he does not necessarily refute the former. Mac either knows better and deliberately has sought to deceive his readers on the problem with tying together the doctrines as I predicted, or else he has bungled once again in logic!



## Basic Math for Mac

Mac Deaver, in his *Biblical Notes Quarterly* (BNQ) Spring of 2011 issue, quotes my comment that he is teaching that the two baptisms (i.e., water baptism and Spirit baptism) are actually but one in the same baptism. I pointed out that mathematically that implies  $1 + 1 = 1$ , according to Mac. However, he says that my math is “erroneous” (6). He is attempting to evade the self-obvious force of Ephesians 4:5 wherein Paul writes: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” There is only one baptism in vogue today. There was only one in A.D. 62 when Paul penned the Ephesian epistle.

If you have two items in base ten math and you add them together, you and I know (and most first graders do as well) that the number is two. However, Mac contends that somehow the two baptisms are but really one baptism, which gives the equation stated above. The math then is Mac’s problem, not mine. Ephesians 4:5 still says that there is but “one baptism” that was in vogue when written. The very language Mac uses to express or describe his doctrine implies that there are two (one into water and the second into the Spirit). As we have shown, he even speaks of two births in his book. He writes: “That is, the birth of water and the birth of Spirit would always occur at approximately the same moment” (*The Holy Spirit*, 317). What does “and” signify? Something **in addition to** something else, does it not? It will also be observed that this statement was made on the premise of his exposition of John 3:3, 5. If John 3:3, 5 teaches that Spirit baptism would “always occur at approximately the same moment” as water baptism it taught it **prior** to the events of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, and Mac has just forfeited his transitional period! So, the statement refutes two parts of his theory in one blow.

## The Godhead and Mac’s Math Skills

Now Mac dons the mantle of the math instructor and tries to appeal to the case of the members of the Godhead to establish his new mathematics. Read his absurd comparison:

Consider God: 1 (Father) + 1 (Son) + 1 (Holy Spirit) = 1 (God in essence; Deut. 6:4; Rom. 1:20,21). We do not have three gods; we have only one God but three manifestations (BNQ 6-7).

But, notice, folks, the three are of **the same essence**, even as Mac parenthetically admits. It is only in the sense that the three Persons of the Godhead are of the **same** essence (i.e., essential nature, which essence is Deity) that there is one God. Yet, they are **three separate and distinct Persons**—hence the term *Trinity* to describe them.

Water and Spirit are not of the same essence. They are two distinct items of differing natures. So, Mac's math breaks down yet again. How many Persons are there in the Godhead, Mac? What about it, Malcolm Hill and Marlin Kilpatrick? Please, answer that when you get a chance.

Also, the three Persons of the Godhead are not merely “manifestations” of the one God. That is United Pentecostal doctrine, brethren, which Mac is teaching. It is the old Gnostic Sabellian error of Modalism and may be quite indicative of a bigger problem arising from the Deaver camp on the very nature of the Godhead.

### **Another Attempt to Get the Math Right**

Mac next turns to yet another analogy that supposedly establishes his doctrine of two baptisms = one baptism. He writes:

Or again: 1 (body) + 1 (soul) + 1 (spirit) = 1 (person). For the proof of this see 1 Thess. 5:23. I am not three people; I am one person comprised of three elements (7).

But Mac again blunders. The three parts comprise the one human person in this life because they are just that—**parts**. Two baptisms cannot **by definition** be one baptism. There is an implicit contradiction in terms.

In the case of his analogy, we are dealing with the fact that **a whole equals the sum of its parts** which whole could not exist at any point in time under the present conditions in this world without each part, but such is not the case with the idea that two

distinct baptisms (in essence, time, duration, et al.) equal one baptism. He has one starting before the other. The other lasts long after the first has ended. He has differing substances or essences involved. Furthermore, he says they are administered by different administrators (water by men, Spirit by Jesus Christ). Each also, as we shall see, supposedly has a different purpose (one for cleansing, the other for regeneration). Again, Mac's own description of the process shows they are distinct in **every major respect**, and his fuzzy math will not extricate him from the dilemma posed by Ephesians 4:5. A remedial course in basic arithmetic is obviously what Mac Deaver needs.

### **More Meanderings by Mac in the Field of Mathematics**

Having shown that he is as incompetent at math, as he is also apparently in dealing with Greek syntax, Mac continues unfazed by his blunderings. He thus pedantically adds:

And when God ceased placing time lapses between the reception of water and the reception of the Holy Spirit, he so combined the elements in one event so as to describe the birth of water and Spirit as one baptism (Eph. 4:5). Furthermore, if there is something wrong with my math, what about Denham's? He himself in describing the New Birth says that it "involves **two** key elements here—water and the Spirit" (p. 5). Is he claiming two baptisms? No (*BNQ* 7).

First, let it be noted that Mac admits that his own doctrine implies that there were very distinct "time lapses" between the two supposed events originally. This is seen not only here but in his ramblings about Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, as we have shown, contrary to what he claims John 3:5 teaches today.

Second, his doctrine still implies some measure of time lapse between the two actions. Remember, he said that one is first lowered into the water and that then while one is in the water he receives Spirit baptism. He also said that after one is raised from the water his human spirit continues to be immersed in the literal essence of the Holy Spirit. There are differences not only in the

**essence** of each element but also in the **time frame** in which the candidate is submerged in each.

Third, I have, on the other hand, consistently maintained that we are dealing with **one birth** involving two elements, not one baptism comprised of two distinct baptisms. There is no point of comparison. So, his plaintive appeal to my position fails as well. Again, a good remedial math course is suggested for Mac and his followers. They might also benefit from a study in the use of semantic categories in logic.

### **Mac's Own Mathematical Self-Contradictions**

It will be observed that Mac does not address the problems of his own statements that I broached in the *Defender* article. Mac himself admitted that his position involved “two immersions (one in water and one in Spirit)” (*The Holy Spirit*, 304). Two immersions equal two baptisms, folks, or does **baptism** not mean **immersion** to Mac? He also writes of “the birth of water and the birth of Spirit” (317). How many births are there in that construction? What does “and” mean, brethren?

He continues his current harangue by making a mess of Titus 3:5:

Also, in discussing the two concepts of cleansing and regeneration, even though he is wrong in his assessment of them (claiming that the washing is the regeneration), he says, “These terms simply look at the one action from two perspectives—cleansing and regeneration” (p. 5). Well, if Denham can have two perspectives for one alleged event, why cannot I claim two perspectives for one baptism (looking at it from the viewpoint of the human body and looking at from the viewpoint of the human spirit)? (*BNQ* 7).

He fails once more to find real support for his view in this quibble. Titus 3:5 is indeed talking about **one** action—salvation. In Mac's present-day Spirit baptism doctrine he is describing **two** distinct actions—**first** immersion **into water** of the candidate's **body** and **then** immersion of the candidate's **human spirit** into **the Holy Spirit**. They are not the same action and they do not

have the same purpose according to him. The first immersion in water is for cleansing and the second immersion in Spirit is for regeneration according to Mac. So, his comparison fails yet again.

Mac chose not to deal with the Greek syntax of Titus 3:5 but simply dismisses the point made in my article on the construction involving hendiadys, though he will later **implicitly** admit its force while explicitly denying the implication of it. At present, Mac simply ignores it, and with a wave of his hand rules that it is wrong. Let him or his cohorts step up to the plate and actually deal with the text rather than operating on assumption and assertion.

One thing is certain Mac is wrong in trying to separate cleansing from regeneration. No reading of the text, however, will permit this perversion. Our KJV text reads “the washing **of** regeneration,” and **not** “washing **and then** regeneration” as Mac tries to twist it into saying. As noted, the genitive syntactically shows that either it is “the washing brought/produced by regeneration” or “the washing which is regeneration,” and either has the same basic significance in practical terms as concerns the New Birth. Mac’s distinction time-wise between cleansing and regeneration, a distinction essential to his new heresy, simply will not hold up in view of Greek syntax. Let Mac deal with the Greek text and show us what he learned from his daddy. I will gladly show him what I learned from his daddy. Then we can see who was actually paying attention. We will have more to say on this text, as well as John 3:5 in future articles.

### **Mac’s Affirmative Debate Proposition**

The specific proposition Mac signed to affirm in our Denton debate stated expressly: “The Scriptures teach that in order for a sinner to become a Christian, he must be baptized in water and in the Holy Spirit.” Now, folks, **who** is the “he” in the second clause? Is it not the sinner of the first clause? He—the **sinner**—must be immersed in what? In water only? That is not what the proposition says. In water to become a non-sinner or saint who is then immersed in the Holy Spirit to become a Christian? That is

also **not** what the proposition says. The **explicit statement** of the proposition **obligated** Mac to prove that the **sinner** received both water and Spirit baptism. That is what he signed to affirm. He devised the proposition himself; so he cannot claim that he was set-up. That is what the **syntax** of the sentence in the proposition he wrote **required** of him to **prove**. Either Mac is not nearly as precise as he claims he is and chides others for not being, or his entire doctrine collapses before his very eyes, because Mac states in his *BNQ* article that he does not believe that the act of Holy Spirit baptism is received by an alien sinner. He claims that upon receiving the remission of sins, the baptismal candidate ceases to be an alien sinner and becomes a saint, but is not yet a Christian because he has not been regenerated by Spirit baptism (10-11). We shall deal with this latter absurdity in due time, but at present the reader should note that Mac was willing to affirm a proposition that **explicitly** opposed his contention in the *BNQ* article that the recipient of Spirit baptism was not an alien sinner.

Now, is he willing to publicly deny that his proposition is true? If so, then he just gave up half of the debate without me ever having to go to Denton to get him to do it! If he agrees that this proposition is false, then he also implicitly admits that my affirmative proposition, which was its transverse, is true. That obtaining, then the matter of the Denton debate is moot. Mac will have thus given up his case on **both** propositions without the debate ever having taken place. What might he have done in actual confrontation?

Is Mac now ready to repudiate his affirmative proposition in view of what it demands him syntactically to prove? Yes or No. That is all that is needed here. Trying to spin it some other way will fly directly in the face of the construction of the proposition as he **himself** wrote it. It will also show that what Mac puts into writing as to what he believes is not necessarily what he really believes, if he quibbles on the meaning of the construction. So, what will it be? What would Glenn Jobe or Marlin Kilpatrick do here? Or Malcolm Hill? Malcolm has perfected the art of lying low when being challenged of late. So, we shall see if he answers.

### **Editor's Note:**

Regarding the propositions for the debate. As you can see in the copies of the email exchanges with Deaver regarding the debate, we tried to get him to change his proposition, but he refused. After he had sent us by snail mail a copy of the propositions (along with rules) for us to sign, on April 21, 2009 (all these emails were in 2009), I emailed Deaver the following:

Now as to the propositions. Neither proposition is sufficient. We are willing to affirm the following proposition:

Resolved: The Scriptures teach that Holy Spirit baptism has ceased.

Here is a proposition for you to affirm and for us to deny that is more specific in its wording.

Resolved: The Scriptures teach that an alien sinner must be baptized in water and baptized in the Holy Spirit to become a Christian.

Deaver replied on the same day (April 21) saying:

I am staying with my proposition as worded: The Scriptures teach that in order for a sinner to become a Christian, he must be baptized in water and in the Holy Spirit. It is a true affirmative and states what I want to affirm. Even though you say that my proposition is not sufficient, you do not say why, and you know that as it is worded, you absolutely deny it.

I responded to Deaver on April 28:

Mac, the agreement was to debate Holy Spirit baptism. Yet, when you sent your propositions, Holy Spirit baptism was clearly and noticeably absent. When I placed Holy Spirit baptism in the propositions, you refused to accept it (I can understand why you want to run from it—I would too—but this is what the debate is to center upon). This seems to be a pitiful attempt to escape your doctrine.... As to your proposition, it needs to include Holy Spirit baptism since that is the topic we agreed to debate. Your proposition, as stated, does not include that vital aspect. Thus a proper



proposition for you would be: Resolved: The Scriptures teach that in order for a sinner to become a Christian, he must be baptized in water and baptized in the Holy Spirit. Mac, this proposition deals with the subject we agreed to debate; your proposition does not. Either accept this proposition or provide one that deals with Holy Spirit baptism.

Mac responded on May 4 writing:

I will come to the main point in your last e-mail. My proposition does indeed deal with Holy Spirit baptism and it states exactly what I believe. If you choose to continue to misrepresent me and falsely accuse me, you will have to answer for that at judgement [sic]. You cannot tell me what I believe. And I know that my proposition as stated is scriptural, and it is the one for which I will contend. You will not be writing my proposition for me.... However, I will affirm the one that I have supplied. Both you and Terry know that you disagree with my proposition as worded. Neither of you would affirm it.

I will be affirming: "The Scriptures teach that in order for a sinner to become a Christian, he must be baptized in water and in the Holy Spirit." If the one you are representing (Terry Hightower, I suppose), does not see Holy Spirit baptism in the proposition, he does not need to be debating the issue. Can you all not read? It is a baptism in water and in the Holy Spirit, and it is worded just like I want it. It shall not be changed.... Your statement that my affirmative proposition as stated omitted Holy Spirit baptism is laughable! Come on, fellows! If Holy Spirit baptism was omitted in that proposition, then will you and Terry affirm the proposition that I sent? You know you will not!!!!

Thus, you can see for yourself that while we tried to get Deaver to change his affirmative proposition, he is the one who refused and even stated that the way in which it was worded states what he wanted to affirm.



## **“The Sinner Is No Longer A Sinner,” Really?**

Mac amazingly heads a section of his *BNQ* article as “The Sinner Is No Longer A Sinner.” It does not seem to dawn upon Mac that the sentence itself is a self-contradiction. If he is a sinner, then he is still a sinner. If the person is not a sinner, then he is a saint. However, Mac seems to be angling for a new category somewhere in between the two. However, he takes a surprising turn, as we shall see, and argues that the sinner is really a saint but not a Christian! Can you believe it?

If he did not take this tact, he would have to invent a new category. The new category would be that of the non-sinner/non-saint. He dwells however briefly in the limbo of the non-lost but also strangely in that of the non-saved as well. Mac hints at this new amorphous category on page 14 when he writes:

Note: If this person is forgiven, he is no longer a sinner. If he is not a sinner, he is either (1) already a saint because no longer a sinner or (2) a non-sinner who by regeneration is made a saint.

Clearly, this idea would prove problematic for Mac and his followers. It would imply that the apostles and the Samaritans were in that group for some time (not just a micro-second). The apostles would have been non-sinner/non-saints for some 3 ½ years. The Samaritans would have been compelled to occupy this same realm for days, because of Philip’s messing up their baptism according to Mac’s new theory on Acts 8:16. If so, they were so lucky that they did not live in Spain or India at the time or it may have taken months or a year or two to straighten out their situation. One can only imagine what the poor Eunuch would have been put through if Philip taught him the same limited baptism that he taught the Samaritans. Maybe when Matthew went down to Ethiopia, as historical tradition maintains he did, he could have caught up with him and straightened out his spiritual condition. After all we cannot have half-saved and half-born again folk wandering around. If they should die, where would they go? They have no sins to condemn them, but they have not really been

saved yet because they are not in the church where the saved are (Acts 2:47; Eph. 5:23). Well, maybe Mac could invent a new *limbus* like the Catholics did for the patriarchs (*limbus patrum*) and unbaptized babies (*limbus infantum*). We suggested before that he could call it *limbus remissionis* (i.e., limbo of the forgiven). Of course, this is all said to make a point. Mac saw this implication, which is why in his article he argues that the sinner is no longer a sinner but a saint who is not a Christian. Yet even realizes that poses other problems. That is why he offers the either/or scenario on page 14 quoted above. He hopes that will satisfy his supporters enough to keep them from jumping the reservation.

### **Mac's Got a Lot of Explaining to Do**

Mac writes at length:

At some point when the sinner is lowered in the water (while he is in the water), God forgives him of his past sins (Acts 2:38; Mark 16:16). Following that granted forgiveness and while the person is yet under the water, the Holy Spirit submerges his human spirit within Himself to change his nature. (Read carefully Tit. 3:5 and 2 Pet. 1:4; Note: Even someone as righteous as Cornelius had been under Gentile-ism, though he was clearly no practicing sinner, he still had committed sin as all men before him had and, thus, he needed to have his tainted nature changed). This is the immersion or baptism in the Holy Spirit. As the person's body is submerged in water, his human spirit is submerged in the Holy Spirit. Then, following the change in the person's nature given the fact that he is now regenerated (or made alive again) person, the Spirit then from the outside of his heart moves into the inside of his heart to take up indwelling residence (Gal. 4:6).

So, when Denham asserts that "...according to Mac's new teaching there is a direct and immediate operation of the Spirit upon the naked heart of the sinner," he notoriously errs! (BNQ 10).

Let Mac explain how the baptismal candidate while in the water but prior to receiving the submerging in the Spirit receives forgiveness of sins without being in Christ where forgiveness is (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). If he has forgiveness at this point, then he must be in the kingdom. If he is in the kingdom, **then he has been born again** which is necessary for him to be in the kingdom (John 3:5). If he has been born again, then he was born again **prior** to receiving Spirit baptism. He has thus been regenerated without it. So the receiving of Spirit baptism could not be essential to being born again or the New Birth. Mac has just defeated his own doctrine!

But consider this quandary as well for him. (1) Mac says that the individual who has been baptized in the water receives forgiveness of sins prior to his spirit being submerged or immersed in the Holy Spirit. (2) He also says that the Holy Spirit when submerging the forgiven person's spirit now **regenerates** that spirit—makes it new again. (3) He describes the one undergoing the latter process as having his “tainted nature changed.” **But if he has been forgiven of his sins, how is his nature still tainted?** Does not God do enough of a good cleansing to make it white as snow? What does Mac even mean by “tainted nature”?

As I have noted, the article Mac is answering is the fourth in a series. I raised several questions on this specific subject in two of the previous articles. Mac has completely ignored them. My true/false questions (statements) are given in the article in *Defender's* October 2010 issue (5), where I deal with Mac's new “Scrub-Board Theology.” Also, the September issue discusses aspects of the same subject. Surely, if Mac expects me to answer his questions, his followers will happily call upon him to return the favor. They ought to insist upon it, if they are genuinely concerned about truth.

Looking back on it, Mac really should be thankful that the Calvinist preacher backed out of the Schaumburg debate at the last moment. If he had gotten wind of Mac's view on human nature it may have proved quite embarrassing not only to Mac Deaver but also to the brethren at Schaumburg, including Mac's moderator, Glenn Jobe.

## **Mac on Implication— A Major Logic Problem for Him to Ponder**

Mac also attempts to attack me on the grounds that, he claims, I do not understand the meaning of implication. However, Mac is the one who clearly does not understand the meaning—otherwise, he would know that to be placed in a substance and remain completely in it is to be immersed in it. Let us examine his ramblings here.

Mac first writes:

Now, as to Denham’s claim that our view implies that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is a never-ending process, he is simply wrong one more time. Daniel uses the word “imply” when, it is clear, that it has no application whatsoever. (BNQ 16).

What does *submerged* imply, folks? If one’s human body is “submerged” in, say, buttermilk, what would that imply? It would imply that he was immersed in the buttermilk. If one “remains” submerged in and thus covered by the buttermilk, is he still immersed in it? Certainly! Is that not an **implication** of the use of the word *remains* here? If he is still immersed, is it not the case then that the immersion in the buttermilk is continuing? Is that not an implication? Let Mac answer here.

He said that the Holy Spirit at baptism encompassed his human spirit and that he remained in the Spirit even after being raised from the water. He also said that he is still “in Spirit” and has been ever since. Now, unless he is going to quibble that he is half-hanging out of the Spirit, we would then conclude that he is all the way in the literal essence of the Spirit according to his teaching. (Note: If he is half-in and half-out, which half is where? Also, which half is “in Christ,” and which half is not? Which half is in the church, and which half is out of the church? Which half is a Christian, and which half is not?) If he is still submerged or immersed in the Holy Spirit, then it must be the case that the immersion in the Spirit is still in Mac Deaver’s case going on, and, therefore, the process has not ended. Now, let us see if Mac can

just laugh that off. I know some of his followers see the point, even if he has become too jaded to do so.

### **Some More on Logic for Brother Mac's Benefit**

Let us continue with Mac's lecture on implication. He states:

He [Denham] often imagines what he thinks I imply. This means that he makes stuff up himself and then ascribes it to me. If he knew how to set out a logical argument whereby he would attempt to falsify what we say, I think he might begin to see how absurd his wild charges of "implication" against us really are. (*BNQ* 16).

Is Mac unaware that the material he was attacking is filled with **hypothetical statements** which constitute one form of syllogism? The preceding material I have given also is filled with them. Several involve enthymemic forms. Is Deaver telling us that he does not understand the use of such forms? Simply, because I choose not on some occasions to set out my arguments in Aristotelian form or do not draw out all hypotheticals in their full form it does not mean that I do not use **any** logical arguments. Hypothetical statements are another form of logical argument, friends. If Mac does not know this, then he needs to return his PhD to Tennessee Bible College. Many of these hypothetical arguments can be given in a much shorter and compact space to make a point. They have been used repeatedly herein, as well as in the article Mac is attacking. He needs to stop whining and engage the arguments.

**If** one's human spirit is immersed in the literal essence of the Holy Spirit in Spirit baptism (as Mac contends), **and if** the person's human spirit remains submerged in the Holy Spirit throughout his lifetime (as he also contends), **then** it is the case that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as per this teaching, is an on-going, never-in-this-lifetime-ending process or action. This is a hypothetical statement utilizing dual and conjoined propositions in the antecedent followed by the consequent. All together it would form the Major Premise to the argument. The conjoined propositions comprise the Minor Premise. The consequent is the Con-

clusion. Now, I have filled in the enthymeme for Mac since he apparently does not understand the nature of this form of argument. Let Mac now address the propositions embedded in the hypothetical statement. We will see very quickly who is telling the truth here on the matter of implication. Imagination is at work, but it is the imagination of one currently located in Sheffield, TX.

### The Strong Disjunctive

Mac continues:

Then, on page 5 of his article he cites two more alleged “implications.” He says that our view implies that either (1) the child of God is never severed from the Holy Spirit even when he sins or that (2) if he is ever severed from the Holy Spirit, then that would mean that the child of God must be rebaptized in the Holy Spirit. Then we would have at least two Holy Spirit baptisms or as many as necessary following the restoration of a fallen Christian. (BNQ 16)

Mac clearly does not like the strong disjunctive here. It is nonetheless what his doctrine logically requires. If a Christian apostatizes then he would **either** still be “in Spirit” despite his apostasy **or** he would have to be re-immersed in the Spirit to remain in the Spirit? Now, which is it that Mac believes happens? Does the Holy Spirit continue to immerse the spirit of the apostate child of God? Yes or No. It is that simple.

For example, when Ananias and Sapphira in Acts 5 so sinned as to be lost, did the Spirit continue to immerse them right up until they passed into torments or did He leave off immersing their human spirits in his essence when they sinned. It must be one or the other. Was Diotrophes in 3 John still “in Spirit” when John penned the epistle? If he was no longer “in Spirit,” then did he have to be re-immersed in the Spirit to be “in Spirit”? If not, then why not? If he had apostatized two more times, but was restored after each time, would he have had to be re-immersed in the Spirit to be restored in order to be “in Spirit”? Additionally, think about this, if so, then when he was not “in Spirit,” due to his apostasy, was he then not “in Christ”?

## Mac's Own Crushing Blow to the Deaver Doctrine

Fascinatingly, Mac makes a statement in yet another section that effectively destroys his own doctrine and his non-sinner quibble above. He states:

Third, as to the charge of multiple baptisms in the Spirit, I will simply say that the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is the baptism in water and Spirit whereby an alien sinner leaves the world and enters the church. When the sinner becomes a saint, he is initiated into the kingdom (Col. 1:13). The Holy Spirit immerses the human spirit in Himself, changing the nature of the heart (2 Pet. 1:4), and then moves into that new heart to indwell there (Gal. 4:6). This initiation can never be repeated, for it is when a sinner becomes a Christian. That only happens *one time* in a person's life. (BNQ 16).

Several things should be noted here. For example, he again makes no real argument on the texts he cites. He simply asserts that they teach what he claims. Also, what does he mean by a change in "nature" and in citing 2 Peter 1:4 in particular to that end? Yes, in adding the Christian graces we become "partakers of the Divine nature." However, what does Mac think that entails? Does he believe that he literally now is part of the Godhead in some meaningful sense? He does not say. Maybe Mac will tell us if he believes that Deity is now part of his own personality in some sense.

Notice this statement: "I will simply say that the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 is the baptism in water and Spirit whereby an alien sinner leaves the world and enters the church." Earlier he taught that the alien sinner becomes a saint at the point of the cleansing and then after Spirit baptism enters the church. Now, he has the alien sinner leaving the world, which is what the cleansing is all about, and then entering the church at the point of Spirit baptism. If he has left the world by virtue of the cleansing, then he is already in the church, unless Mac is ready to postulate some sort of spiritual limbo for the non-worldly, alien, non-sinner, yet also



non-Christian person! Mac evidently cannot make up his own mind on the order of things with his Spirit baptism theory.

The key thing to note here, however, is that Mac states that this Spirit baptism only occurs **one time** in a person's life. This means that **either** the Spirit continues to encompass the human spirit of the apostate child of God or the Spirit does not re-encompass his spirit when he is "restored." (Note: Mac I can state this in the form of a hypothetical syllogism involving a strong disjunctive, if you need me to do so for you to recognize the argument. In fact, I will do so and place it in bold type just to save you the pain of asking for it and to help you so you cannot miss it. It is as follows:

**Major Premise: If it is the case that Spirit baptism can only be received one time in one's life, then it *must* be the case that *either* the Holy Spirit continues to encompass (immerse) the Spirit of the apostate child of God *or* the Spirit does not re-encompass (re-immerse) the heart of the apostate when said person is restored.**

**Minor Premise: It is the case that Spirit baptism can only be received one time in one's life (Mac Deaver).**

**Conclusion: Therefore, it *must* be the case that *either* the Holy Spirit continues to encompass (immerse) the Spirit of the apostate child of God *or* the Spirit does not re-encompass (re-immerse) the heart of the apostate when said person is restored.** As the argument is in the form Modus Ponens and is formally valid, the conclusion follows from the premises. As Mac has admitted the truth of the Minor Premise, then the conclusion must be true. Thus, the argument is sound.)

These are the **only two possible conclusions** that can be drawn from Mac's position thus far. (1) If the Spirit continues to envelope the heart of the apostate then He is having direct contact and in that measure **fellowship** (joint participation) **with** the apostate despite his apostasy. Mac states that the Holy Spirit does not abide in his heart in the indwelling, but Mac implies the Spirit does continue to abide around and in contact with it in the immersion of it! The Spirit cannot fellowship the apostate one way but the

Spirit must have fellowship with the apostate in the other according to this strange view. Thus, the Spirit fellowships the apostate by continuing to immerse his heart, but the Spirit does not fellowship him by indwelling his heart. Is Mac willing to accept this conclusion? Now, this means that all of the passages Mac cited to show the Spirit cannot fellowship that which is unholy would have to apply only to the matter of His indwelling. Is Mac willing to accept that consequence?

(2) The other conclusion in the strong disjunctive of the argument is that the Holy Spirit does not re-immerses the heart of the apostate at all. To do so would necessarily re-initiate that which Mac says can occur only “one time in a person’s life.” However, it gets worse for Mac’s theory on this point. This latter conclusion implies further according to Mac’s teaching that **when one is restored after having apostatized** he is no longer “in Spirit” **because he is not encompassed and cannot be re-immersed by the literal essence of the Spirit.** Thus, the person so restored is not “in Christ,” because he is not “in Spirit.” If he is not “in Christ,” then **he is not a member of the Lord’s church** even upon restoration. So, how in the world is he really “restored”? As salvation is “in Christ” (2 Tim. 2:10), then he is a restored person without salvation. Such is absurd!

But Mac, evidently not realizing the quicksand of his explanation, trudges onward:

Denham knows that a faithful Christian can become an unfaithful Christian; so do I (cf. Acts 8:18-24; 2 Tim. 4:9). He knows that a child of God can so sin as to be lost again; so do I (Gal. 5:4). But he ought to know that even a fallen saint is yet a saint; and that a fallen saint cannot become a Christian again because he never ceased being a Christian (1 Cor. 1:2). So again, just how many times can a person become a Christian? One time! (BNQ 16).

Yes, Denham knows these things, but Denham wondered if brother Mac had forgotten them. Yes, indeed, one becomes a Christian once, and then has the right to be restored through re-

pentance and prayer (Acts 8:22). That does not avail Mac here. His problem is to account for where the Spirit is relative to the encompassing of the heart of the unfaithful Christian or the Christian who has so sinned as to be lost. Is the immersing continuing despite it? Or has the immersing ceased? Which is it, brother Mac?



### Yet Another Misrepresentation

Where is the integrity of Mac Deaver? I have detailed the mathematical absurdities involved in Mac's theory that two baptisms (one in water and another in the Spirit) equal the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5. I have also documented his many misuses of Biblical texts, glaring self-contradictions, false implications, and logical fallacies relative to Spirit baptism. In his Spring 2011 BNQ response to my *Defender* article from February 2010, which was but one installment of an entire series dealing with his errors, he claims to have thoroughly rebutted my charges and exposed the weaknesses of my expose.

Yet, over and over again he makes counter charges that are not only wrong, but are founded on his obvious failure to have even read the materials as carefully as he claims to have read them. He charges that I took him out of context, for example, concerning what he claims is a "spliced quotation" pertaining to his theory that Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 provide exceptions to the time-frame on conversion as taught in John 3:5 (cf. the July to September 2011 issues of *Defender* on this theory). There is an obvious intimation by Mac that there was something unscrupulous about the way I handled the statement. I "spliced" it; so, I must have been dishonest in handling it and in my criticism of his position.

However, this so-called "spliced quotation" came from his own **explicit** statements on page 317 of his book. He said concerning "the birth of water and the birth of Spirit" that these "would always occur at approximately the same moment." That statement is in his book; I did not make it up. That he contradicts himself in

his handling of Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 is not my fault. I did not write his book. He wrote it, supposedly even being guided by direct Divine wisdom in doing so. Here is the **precise** sentence from the book: “That is, the birth of water and the birth of Spirit would always occur at approximately the same moment.” Now compare that to my quotation of it: “He speaks of ‘the birth of water and the birth of Spirit,’ and says these ‘would always occur at approximately the same moment’ (317)” (*Defender 2:2011*, 1). The only difference is my documented insertion, “and says these,” which alters the meaning not one whit! The insertion itself is set off by the quote marks used around Mac’s own words showing that “and says these” are my words and not his. The entire sentence which he gave is found in the quotation without any alteration of its syntactic or semantic force. His charge is not only bogus, but outright deceitful!

Mac knows he has been caught in yet another glaring self-contradiction, and he has caught the self-evident force of that self-contradiction. So he trumps up a bogus charge to deflect from his blunder. He blundered in a field upon which he prides himself. He knows that it is not rational to contend that (1) these two actions “always” occur at approximately the same time and then argue that (2) in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19 they did not occur at the same time. Does he not know the meaning of *always*? Where is the master of precision in speech on this? If it **always** is to occur that way, but did not as he claims concerning the 12 apostles and the 120 in Acts 2, the Samaritans in Acts 8, Cornelius and his household in Acts 10, and 12 more disciples in Acts 19, then who messed up? Those are an awful lot of exceptions for the way it **always** is done. Instead of owning up to his own logical blunder, Mac shifts blame to me for daring to expose his folly.

He made his claim pertaining specifically to John 3:3, 5 which antedated the texts in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19. “But as Jesus had plainly affirmed, both elements (water and Spirit) were necessary in order for one to enter the kingdom (John 3:3, 5)” (*The Holy Spirit*, p. 317). Yes, he argues for a transition period between the

two, but he has no text after Acts 19 that shows that the two are to be simultaneous—he has none. He has to go back to John 3:5 to argue for this supposed simultaneity. If John 3:5 meant that they were **always** to be simultaneous, then it would have had to have meant it when Jesus first said it. Thus, Mac destroys his own transition period quibble. That he cannot stand having shown! I have noted in my articles and lectures several times how he has argued for exceptions to this format. I have also pointed out the **inconsistency** of these claims with his use of John 3:5. Mac's doctrine is incoherent; it does not hang together. The problem then is with Mac and his doctrine, and he is the only one who can correct his self-contradiction. He must **either** admit that John 3:5 never taught the two actions were simultaneous, which leaves him with no text describing the process, **or** else reject his doctrine of a transition period in Acts concerning them. He cannot have both as true.

### **More Imprecise True/False Questions**

Also in his Spring 2011 issue of *BNQ*, Mac resorts frequently to imprecise true/false questions to try to do what he has so miserably failed to do through more direct means. Surely, he knows that only a precisely stated proposition is either true or false. Imprecisely stated ones suffer from the fallacy of ambiguity. He needs to rework his statements very carefully and avoid that and other pitfalls.

It is obvious that Mac cannot set forth a basic 3-point argument from John 3:5 demanding the conclusion he urges. It is true that true/false questions are most helpful in defining the parameters of one's case and focusing on and exposing the weaknesses in an opponent's position. This writer has frequently made use of them. I noted earlier a number of them I asked of Mac and his followers in an article in the *Defender* series on his Spirit baptism heresy, which article Mac conveniently and completely ignored. But true/false questions are valuable only **when precisely stated**, because then and only then does the Law of Excluded Middle apply to propositions. Mac knows this as well as anyone. The statements must be **precisely** stated. Most of Mac's questions are

not precisely stated in his article. They often commit fallacies of thought—such as ambiguity, begging the question, and diverting the issue. As such, they prove nothing other than the fact that Mac is resorting to deception to advance his case in such matters.

He gives the following true/false question (or statement): “T F 1. In order for a person to become a Christian, he must receive water and Spirit (**True:** John 3:5; Acts 5:32; John 7:37-39; Eph. 1:13,14)” (BNQ 9). Now, stop and think, folks! Notice that Mac marked this statement as “**True.**” Elsewhere Mac admits that the alien sinner cannot receive the Holy Spirit (cf. John 14:17). Now, he says that he must to become a Christian, i.e., to cease being an alien sinner. The “he” must be an alien sinner: for if he is already a Christian then the statement is absurd. A Christian does not need to become a Christian. He obviously already is one. What Mac means (but does not state) is that the alien sinner must receive Holy Spirit baptism, but according to Mac that entails immersion of the alien sinner’s human spirit into the literal essence of the Holy Spirit. Thus, his doctrine implies that the alien sinner not only can but must receive the Spirit directly and immediately to be saved. It is the alien sinner who needs to become a Christian and thereby cease being an alien sinner, Mac’s ridiculous “non-sinner but not a Christian” theory, as we have previously detailed, notwithstanding.

John 3:5 only shows that water and the Spirit are in some manner involved in the New Birth for one to enter the kingdom. John 3:5 does not teach that one must receive Spirit baptism to enter the kingdom. Mac must read that into the text from somewhere else. The other three passages he cites concern individuals who are already “obedient ones” (Acts 5:32), disciples (John 7:38-39), and members of the Lord’s church (Eph. 1:3-23). They do not deal with the alien sinner, but rather with those who are already in the kingdom (or the church). Remember that Mac said “true” to the true/false statement here. It will come back to bite him in later statements in his article.

His second true/false question (or statement) here is as follows:

T F 2. In some cases of conversion in the book of Acts, if one receives water, but does not receive the Spirit or if one receives the Spirit but does not receive the water, he is still a Christian (False: However, when applied to the Samaritans (who received water but not Spirit for a while) Denham wants to claim that they were Christians, but with regard to Cornelius who received the Holy Spirit before he received baptism in water, Denham thinks he is not a Christian until he receives the water (BNQ 9)!

Again, Mac affirms that the alien sinner (e.g., the Samaritans and Cornelius) had to receive the Spirit to become Christians. Yet elsewhere Mac says that alien sinners cannot receive the Holy Spirit and cites John 14:17 for this conclusion. That Mac cannot see his own self-contradiction is astonishing. But he contradicts himself in his own book. He states expressly: “But I did say that sinners become Christians today by being baptized in both elements” (*The Holy Spirit*, p. 297). What are the elements? Water and the Holy Spirit. So, the sinner must be immersed in the Holy Spirit to become a Christian according to Mac Deaver, but the alien sinner cannot receive the Spirit to do so according to him as well. That leads to yet another quandary for Deaver—the inevitable conclusion that no alien sinner then can ever be saved. He must directly receive the Spirit to be saved, but he cannot do it because he is in the world and not in Christ (John 14:17). Let Mac wrestle with his own predicament here awhile.

Let us now consider, while Mac contemplates his quandary, the supposed dilemma he posits for “Denham.” If Mac states that Cornelius received the Holy Spirit in the same sense as Acts 2:38, which he claims entails the personal indwelling of the Spirit, then he implies that Cornelius had the personal indwelling before obeying the Gospel. Remember Mac equates the gift in Acts 2:38 in every respect with the gift in Acts 10:44-45. However, Cornelius had not yet been baptized for the remission of sins and so still

was in sin at the time. Thus, Mac implies that Cornelius received Spirit baptism to regenerate him while he was still an alien sinner.

Mac contends that Cornelius was a Gentile living under Patriarchy, but that really does not avail his case here, because Cornelius was still in need of salvation which implies that he was a sinner nonetheless. Peter told him “words whereby [he] and all [his] house **shall be saved**” (Acts 11:14). If he needed salvation, what was it from? Obviously, he needed salvation from sin like everyone else (Rom. 3:23). If Cornelius did not need forgiveness of sins, then why was water baptism even needed? Mac has just removed water from the plan of salvation. Baptists and Methodists ought to rejoice over his efforts here!

What Cornelius received was a miraculous demonstration or gift from the Spirit to convince the Jews present that the Gentiles had a right to hear and receive the Gospel as well as they. It no more meant that he was a child of God at that point than Balaam’s ass speaking with a voice of a man proves that he also was a child of God (Num. 22:28).

As concerns the Samaritans, Mac implies that they were not children of God until several days after their baptism in water by Philip. That is brother Mac’s problem, not mine. He is the one with the Samaritans being half born again for several days and poor Philip botching their baptism by not baptizing them “into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

Thus, as I noted, the Samaritans were Christians upon their baptism, and Cornelius and his household were not until their baptism (Acts 10:48). What contradiction is there in that statement? Let Mac pick up and deal with what I have said rather than what he wishes I had said.

### **The Crux of the Matter Relative to Mac’s Doctrine**

After all the falderal over Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, Mac finally comes back to the real focus of his error and the assumption essential to his position. In so doing, he makes yet another blunder and totally negates all of his claims concerning the preceding



texts. He goes back to John 3:5 to try and establish his doctrine. Hear him:

I claim that to be a Christian one has to be immersed in both elements. And if water is an element (the thing to be baptized in) in John 3:5, there is no hermeneutical basis upon which to conclude that Spirit is not equally an element as is the water (see 1 Cor. 12:13 with John 7:37-39) (BNQ 9).

First, no one has denied that the Spirit is an element in the New Birth. I for one have said so repeatedly and taught so for over 35 years now. For one to become a Christian one must be born of water and of the Spirit. That is absolutely true. There is no dispute over that. However, the verb *born* does not mean, “be baptized.”

While water baptism is certainly part of the New Birth, it is not all there is to it. There is more to the New Birth than baptism. The verb *born* is modified by both prepositional phrases. These phrases show some relationship of the parent noun of each phrase to the action of the verb. **It does not tell us what that relationship is.** In fact, Mac would not know what water’s relationship to the New Birth is **except by virtue of other texts** bearing on the subject (e.g., Eph. 5:26). He cannot **by John 3:5 alone** establish immersion in water as the means by which one is born of water. Neither can he extrapolate from that the specific relationship the Holy Spirit has to the New Birth. Again, that must be determined by other texts bearing on the general subject.

As those who obeyed the Gospel in Acts wound up in the church, which is the kingdom of God (Acts 2:47; Mat. 16:18-19; Col. 1:12-13), it must be the case that whatever they did to do so they had to have experienced the New Birth in doing it.

Peter preached the Word of God by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and commanded those who sought a remedy for their sins to repent and be baptized for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38). Does Mac deny any of this? And Mac himself admits that this baptism was in water. I note that Peter “with many other words, did exhort and testify, saying unto them, Save yourselves from

this untoward generation” (Acts 2:40). Those who *obeyed* his message (the force of the Greek idiom translated in the KJV as “gladly received the word”) “were baptized; and there was added unto them about three thousand souls” (2:41). Again, the words that Peter spoke were directly from the Holy Spirit, or will Mac and his followers deny that? There is no mention of them being baptized in the literal element of the Holy Spirit here. There is no mention of Spirit baptism as being involved in their being added by the Lord to the church. There is only a mention of them receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, and Mac cannot prove that such was Spirit baptism. In fact, if he takes that position then he repudiates the text as a promise of the personal indwelling of the Spirit that he differentiates from the baptism of the Spirit. So, let him take his pick which one he will give up here. If he says that the indwelling implies Spirit baptism, then he needs to prove it.

Now, the apostle Paul taught that he had begotten the Corinthians through the preaching of the Gospel (1 Cor. 4:15). If that was true of an apostle through his preaching of the Gospel, then why is not also true concerning the Holy Spirit who inspired him to preach that Gospel? It can be rightly said that those who experience the New Birth are begotten by the Spirit thus through the preaching of the Gospel. It is also not surprising then that the Bible expressly teaches that we are begotten by God through the Word of truth (Jam. 1:18; 1 Peter 1:22-23). This then is the Spirit’s role as one of the elements involved in the New Birth. In summary, we see both elements on Pentecost with the 3000. They heard, believed, and obeyed the Word of the Spirit, wherein is life (John 6:63, 68), and in obeying they were immersed in water for the remission of sins and thus had those sins washed away (Acts 22:16). It is that simple. That is the New Birth succinctly demonstrated on the first Pentecost following the Resurrection of the Lord who made it possible through His atoning blood. Now, brethren compare that simple description of things, which brethren have long understood, held, and taught, with Mac’s messed up and bollixed version that is so self-contradictory that Mac himself cannot even

keep his story straight as to when Spirit baptism is in view and when it is not in view.

By the way, it is in obeying the teachings of the Spirit that one is baptized into the one body as per 1 Corinthians 12:13. Brother Mac needs to address the material we have presented elsewhere in other articles and lectures showing that such is the self-evident force of that text as per Greek syntax. He needs to examine Paul's use of *en pneumati* in his epistles, especially in 1 Corinthians 12 itself. Paul is not using it here of the **element** into which we are baptized, but of the Spirit as **agent** in the baptism. Mac has a tendency of only noticing those arguments that he believes he can poke a hole into and particularly seems to avoid getting into a discussion of the original text when it clearly does not support his theory.

Relative to John 7:37-39, it deals with one who is a disciple (*pisteuon*, literally, "he who keeps on believing," **present active participle**) and so also does not support Mac's theory of Spirit baptism for the alien sinner to enter the church. Or is Mac ready to admit that the alien sinner prior to complete obedience to the Gospel receives the Spirit and has thus "living waters" flowing out of his belly?



### **More Questions from Mac, But More Woes for His Doctrine**

Mac offers a bunch more true/false questions that are assumed by him to establish the truth of his "cleansing first and then regeneration" error, but they really create more problems for him than they are intended to solve.

The second true/false question, for example, actually unstrings his entire case. Mac writes:

T F 2. When a sinner is immersed in water for the remission of sins, following the moment at which he is forgiven of his sins and while he is still under the water, he is regenerated or made spiritually alive again (**True** – Tit. 3:5) (BNQ 11).

He cannot prove from Titus 3:5 that regeneration follows cleansing. He will not (and really cannot) deal with the phrase “the washing of regeneration.” He cannot explain how one can receive the remission of sins without being in Christ (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). For one to receive forgiveness he has to be, therefore, in the kingdom (the church). If he is not, he is still an alien sinner. So, Mac’s statement is false, not true. That destroys his line of argument.

Back in 1999, Mac endorsed the teaching of Bob Berard that the Spirit directly **cleanses and imparts spiritual life to** the heart of the sinner. Bob Berard wrote:

Summarizing, one remains spiritually dead until he is baptized even though he has willingly submitted to the Spirit’s word and was thereby “indwelt” (as some imply) by the Spirit solely by means of the Spirit’s word. The Spirit’s word and man’s submitted will leave man lost in sin until that man is immersed (Acts 22:16). It is in that immersion that God operates in addition to His word according to Colossians 2:12. At baptism (not before by the word alone) spiritual life is attained and this is simultaneously with the Spirit’s personal entrance into the heart (Rom. 8:9; Col. 2:12-13). Since spiritual life is a working of God occurring at baptism (Col. 2:12-13) and since the indwelling Spirit is identified as the Divine Person giving life (John 4:10-14; 7:37-39; Rom. 8; [sic] 11,13). The Holy Spirit is the Person of the Godhead who personally imparts spiritual life in the heart of the person being baptized (BNQ 199/16).

Mac felt so compelled right here to endorse Bob’s new doctrine and explain it *more precisely* that as the editor of BNQ he added the following notation parenthetically:

(If the reader would require even more precision, it could be said that the Holy Spirit changes the heart during baptism [Titus 3:5] and then moves into the heart to take up His indwelling after the heart is cleansed [Gal. 4:6], Editor) (16).

Bob then completed the summary by writing:

This is the personal work of the Spirit done in addition to (but in conjunction with) what He does through His word and this is precisely what is meant by the term “direct” as defined in the introduction of this article (16).

Here Bob and Mac equated the cleansing and the giving of spiritual life (or regeneration) and assigned the action to the direct work of the Holy Spirit on the heart of the alien sinner. Mac said the Spirit cleanses the heart and then moves in. Bob says the Spirit directly imparts spiritual life to the heart of the sinner in addition to and in conjunction with the Word of God. That was in 1999. Bob later applied this work to Holy Spirit baptism without any contradiction or opposition from Mac.

It will also be observed that Mac was using both Colossians 2:12 and Titus 3:5 during those years to affirm a direct operation by the Spirit on the alien sinner’s heart to cleanse him (or impart spiritual life). I pointed this out in material dealing with Bob’s articles. However, now Mac has concocted his absurd doctrine that an accountable person can be a non-sinner without being a Christian to try to extricate himself from the obvious problems confronting his theory on present day Spirit baptism. How many more changes will he make just in responding to these key points?

The text of Colossians 2:13, immediately after verse 12, shows that **the cleansing occurs at the same time as the regeneration**. The text reads: “And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses.” The verb translated “quickened together” (*sunedzopoieesen*) is aorist active indicative and certainly refers to regeneration. It is modified by the participial form “having forgiven,” which in Greek is *charisamenos*. It is an aorist middle participle. It is used here as a circumstantial participle. While aorist participles often (though not exclusively) indicate antecedent action relative to their relationship to the action of the principal verb, also called the main or controlling verb, which would be *sunedzopoieesen* (quickened together), the general rule

does not hold for constructions where the principal verb is also aorist tense, as is the case here. In such cases where the principal verb is aorist and the modifying circumstantial participle is also aorist the action is commonly **simultaneous** or **contemporary** (i.e., the action of each coincides with the other in time and effect) (cf. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 624-625). Handley C. G. Moule, in his analysis of the Greek text, even specifically noted that the action of the forgiving here occurs “at the moment, in the act, of the ‘quickenings’” (*Studies in Colossians and Philemon*, 106).

It is perfectly logical that forgiveness and regeneration (making alive again) should be simultaneous in nature because the reason why one is spiritually dead to begin with is due to the sin he has committed. That is why the Scriptures speak of the alien sinner as “being dead **in his trespasses and sin**” (Eph. 2:1; cf. Col. 2:13, “dead in your sins”). If one’s sins have been forgiven or cleansed then why is he yet dead? His sins have been pardoned and removed. How can his spirit in any meaningful sense still be “tainted”?

Mac’s third question in the *BNQ* article is also utterly disingenuous and reflects his lack of understanding of redemption itself. He asks:

T F 3. Forgiveness and regeneration are identical concepts  
(**False**—Look up the words) (*BNQ* 11).

He needs to deal with the phrase “the washing of regeneration” in the original language, as we have pleaded with him to do. Forgiveness and regeneration are differing terms looking at **the same general action** (namely, salvation) from **two perspectives**. The former, like the term justification, looks at salvation from a strictly **judicial** perspective (i.e., the condition of the saved person as one forgiven or pardoned as opposed to still being guilty of sin). The latter looks at it from a **moral** perspective (i.e., the condition of the saved person now made alive as opposed to being dead in sin). To try to separate the two as utterly distinct actions in

time is patently absurd. Those who have tried to do so tended to be Arminian in theology (e.g., A. T. Robertson). Forgiveness and regeneration are two descriptive depictions of the same process. Mac needs to define the phrase “identical concepts.” Is he referring to the specific definition of each term? Or does he have reference to the process they implicitly describe? Maybe Mac needs a course in semantics, as well as in grammar and syntax.

How can one who is **not** in Christ have forgiveness in the Gospel Age when one **must be** in Christ to even have it (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14)? How can one no longer be dead in sin, which is why he needed regeneration in the first place, when he no longer has any sin in which to be dead (Eph. 2:1; Col. 2:13)? Also, using Mac’s terminology, how can one’s nature remain tainted when that which tainted it has been cleansed?

### **Some Parallel Texts That Trouble Mac’s Theory**

It will be observed that Acts 3:19 parallels Acts 2:38 in structure and promise in its key points. The former reads, “repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” while the latter reads, “repent, and be baptized...for the remission of sins.” Conversion (hence regeneration) is equated with the action of baptism itself, which Mac also admitted concerning Acts 2:38 is water baptism. Thus, conversion (or regeneration) occurs in water baptism at the same time as the remission of sins.

The result of receiving “the gift of the Holy Spirit” or “the times of refreshing” would also be conditioned on the actions of the two verbs in each text by Mac’s own use of Acts 2:38-39. If the baptism in 2:38 is water baptism only, then so is the “be converted” in 3:19 a reference to water baptism only. If there is not involved in the verbs “be baptized” (in 2:38) and “be converted” (in 3:19) any reference then to Spirit baptism, then “the gift of the Holy Spirit” (in 2:38-39) and “the times of refreshing” (in 3:19) are not contingent on one receiving Spirit baptism. Thus, Mac has once more repudiated by implication his own doctrine. It will be recalled that he teaches that the gift of the Holy Spirit is the personal indwelling of the Spirit. If so, then the only baptism upon which it is contin-

gent, according to Mac's own use of Acts 2:38-39, is water baptism. Spirit baptism is then precluded.

Mark 16:16 parallels Acts 2:38 as well. This is a fact that brethren have often noted in debate with denominational preachers and in Gospel sermons. To receive the remission of sins is clearly the same thing as to be saved. That implies that when one receives the remission of sins, he must be "in Christ" or in the church, for that is where not only the remission of sins found (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14) but also where those who are saved are (Acts 2:41, 47; Eph. 5:26). Mark 16:16 shows that Mac's "cleansing first and then regeneration later" doctrine is false.

### **Mac's Questions Resumed and Another Dilemma for Mac**

Mac, however, is undeterred by the problems of his case. Ignoring them, he goes on to his fourth true/false question in this section of his article by writing:

T F 4. A sinner can be regenerated before he is forgiven (**False**—If he could be he would be both spiritually alive and spiritually dead at the same time. God would be making a guilty sinner spiritually alive while still guilty! Denham's unfortunate claim that cleansing and regeneration are identical concepts (his words are: "one in the same") means that he is unintentionally suggesting this impossible situation) (BNQ 11).

Again, the question is based on the either/or fallacy that one of the actions must precede the other. That is simply not so. They can be—and indeed are—simultaneous in nature referring to the same ultimate result which is salvation. That is why Paul said that God "saved us...through the washing of regeneration and renewing by the Holy Spirit" (Tit. 3:5). Note again it is "the washing of regeneration" and not "washing and then regeneration"!

Mac's question also devastates his distinction though he does not catch it. If the individual, where regeneration would precede cleansing, is both spiritually alive and yet spiritually dead in the scenario he gives, why is that so? Is it not because he would still be in his sins, even as Mac points out? Is that not why he is dead



in the first place? Certainly, it is. But, watch it, what if he now has been forgiven and thus has no sins? If he has no sins, then how could he still be spiritually dead? If he is no longer dead in sins, then he must be alive. If not, then why not?

Is it not conceivable that in practical terms **the same act** by which one is forgiven **is the same act that makes him alive**? As there is no longer any sin, then there is obviously no longer any spiritual death. If one is no longer spiritually dead, then, as Mac admits, he must in fact be spiritually alive (he cannot be both at the same time as Mac admits).

### **Mac's Muddled Thinking on Forgiveness**

Mac's confusion here arises from his muddled concept of cleansing itself. Again, Mac believes that man's innate human nature is somehow literally tainted. As man is essentially a moral, spirit being, it would have to be the case that this "taint" literally attaches to either the mind or the spirit of the sinner. What is the nature of this ethereal filth? It would have to be some sort of spiritual substance adhering to the mind or spirit, if it literally exists as Mac claims. This is what, in Bob Berard's thinking, necessitated the Spirit directly contacting the human spirit of the sinner to cleanse thus imparting life. In Mac's present thinking it is what demands the action of Spirit baptism to regenerate by changing this "tainted" nature. The quasi-materialistic impulse of this doctrine, however, is the very essence of its failure. It takes metaphorical language and tries to literalize it.

Where does forgiveness take place on the Divine side to begin with, folks? In the Mind of God, does it not? Is that not **where** also justification (i.e., the **accounting by God** that one is now righteous or in a right relationship with Him and thus now the object of His blessing rather than His wrath) occurs? Again, the answer is: Certainly! Thus, we are talking about essentially **an act of God's will** that occurs **at the time man completes his compliance to the terms of pardon**. What is Mac missing here? What is so difficult for him to grasp as to the relationships of these terms

and concepts to God's action in salvation? Why does Mac not know these things?

### **A False Charge from Mac Answered**

As concerns my supposedly “unfortunate claim,” I explained exactly what I meant by my terms “one in the same” immediately following the phrase. Notice I also said **in the very same paragraph**: “These terms simply look at the **one action** from two perspectives—cleansing and regeneration” (*Defender* 5). It is in that they refer to the same action that they are one in the same. For all practical reasons they are in this respect. How often, brethren, have we compared Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38 and noted that being saved in Mark 16:16 has the same **practical** force as receiving the remission of sins? Has Mac ever done so? Most certainly he has, if he will be honest about it. Why did not Mac point out my expansion on the meaning of the phrase he uses here rather than try to mislead his readers into drawing a conclusion that I obviously did not intend? Again, is the man becoming incapable of telling the truth concerning certain matters?

I even added in the statement from which he clips the misappropriated phrase: “and are tied to the same event.” For one complaining earlier about spliced quotations, why did he clip this phrase out to use while obviously ignoring not only the explanation given bearing on the expression but even the rest of the specific sentence in which the phrase stands? Perhaps, it would be because his readers might realize the self-evident force of a plural verb (“are tied”)—it indicates that at least two items or things are in view.

Further, they might also from the phrase “to the same event” conclude that this is the sense in which I was saying the cleansing and regeneration were “one in the same.” Again, cannot the man be honest about anything pertaining to the subject and his opponents?

## The Remaining Questions In This Section

His fifth and sixth true/false questions are really *non sequitur* to the central issue here, though Mac is going to try to make something from them. It is freely admitted that repentance is required for the validity of one's baptism and that this entails the cessation of sin, but what does this have to do with his case?

His seventh true/false question is where he tries to twist the doctrine of repentance into meaning the alien sinner is now no longer an alien sinner. There is an implication from his question (however, I suspect Mac will not accept it) which crushes his attempt. He writes:

T F 7. In the process of a sinner's becoming a saint, at some point while he is under the water, since he is no longer a practicing sinner and since he is no longer guilty of sin, he is no longer a sinner (**True**) (BNQ 11).

Now, watch his twisting of his question. He states:

Note: If he is not a sinner by practice and if he is not one by guilt, then how can he possibly be a sinner as distinguished from a saint? In baptism, does God forgive the sinner or does he forgive the saint? He forgives the sinner in order that the sinner may become a saint. By forgiveness, he becomes a non-sinner. By regeneration he becomes a new creature which is a Christian (Rom. 6:3, 4; 2 Cor. 5:17) (BNQ 11).

If he is not a sinner, then he is a saint. But if he is a saint, then he is a Christian. Mac seems to miss that point. Mac wants to place the saint between the alien sinner and the Christian. But if he is a saint, then he is already a Christian. It is the church that is said to be sanctified (Eph. 5:26). The church is comprised of Christians. Or is Mac ready to contend that others are sanctified under New Testament law without becoming Christians? Furthermore, one is either in the world or he is in Christ (the church). The forgiven person in the scenario described by Mac, if he is not a Christian, is then not "in Christ" but is still in the world. The Law of Excluded Middle offers no other option for Mac. Additionally, how can

the forgiven person even have forgiveness without having entered into Christ (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14)? Such is self-contradictory.

Certainly, it is the sinner who is being forgiven, but at the point he is forgiven he then becomes a saint and, thus, a Christian. The same washing that cleansed him also sanctified him. Ephesians 5:26 says that we are both **sanctified** and **cleansed** by the washing of water by the word (KJV). Mac admits in his book that this refers to the water baptism part of the one baptism of Ephesians 4:5 which he proposes (*The Holy Spirit*, 321). It should be noted that again we have an aorist main verb (hagiasee) with an aorist circumstantial participle of simultaneous or contemporary action (*katharisas*) in Ephesians 5:26. If he is a saint, then he is in the church, for it is the church (i.e., its members) that is said to have been sanctified in baptism. If he is in the church, then he is in the kingdom, and thus has experienced the New Birth (John 3:5). If he has received the New Birth, then he has been regenerated, and once more Mac's doctrine is defeated. Also, if he is in the church, he is "in Christ," which is where one must be to be a new creature (2 Cor. 5:17). So, Mac is defeated at every point.

Recall the parallel between Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38. If it is the case that salvation is equal to having the remission of sins, then it must be the case that at the point one receives the remission of sins he is saved. If he is saved, then he is in the church where the saved are (Acts 2:47; Eph. 5:23). He is therefore in the kingdom (Mat. 16:18-19), and so has received the New Birth (John 3:5). The forgiven person is a Christian. He thus has been regenerated, and once more Mac's doctrine is defeated.

It will be observed that Mac ignores the need in baptism for one to complete the *tupos* (pattern or form) of doctrine delivered by the apostles concerning the death, burial, **and resurrection** of Christ as mirrored by the act of Bible baptism (cf. Rom. 6:17-18). It will be noted by the careful reader of Romans 6:3-4, cited by Mac in his question, that one must be "raised up" like Christ to "walk in newness of life" to actually complete and comply with the *tupos*. In fact, Mac even adds to the text the necessity for one's

spirit to **remain** submerged in the literal essence of the Holy Spirit as an essentially continuing process, while the text says nothing of that nature. So, Mac takes away an essential part while adding something else to Romans 6:3-4. Can you believe it?



### **The Problem of Time and the Text of Titus 3:5**

Mac tries to extricate himself from the dilemma that he surely perceives by reducing the time distinction between **the cleansing and the regeneration** so he can slip Spirit baptism upon the human spirit of the candidate just after he is forgiven but just before he becomes a Christian. He posits that the person first becomes a saint and then upon regeneration a Christian. That way, Mac seems to think, he evades the charge of a direct operation on an alien sinner. However, a saint does not need regenerating. If he is a saint, as noted above, he is a Christian. Thus, Mac will have to opt for a category somewhere between the alien sinner and the non-Christian saint. However, as we have already noted, there is no such category in between the alien sinner and the saint in the process. He has to invent it and ignore many passages to squeeze this nebulous category in between the two. As noted, he floats this new category on page 14 under the rubric that he could be “a non-sinner who by regeneration is made a saint.” However, Titus 3:5 speaks of “the washing of regeneration.” Again, this is either the washing which regeneration produces, which would naturally entail simultaneous action, or the washing which is regeneration. *The renewing of the Holy Spirit* simply describes this same action in the form of hendiadys, as I have repeatedly noted. Mac cannot answer this! I am persuaded that some of his supporters know this to be the case, even if Mac does not do so. We challenge Mac and them to deal with the original construction rather than making unsubstantiated assertions that syntactically are not only incorrect, but obviously absurd. Titus 3:5 does not read “first the washing and then the regeneration” which Mac’s theory must

logically call for in the construction. Ignoring the obvious, brethren, is not an answer.

Returning to his material in the Spring of 2011 *BNQ* article, we note the following from Mac:

But now note that while conceptually forgiveness must precede regeneration, and regeneration must precede the indwelling, chronologically while they as events appear in due order, the whole process transpires in the blink of the eye while the person is under the water. Conceptually, we must make certain significant distinctions. But forgiveness, regeneration, and indwelling all transpire in a brief moment when the person's body is under the water (*BNQ* 11).

The blink of an eye is indeed quick, but that blink can be the difference between life and death in driving an automobile or in facing the muzzle of a gun. Regardless of however fine Mac wants to pare down the time between the two actions, there is nonetheless implied **a difference in time**. He still has the Spirit contacting directly and immediately the naked spirit of one who is not a Christian and not a saint. Such a one is by definition still in his sins, because he is not in Christ where one receives the remission of sins (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). Mac, like Arminian Baptists seeking to avoid their own dilemmas, tries vainly to reduce the time difference between the direct operation he envisions and the act of salvation. Nevertheless he, like they, still has some minuscule gap of time between them that cannot be bridged. It may as well be a chasm like that between the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:19ff.) for all practical purposes. It is still a direct working of the Spirit on the heart of an alien sinner. As such it is the death-knell to his doctrine. Also, the time would have differed in specific cases according to his own teaching on the subject. In the case of the apostles, for example, it would have lasted for 3 ½ years and for the Samaritans in Acts 8 for several days, if Mac's doctrine were actually true (which it obviously is not).

## The Mac-Ian Art of Missing the Obvious

Mac, after having made a bigger mess, bristles in writing:

Now, in all of that description, where did I imply that the Holy Spirit comes on “the naked heart of the sinner” as charged by Denham? Dear reader, can you find the evidence in the foregoing description of the conversion process that I taught some form of Calvinism? Where did Denham or anyone else ever find the evidence to charge Roy and Mac Daever with being Calvinists or as being “neo-Calvinists” as one reckless antagonist falsely claimed? I deny to the death that we have ever explicitly or implicitly taught Calvinism! And I would remind Denham and his friends that it is a serious matter to become a false accuser (cf. Rev. 21:8; cf. Matt. 26:59-66). And all of those who in their uninformed zeal have taught that we are Calvinists need to be reminded that while it is surely wrong for a man to become a *false teacher*, it is also wrong for one to become a *false accuser*! (BNQ 11).

First, notice again the false canard about Calvinism! Mac is the one who needs to be reminded about the consequences of the sin of lying against others here. Let him show where I accused his father of teaching Calvinism. He cannot find it. Let him find where I taught that his daddy taught Calvinism. He definitely did not present the evidence in the quotes he has given so far. I have specifically set forth the case that he is teaching what John Wesley taught on salvation during his earlier years due to his Anglican roots and the Arminian influence among the Anglicans of his period. Such are not false charges. They are based on historical fact. As N.B. Hardeman often said, “If it walks like a duck, looks like a duck, and quacks like a duck, pardon me if I call it a duck!”

Second, what he is doing is falsely equating the charge of a direct operation on the alien sinner with the charge of teaching raw Calvinism. This is diverting the issue yet again. Arminianism and its perfectionistic step-child Wesleyanism both teach a direct operation on alien sinners. **This is not a false doctrine peculiar to Calvinism.** To imply that it is not only false; it is patently dis-

honest, if the man knows anything of these systems. The brethren at Tennessee Bible College ought to know of these things! Or do they not study Systematic Theology there? What say ye, Malcolm?

Third, Mac pouts over having the unsavory implications of his doctrine tossed at him, but rather than answering them honestly, he smears his opponents with false charges. In his arrogance, the man shows both his abject ignorance and immaturity. One would think that for one claiming to have direct help of the Spirit in organizing his material and making his case that he would avoid such blunders in both logic and manners.



### **Denying Obvious Parallels Does Not Make Them Non-Parallel**

Leaving the impression that he is following along with my line of argument to answer my article in order, Mac now says: “Now let us continue with Denham’s own words” (*BNQ* 11—all quotes from this page). In actuality he has gone back a page or two to pick up on a point of linguistics and language that he had previously chosen to ignore because it strikes at the fundamental structure of John 3:5, the central text upon which he bases his position, and to have done so at the time in keeping with the flow of my article would have placed his response in the midst of the discussion of his supposed transition period texts in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19. This would, as we shall show, have proven quite enlightening to his readers as to how he really is using John 3:5. He is going back and forth between two completely different approaches to the text—each of which is mutually exclusive to the other. The deception was carried out in his book, but would have been made even more obvious in a shorter space. So, what he has done is separate, as best he could, this material on John 3:5 from the discussion on the transition he sees in Acts, as though they have no relevance to one another. The deception, however, does not help him.



Mac depicts the quote he uses from me as “such confusion,” and refers to it as “a mangled mess of ideas!” (BNQ 11). So, let us break down the quote sentence by sentence and see if that is so, or if the confusion is really with Mac. Where is the “mangled mess of ideas” really to be found?

(1) Mac quotes the following from me: “Mac’s error on John 3:5 implicitly takes the construction as **an order of operation** type of construction.” *Order of operation* simply refers to an order of actions that are involved in the syntax **of the sentence or clause** to which the actions belong. What is so difficult or confusing about that?

“Mary went to the store and bought apples” is an example of an order of operation construction. The sentence entails an “order of operation” in that Mary first goes to the store and then (at the store) buys the apples. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16:16). That too is a sentence involving “an order of operation.” One must first believe and then be baptized to be saved. Does Mac dispute any of these as entailing an order of operation?

(2) The next sentence in my statement is: “He is reading the text in this fashion, ‘One must be baptized into water and into the Holy Spirit to enter into the kingdom of God.’” What is so confusing about that observation which is simply based on how Mac has reasoned from John 3:5? If there is confusion, it has to be in Mac’s use of the text to teach both water and Spirit baptism as essential to enter into the kingdom of God.

(3) Then I said: “The problem is this wrongly equates born with baptized.” The sentence simply means that Mac takes *born* to mean “be baptized (in)” when he uses John 3:5. What is confusing about that? Is Mac willing to admit that the verb rendered *born* does not mean, “be baptized”? If so, then we have already made good progress in driving him off his main argument, whether he will acknowledge it or not. While baptism is part of the New Birth, it does not follow that *born* means “be baptized (in),” as Mac’s use implies.

(4) He next quotes me as saying: “While baptism is part of the New Birth, baptism **alone** is not the New Birth.” The New Birth consists of more than being dipped in water. In fact, even prior to Mac’s new doctrine on present-day Spirit baptism, I suspect Mac would not have argued that water baptism alone comprised all that was involved in the New Birth. That is my point. Baptism alone is not all that comprises the New Birth. Again, what is so confusing about that statement? Is faith a part of the New Birth? Is repentance essential to the New Birth? What about confession of Christ?

(5) “The New Birth involves two key elements here—water and the Spirit.” That is pretty self-explanatory as well. I do not state here how the two relate to the action of the verb “born.” I simply note that there are two elements in the text that do. The genitive forms in which they are couched grammatically modify the action of the verb. That is a simple fact. So, where is the “confusion” or the “mangled mess” here, Mac?

(6) Let us move to the next sentence which reads: “The form of construction is the same as that given in John 4:24, where worship is said to be ‘in spirit and in truth.’” This is also a simple statement of fact. The constructions are the same in that we have a verb modified by adverbial phrases. The only difference is that John 3:5 employs the preposition *ex* (or *ek*) with the genitive constituting the phrases “of water...of the Spirit,” while John 4:24 uses the preposition *en* with the dative case, “in spirit...in truth.” In the Greek text of each, one preposition actually governs the two nouns conjointly creating the two phrases in our English translations. The effect is ultimately the same in that the action of the main verb is modified by prepositional phrases that are acting **adverbially**. What does Mac not understand about this point? What is so confusing about it to him? Does he need a refresher course on how adverbs and adverbial phrases function in a sentence? Again, was he not listening when his own Daddy, one of the best Greek students in our lifetime, covered such subjects

in Greek class? Was Mac not paying attention, or is he suffering from selective amnesia?

I suspect that he really does see the significance of my point and feeling the force of the argument, which he cannot answer. It is much easier to dismiss it *a priori* as confusing, a “mangled mess,” etc., rather than actually dealing with the syntax of the constructions.

(7) I then said regarding John 4:24: “Clearly, that is not an order of operation construction.” Again, where is the confusion here? Let Mac show us and engage us on the syntax of the statements. “Jesus is not saying that we,” I went on to say, “must worship first in spirit and then in truth.” First, notice that I “spliced” the “quotation,” and yet did not alter its meaning one whit. Second, this statement is another simple statement of fact. Does Mac deny the statement? Does he believe, teach, and practice that John 4:24 involves an order of operation in which one must first worship in spirit and then worship in truth? Yes or No. If no, then he admits what I am pointing out in the statement. Where is the confusion here?

(8) I then draw the appropriate conclusion demanded by the consideration of the John 4:24 construction, by stating: “Neither is He affirming in John 3:5 that we are to be baptized in water and then in the Spirit.” What is confusing about this, folks? It is another simple statement of fact based on the preceding fact.

(9) So, I said: “That does not follow from the construction.” And it does not! That is another simple statement of fact proven by the example of the construction in John 4:24 where a verb is modified by adverbial phrases.

(10) I conclude: “Yet, Mac acts as though it does (289-299).” That is another statement of fact. He does act as though that is its significance and so employs the text of John 3:5 in his discussion of it in the pages cited. If Mac wants to go on record saying that such is not the case, and that he rejects the uses of John 3:5 as an order of operation construction, then let him say so. Here is his chance to be on record on that point! I suspect that he will

not touch top, bottom, or sides of the matter, however, because to do so would mean to explicitly repudiate his main argument on John 3:5.

Now watch how Mac tries to twist what is so basically simple. He writes:

Dear reader, just where shall I begin in answering such confusion? What a mangled mess of ideas! First, he attempts to deny that the process of conversion is, in fact, an orderly process. The process, per Denham, is not “an order of operation.”

This statement makes me again wonder if Mac can tell the truth about anything. **Where did Denham say that “the process of conversion” is not an “orderly process”?** What Denham said was that there is **not an order of process taught or demanded by the construction of John 3:5!** And there is not. If Mac believes there is, then John 4:24 would also involve the specific order I set out in my comments above, which surely Mac would not accept. I was dealing with the syntactic and semantic structure of John 3:5. I said the construction of John 3:5 is “not an order of operation type of construction.” It is not. That is a simple fact. An order of operation construction entails the use of conjoined **verbs** or **verb forms** (e.g., infinitives, participles). If Mac really knew anything about syntax (whether Greek or English) he would know that. Why conjoined verbs and verb forms? Because that is where the action is expressed! Let brother Mac be honest about the matter and address it as such.

Mac continues his obfuscation of the matter, by next claiming:

Second, he then affirms that conversion is not merely baptism alone (which I take to mean water baptism alone), but he says that the new birth involves “two” key elements—water and Spirit. Now, dear reader, which comes first today? Water or Spirit?

What did I say about his arguing that John 3:5 involves an order of operation? Does he so soon forget that Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19

come after the Lord's teaching in John 3:5? Whatever Mac claims that John 3:5 teaches today it has to have taught when first spoken, and that brings us right back to the force of the syntax of the exceptive clause which **precludes** all of the exceptions to the order of operation he implies is indicated by John 3:5. Now, let us see him extricate himself from this self-contradiction.

Brethren, this is why he separated this material on the order of operation from the fuller discussion of the exceptions in Acts 2, 8, 10, and 19, which he says are not really exceptions. He feels the force of the point and it has hit home despite his attempt to avoid it. Thus he immediately cautions against bringing the case of Cornelius in Acts 10 into the discussion at this point. Why? Because Cornelius received the Spirit **first** and then the water according to Mac's own statements which are reversed from what he says John 3:5 binds upon us today. It does not dawn upon him that John 3:5 was spoken **before** Acts 10:44-48, which then violated his pattern as per John 3:5. If it does, he is conveniently ignoring it and being deceitful about its meaning. Let him tell us whether it is incompetence in handling the chronology of the Bible's teaching or duplicity concerning it as to why he is doing this.

Mac writes:

Don't be confused over the case of Cornelius which case cannot now be duplicated. No one in the world today is in the same situation that Cornelius was in (the case of Cornelius is explained in much detail in our book). Today as in all other cases of conversion in the book of Acts, we see that water comes first, followed by the reception of the Holy Spirit. Will Denham deny this order? No, he will not (*BNQ* 11-12).

Denham does deny that the Spirit is received today as Mac claims as per the 120 in Acts 2, the Samaritans in Acts 8, and the twelve disciples in Acts 19. Denham does deny that Spirit baptism was involved in each of these cases. (By the way, the 120 are not even mentioned in Acts 2. I challenge Mac to show from the original text that **they** received Spirit baptism on the day of

Pentecost in Acts 2. He cannot do so. The original text refutes this silly notion.) Denham does deny that Spirit baptism occurs when the candidate is submerged in the water of water baptism, which is what Mac claims John 3:5 teaches. Again, if it teaches that today, it taught it when first spoken. None of the examples given here fit that teaching. So, unless “except” really does not mean “except,” these cases did not entail Holy Spirit baptism as per his main argument.

# Attempted Arguments for the Deaver Heresy of Present-Day Spirit Baptism

*Daniel Denham*

Marlin Kilpatrick has decided to weigh in on the side of the Mac Deaver doctrine of present-day Holy Spirit baptism by submitting three syllogisms, which he evidently believes establish in concert the truthfulness of Deaver's error. There is some question as to whether Mac himself has endorsed this material as successfully supporting his doctrine. It would be to his benefit not to do so, in that the material is so shot full of logical fallacies and errors that to endorse it would certainly call into even more question his actual command of logic upon which he has so often prided himself. His most recent writings and debate with Ben Vick have done already considerable damage to that image, and another blow of this sort would not only be further damaging, it would also continue the assault on both reason and the Scriptures begun when he determined to go off into this nonsense.

## **Does Mac Endorse Marlin?**

There have been reports that Mac has praised and endorsed Marlin's arguments. If Mac endorses Marlin's syllogisms, perhaps he would be willing to test them in public debate and thus return to the mutually agreed arrangement we had before he pulled the plug on it in his temper-fit a couple of years ago?

All he has to do is contact me or Michael Hatcher saying that he is ready to get back to that and pick up where he left the matter hanging. For the present, however, we shall concentrate on examining the Kilpatrick syllogisms that Marlin, at least, seems to think are so overwhelming in their logical force as to defy refutation.

## **The Arguments Stated**

As noted there are three syllogisms. These are as follows (quoted from Kilpatrick):

### **No. 1**

**If** it is the case that to enter the kingdom one must be “born of water and of the Spirit,” and it is also the case that the apostles entered the kingdom, then the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit.”

### **Proof:**

It is the case that to enter the kingdom one must be “born of water and of the Spirit” (Jno. 3:5) and it is the case that the apostles entered the kingdom. (Acts 2:1-4)

Then, the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit.”

### **No. 2**

**If:** It is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit,” and to enter the kingdom the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit,” then to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” and to be “born of water and of the Spirit” are equivalent terms.

### **Proof:**

To enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit.” (The apostles were converts of John the Baptist who baptized in water Jno. 3:23. [sic] And the apostles were baptized in Spirit by Christ (Lu. 3:16, Matt. 3:11; Acts 2:1-4).

To enter the kingdom one must be “born of water and of the Spirit” (Jno. 3:5).

Then, to be “born of water and of the Spirit” and to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” are equivalent terms.

### **No. 3**

**If:**

- 1) There is only one way into the kingdom. And
- 2) To enter the kingdom one must be “born of water and of the Spirit,” and



3) To be “born of water and of the Spirit” and to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” Are equivalent terms,

Then:

All who enter the kingdom must be baptized in water and in the Spirit.

### **Marlin’s Boast and the Arguments’ Form**

At the close of the three syllogisms, Marlin asserts: “These 3 syllogisms show that to be ‘born of water and of the Spirit’ (Jno. 3:5) is to be Baptized in water and in Holy Spirit; they also show Holy Spirit baptism is not limited to the apostles, else no one other than the apostles can enter the kingdom.” Is such really the case? Are these grandiose claims actually born out by the weight of the argument asserted by brother Kilpatrick? Would Mac add his hearty, “Amen,” to them and ascribe such an accomplishment to their ostensible decisiveness?

The first syllogism really we do not dispute and would freely grant, though the structures of all the forms clearly are awkward and uneven in nature. However, looking beyond the aesthetics of the matter, the real issue is over whether the last two accomplish in concert with the first what Marlin so boldly proclaims. The basic force of the first syllogism is granted. Indeed, if it is necessary for everyone who enters into the kingdom of God (the church) to do so by being “born of water and of the Spirit,” and if the apostles of Christ did so (which they did), then it must most certainly be the case that the apostles were “born of water and of the Holy Spirit.”

Kilpatrick’s chain breaks at the second. In fact, its link is never really even *forged* by Marlin in the fires of logic but is *forged* by means of empty rhetoric. Pardon the pun, but Marlin’s chain is a fraud. It is a sham—having not really been conjoined together here—neither by logic nor by the Scriptures! It is a case of sophistry, pure and simple. Sophistry is the alchemy of words. It is an attempt to couch a weak case in a form that appears on the surface logical and hence reasonable, but it is a sham. What it proffers it does not deliver. What it claims it cannot sustain. What

it professes it cannot establish. In the case of the second syllogism it fails.

First, there is some question as to the validity of the form of the argument. It will be observed that the hypothetical statement comprising the second argument is not fully given in syllogistic form. It is stated as a simple hypothetical with a compound antecedent. This is the form given by Marlin:

**If:** It is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit,” and to enter the kingdom the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit;”  
**then** to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” and to be “born of water and of the Spirit” are equivalent terms.

Now, the fuller, proper form in that of a Modus Ponens structure would be as follows:

Major Premise: If it is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit,” and if it is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit,” then to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” and to be “born of water and of the Spirit” are equivalent terms.

Minor Premise: It is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit,” and it is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were “born of water and of the Spirit.”

Conclusion: Then to be “baptized in water and in the Spirit” and to be “born of water and of the Spirit” are equivalent terms.

Surely Marlin would admit that repentance was just as necessary for the apostles to enter into the kingdom (Luke 13:3, 5). Does it follow from this that it, therefore, must be the case that being baptized in the Holy Spirit is the exact same act as repenting of one’s sins? If not, then why not? What about confessing faith in the Deity of Christ? Again, as the argument seeks to equate all things essential for the apostles to enter into the kingdom, then what about these things? Is “confession” then an equivalent term to “being baptized in water and in the Spirit,” or is confessing Christ the exact same act as being “baptized in water and in the

Spirit”? If not, then the form of the argument fails to assure justification for the conclusion, even if the premises are both true. Its formal validity can be challenged on that salient point. All that can be possibly determined from the stated premises, **if they are true**, would be that “being born of water and of the Spirit” and “being baptized in water and in the Spirit” were both essential for the apostles to enter into the kingdom of God.

Furthermore, the argument really says nothing at all concerning **how** one enters the kingdom today, which is what Kilpatrick is supposedly seeking to prove! The argument cannot then guarantee the conclusion, even if its premises were true (which, of course, they are most certainly not), which conclusion is at the heart of the argument’s purpose. The premises fall far short of what Marlin claims they imply. The conclusion is not really entailed in the premises. The argument has the valid form of Modus Ponens as concerns Classical logic, but in the area of entailment it is woefully lacking.

Those who hold to “material implication” alone for validity might find some minimal comfort in the Modus Ponens form, but the obvious failing of real, logical relevance between the antecedent and its consequent raises red flags to those more discerning. It is counterintuitive to any thinking person to conclude that all actions described as essential for anyone to enter into the kingdom always contemplates the same, singular act as Kilpatrick’s argument presupposes. Now, to be certain, Baptists have long argued that faith and repentance are one in the same act. I have even seen some argue that confession and baptism are one in the same. Does Marlin so contend? Is he willing to accept such a consequence of his own argument that equates these diverse actions? If not, then again why not? If repentance does not equal being baptized in the Spirit, then why does being born of the Spirit do so? That the argument does not genuinely address. It only makes a show of it by oblique reference to the word “Spirit.” Is it at all conceivable that “born of” and “baptized in” are not co-equal? Does Deaver really endorse the kind of shoddy reasoning on Marlin’s part that

assumes what it must genuinely prove? The argument does not guarantee that outcome, even if one were to grant the premises. It is almost like arguing that if the grass is green, then the moon is made of green cheese. There is no real relevance between the antecedent and the consequent in the hypothetical form of Marlin. Neither is there any real relevance between the premises and the conclusion in the argument even stated in Modus Ponens form. The conclusion is not reality entailed in the premises, despite the form.

### **The Second Argument's Complete Failure**

The biggest problem for Marlin's attempt, however, is that the conclusion to the second argument is false. Therefore, the third argument's conclusion, which is dependent upon it, is also false. Here is the second argument again:

#### **No. 2**

**If:** It is the case that to enter the kingdom the apostles were "baptized in water and in the Spirit," and to enter the kingdom the apostles were "born of water and of the Spirit;" then to be "baptized in water and in the Spirit" and to be "born of water and of the Spirit" are equivalent terms.

#### **Proof:**

To enter the kingdom the apostles were "baptized in water and in the Spirit." (The apostles were converts of John the Baptist who baptized in water Jno. 3:23 [sic]. And the apostles were baptized in Spirit by Christ (Lu. 3:16, Matt. 3:11; Acts 2:1-4).

To enter the kingdom one must be "born of water and of the Spirit" (Jno. 3:5).

Then, to be "born of water and of the Spirit" and to be "baptized in water and in the Spirit" are equivalent terms.

It is not the case that "to be **baptized** in water and in the Spirit' and to be **born** of water and of the Spirit' are equivalent terms" (emphasis added). In fact, the argument cannot prove it. The antecedent is false upon which the consequent depends. If Marlin is

to establish the consequent, he must come up with a true antecedent that requires it. The statement that “the apostles were baptized in both water and the Holy Spirit in order to enter the kingdom” is not true. While they **were** baptized *in water* to do so, they were **not** baptized *in the Holy Spirit* for that purpose. The supposed *proof* offered by Marlin does not touch top, bottom, or sides of the matter on this last point!

Here is the proof again:

**Proof:**

To enter the kingdom the apostles were “baptized in water and in the Spirit.” (The apostles were converts of John the Baptist who baptized in water Jno. 3:23 [sic]. And the apostles were baptized in Spirit by Christ (Lu. 3:16, Matt. 3:11; Acts 2:1-4).

While we grant the first sentence, the second is not true. The verses cited to support the statement say nothing at all about the apostles’ entrance into the kingdom being dependent upon their receiving of Spirit baptism. Simply proving they were baptized in the Spirit does not show that the **purpose** of that was **that they would enter the kingdom**. Where is their entrance into the kingdom even found in these texts? Marlin assumes as having already proven what he is obligated to prove for the argument to be a sound argument. He is begging the question. Let him come back and show that the apostles only entered the kingdom once they had been baptized both in water **and in the Holy Spirit**. He cannot do so! The argument is an abject failure!

Here is a dilemma for Marlin to ponder, as he seeks to prove the unproveable here. Mac Deaver has, rightly, affirmed that one must be baptized in water to receive cleansing or the forgiveness of sins. To this we would heartily agree. However, Mac also has wrongly affirmed that one must also be baptized in the Holy Spirit to finally enter into the kingdom or the church. Mac has admitted that the alien sinner cannot receive the Holy Spirit. Mac wrote on page 14 of his special Spring 2011 issue of *Biblical Notes Quarterly* the following:

Note: If this person is forgiven, he is no longer a sinner. If he is not a sinner, he is either (1) already a saint because no longer a sinner or (2) a non-sinner who by regeneration is made a saint.

So, he has concocted this inter-mediate category between alien sinner and Christian that he calls a “saint.” In this supposed inter-mediate state one is a “saint,” having the forgiveness of sins and is no longer an alien sinner, but he is not yet in the kingdom and thus a Christian, a child of God who has thus experienced the New Birth in full. But there are only two realms: either one is in Christ, which is the same as being in the church or kingdom (Eph. 1:20-23; Col. 1:14), or he is in or of the world. The text that Mac cites to prove that the alien sinner cannot receive the Holy Spirit actually says of the Spirit, “Whom **the world** cannot receive” (John 14:17; emphasis added). Marlin needs to tell us whether the “saint” who has not yet received Spirit baptism is still in or of the world. If he says that he is still in or of the world, then he cannot receive the Spirit and so cannot receive Spirit baptism. The doctrine is then dead in the water at that point.

If Marlin says that this “saint” is already in Christ, then he denies his own argument as he implies that the “saint” is already in the kingdom without being baptized in the Holy Spirit. But that is not all he is confronted with here. As the doctrine of Mac Deaver teaches that this “saint” already has the remission of sins, then it is implied that the “saint” is already in Christ, because Paul explicitly says that is where the remission of sins are possessed (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). Will Marlin contradict Paul or Mac on the matter? Mac says that this “saint” is not yet in the kingdom, just as Marlin’s argument seeks to prove, but Paul says that the remission of sins can only be possessed by one who is “in Christ,” or in the kingdom! Will Marlin address this? We shall see. Mac Deaver has steadfastly chosen to ignore the point. Will Marlin show more conviction and courage on this than his mentor? I am not holding my breath. I hate blue face.

### **The Third Argument**

That brings us to the third argument stated previously in Marlin's arsenal for the Deaver doctrine. That argument is totally dependent on the truth of the second. The second provides the bulk of the antecedent to the third, and critical to that antecedent is the proposition that the apostles were baptized in the Spirit to enter the kingdom.

The second argument being false, then Marlin's third argument does not follow and is also false. It is **not** the case that "all who enter the kingdom must be baptized in water and in the Spirit." Marlin's final conclusion is a false proposition.

### **Conclusion**

Brethren, Mac Deaver ought to be ashamed of himself for the division he has created through his false doctrine. Marlin Kilpatrick ought to be ashamed to lend support to such obvious error. Brethren ought to take a stand with elders stopping the mouths of the false teachers pushing this error in their congregations. Gospel preachers ought to buck up and summon the courage to say that this is indeed damnable heresy that Mac and Marlin are foisting upon the Brotherhood. Members ought to leave congregations where this false doctrine is tolerated and fellowshiped. To say that this is not a salvation issue is a monstrous lie that seeks vainly to deny the obvious. If the way in which one enters the kingdom (the church), which is the place where the Lord places all the saved under the New Testament, is not a salvation issue, then, pray tell, what is?

# Weylan Deaver Falsifies His Daddy's Holy Spirit Baptism Doctrine

*Daniel Denham*

Stop the presses! Here is a newsflash concerning Mac Deaver's doctrine that Holy Spirit baptism occurs today and is necessary for one to experience the New Birth! Weylan Deaver, Mac's eldest son, has falsified his daddy's teaching on the subject! More to follow!

Of course, Weylan is completely unaware of the fact that he has done so, as is also his father. For people who pride themselves as logicians, they, in fact, both have missed the clear implications of some of their own teachings elsewhere on the subject of salvation bearing on this newest peccadillo from Mac's furtive mind. Nonetheless it has been done. However, first we must back track a bit to bring everyone up to date on the matter.

## **A Sound Argument on the Falsification of the Deaver Doctrine**

Several months ago I posted on Facebook the following notification on my page for public access:

Mac Deaver's present day Holy Spirit doctrine is falsified by one precisely stated question. True or False. One must be in Christ in the sense of being in the spiritual body of Christ as per Ephesians 1:3 and Ephesians 1:7 in order to receive the remission of sins. Mac teaches that one receives the remission of sins first in water baptism and then is regenerated in order to enter into the spiritual body of Christ, the church, through the baptism of the Holy Spirit. To draw out the point a bit, please consider the following hypothetical argument. If it is the case that the remission of sins can only be received initially at the time one enters into the kingdom (Eph. 1:3, 7), and if it is the case that the time of entering into the kingdom entails the regeneration of said



individual (John 3:3, 5), **then it must be the case that the receiving of the remission of sins by and the regeneration of said person must occur at the same instant.**

The hypothetical statement can be easily set up in a Modus Ponens form syllogism with the statement comprising the Major Premise, the antecedent (the “if” portion, also called the protasis in grammar) comprising the Minor Premise, and the consequent (the “then” portion, also called the apodosis in grammar) comprising the Conclusion. As a Modus Ponens form in classical logic, it would be formally valid. The conclusion then follows. As the texts cited show, the premises would also be true. Thus, the conclusion would be true. The argument then is materially true and thus a sound argument. The conclusion is true, and so Mac’s teaching must be false.

In short, consider: Major Premise: If the Mac Deaver doctrine of present day Holy Spirit baptism is true, then the doctrine that alien sinners receive the remission of sins before and without entering the spiritual body of Christ is true. Minor Premise: The doctrine that alien sinners receive the remission of sins before and without entering the spiritual body of Christ is not true (Eph. 1:3, 7). Conclusion: Therefore, the Mac Deaver doctrine of present day Holy Spirit baptism is not true. This argument is in the form of Modus Tollens and is formally valid. The premises are also true. So the argument is materially true and thus sound! Mac’s doctrine is thoroughly falsified.

As of this writing, Mac has not even attempted to engage logically the sound argument posted above and made available to him through various sources. He really cannot answer it. He has resorted to what has become a standard reply from him on anything he really cannot answer. It is the hackneyed claim that something in the argument is “imprecise.” He will not show why he deems it as “imprecise.” It just is, because he says it is. That is just a dodge. It sounds good in sophistry, but it does not read well in print. Mac knows that a sound argument has been made

against his doctrine, and so does Weylan! This is because they endorsed the very same argument in the writings of one, Thomas B. Warren, as shall be shown! But first let us consider the attempted rebuttal that the phrase is too “imprecise.”

### **Mac Deaver’s Attempted Rebuttal Answered**

One of Mac’s acolytes, Marlin Kilpatrick, was notified of this particular argument against Mac Deaver’s Spirit baptism doctrine. At first, Marlin, to his credit, acknowledged that the argument was very problematic for Mac’s teaching, but then he went to Mac to clear up the problem for him, as Marlin has repeatedly done when the Scriptures and logic clash with the new theories of his mentor. What was the devastating answer that Mac gave to Marlin to clear up his problem? As Marlin quoted him to others, “The phrase ‘in Christ’ is just not precise enough!” The poor apostle Paul, upon whose writings and use of the phrase and its equivalents the argument is based, did not have Mac Deaver to tell him to be more precise. What an amazing condition of things! We have to find out from Mac what Paul really meant to say but, was too imprecise in saying it himself! Mac has already affirmed that Philip messed up in Samaria by not baptizing the Samaritans by expressly saying “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” so that Peter and John had to come all the way from Jerusalem to correct the matter (*Except* 151-162). Now, he implicitly edicts Paul and the Holy Spirit who inspired him for imprecision in his teaching! Can you believe it? But such is the implication of Marlin’s recounting of Mac’s *explanation*. Let them iron it out between them!

Now, to be certain, Mac will claim that the argument’s use is too imprecise, and not Paul’s use, but it will be observed that the argument specifically is based on Paul’s use in Ephesians 1:3, 7. Clearly, these verses use the phrase in an adverbial, locative sense, which means that Paul is locating where “all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places*” (1:3) and “redemption...the forgiveness of sins” (1:7) are to be found. They are “in Christ,” thus meaning they are in His spiritual body, which is the church (1:22-23; Col. 1:18).

One receives these blessings when he is baptized in water into Christ to put Christ on, according to Galatians 3:26-29. Well, that is quite precise in force, is it not? And it is quite easy to grasp! The idea of incorporation into Christ, i.e., His spiritual body, is the significance of this typical Pauline use of the phrase and its equivalents. If one is in Christ, he is in the church. If one is in the church, he is in Christ. *In Him* and *in Whom* used in Ephesians 1 simply reflect the same basic incorporative idea as “in Christ.” This is precisely how the argument employs the phrase and its equivalents. Thus, the claim by Mac is false. The rebuttal fails.

If one is in the Christ and thus in the church, it must be the case that when he enters into Christ he also enters the church. Further, when he enters the church, he necessarily also enters into the kingdom of God, which is the church on earth today (Mat. 16:18-19; Col. 1:12-13). If he is in the kingdom, he, therefore, must also have experienced the New Birth, as that is essential for one to enter into the kingdom of God (John 3:3, 5). One cannot be in the kingdom without having been born again—born of both water and the Spirit. However, Mac admits that when one is first lowered into the water, he receives immediately the remission of sins, even though Mac also contends that such a one is not yet a Christian, despite having the remission of sins, and must then be baptized in the Spirit to be regenerated and thus become a Christian. Mac claims that the man who has remission of sins without being a Christian, a member of the Lord’s church, is a “saint.” He is a “saint” but not a child of God, according to Mac Deaver’s doctrine (“Another Look” 14).

The argument shows, as Ephesians 1:3, 7 teach, that when one receives the remission of sins, he necessarily becomes a child of God because he is now “in Christ” by the same process and at the exact same point in time. When he enters Christ, his sins are forgiven, and vice versa. As a result, he also becomes a child of God “through faith, in Christ Jesus” (Gal. 3:26-29—ASV). The latter phrase is again an adverbial, locative construction telling where one becomes a child of God “through **the** [note the Greek

article] faith” or Gospel system. He receives the blessings pertaining thereto. He is an heir “according to the promise.” So, the Deaver doctrine of present day Holy Spirit baptism to regenerate people as children of God is a false doctrine. Mac cannot answer that, which, I strongly suspect, is one reason he pulled out of the debate. He would have to deny the obvious to hold to his error.

### **Another Problem for Mac Created By His Own Writings**

The position taken by Mac in his 2011 *BNQ* article is also directly contradicted by that taken by him in his first book on the Holy Spirit, which is titled *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy – Basis of Unity)* and published in 2007. On page 301, in describing the process of being baptized in water and then the Spirit, he writes:

As a man’s body is lowered in the water, when it is submerged in the water, the Holy Spirit submerges that man’s human spirit within himself to change his nature. And at the precise moment when God considers that man no longer sinner but now saint, at that precise instant, the regenerating submerging Spirit moves from the outside to the inside of that heart (Tit. 3:5; Gal. 4:6). Less than this we cannot write; more than this we do not know (301).

It will be observed that (1) Mac clearly implied that the Holy Spirit is operating initially on an alien sinner directly and immediately while the sinner’s body is immersed in the water of baptism. That entails a direct, immediate operation of the Spirit on a person who is still in the world as an alien sinner. However, Mac admits that those who are of the world cannot receive the Spirit (John 14:17). He also affirmed here (2) that the reception of forgiveness of sins and the regeneration of one’s human spirit occur at the same “precise instant.” He says that “when God considers that man no longer a sinner but now saint, at that precise instant, the regenerating submerging Spirit moves from the outside to the inside of the heart.” So, there is **no time difference between forgiveness and regeneration according to this statement**. Thus, Mac stands here in direct contradiction with his po-

sition in the *BNQ* article that affirms that the alien sinner is first forgiven or cleansed of sin to become a saint, and then the new saint is immersed in the Spirit to be regenerated and become a child of God—a Christian. (3) Mac implied that he knows that what he has written here in 2007 on this point is the truth and he **cannot write anything less than this** on the matter and be true to it. Yet, within five years his known truth changed, and he is now affirming that one can be a saint first but a Christian later! Simply, amazing!

This metamorphosis in his doctrinal “truth” was necessitated by his realization of the self-contradictions in his prior “truth.” Now, he wishes for us to accept the conclusion of this new “truth,” which he has come to hold. However, he still offers the proviso that even that “truth” may have to change as he comes to greater realizations and new conclusions through his continually receiving new insights directly from the Holy Spirit in his studies of the subject. As he claims this does not entail new information, it must be the case that the Spirit is enhancing his mental capacities with these new enlightenments. But new self-contradictions have arisen, despite such advancement in his brainpower.

Perhaps, it was the realization of this glaring self-contradiction between Mac’s 2007 book and 2011 article that moved him to submarine the debate that we had agreed to hold. At any event, it is clearly a self-contradiction that refutes his doctrine. If he asserts his 2007 teaching stated above is true, then he implies a direct operation on an alien sinner. If he asserts that his 2011 doctrine is true, thus making the distinction between one being a saint and one being a Christian under New Testament law, then he implicitly admits that he taught false doctrine in 2007, of which he has not repented, and really did not know what he claimed to know at that time. It then begs the question: Does he really know that the 2011 doctrine he is teaching is true or do we have to wait for the next evolutionary stage of Mac’s Spirit baptism doctrine to get closer to the truth?

## Works Cited

- Deaver, Mac. *Except One Be Born From Above*. Sheffield, TX: Biblical Notes Publications, 2013.
- - -. "Another Look at New Testament Teaching on Baptism." *Biblical Notes Quarterly*, Spring 2011.
- - -. *The Holy Spirit (Center of Controversy – Basis of Unity)*. Denton, TX: Biblical Notes, 2007.



### Weylan Deaver's Review Of The Warren Book

Now Mac's eldest son, Weylan, has added to his father's discomfiture over the subject—again, unknowingly, but quite effectively and even with his father's tacit approval no less. In fact, Weylan actually falsified his daddy's teaching before I did!

In October 2012, Weylan wrote a review of Thomas B. Warren's book, *The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians*, on behalf of the journal for the Warren Christian Apologetics Center. This review was reprinted in the October 10, 2013 online edition of the *Biblical Notes Quarterly*, which is operated jointly by both Mac and Weylan Deaver. It was obviously approved by Mac Deaver, himself, for republication in his own journal. Thus, in effect, Mac placed his own imprimatur on the observations of Weylan who gave Warren's book and Warren himself a glowing endorsement across the board. Mac by extension also endorsed the teaching of Warren in the book.

But what does that have to do with the falsification of the Deaver doctrine on Holy Spirit baptism? Before I answer that question, we should first note the review by Weylan. Please, read carefully the following:

Thomas B. Warren was a premier Christian philosopher of the twentieth century, and his influence in apologetics is still felt. More than a theologian and philosopher, he was a gospel preacher. And what happened when he turned his logician's mind to the subject of the church was a book

titled *The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians*.

In this case, the title really does say it all, and serves as the book's central thesis. Its focus is neither the existence of God, nor the deity of Christ, but, rather, an all-out defense of the uniqueness of the Lord's church. It is an honor to review, in part because my grandfather, Roy C. Deaver, is one of the preachers to whom the book is dedicated.

As an accomplished debater, Warren knew the power of precision. His terms and propositions are sharply defined. His arguments are cogent and unambiguous. With a rare combination of facts, force and feeling, Warren demonstrates concern for souls while marshaling the muscle of Scripture to wield his thesis with the subtlety of a sledgehammer. Those used to hearing anemic religious claims may be shocked at his vigorous writing, ignited by his understanding of just how high the stakes are: Every reader will spend eternity in heaven or hell, based on his relationship to the church of the New Testament. Warren wrote to win souls, not to entertain.

The book is composed of eleven parts which are divided into thirty-seven brief chapters. It ranges over epistemology, ecclesiology and soteriology. Firing both barrels at the denominational concept of the church, Warren leaves it unable to give more than a dying gasp. With an arsenal of logic and hermeneutics, he operates as a biblical surgeon, severing denominational from divine doctrine, cutting away the cancer of religious creeds, exposing the healthy tissue of a body nourished by Jesus' blood because it is governed by naught but the simple New Testament.

Warren did not intend his thesis be refuted, and this affects the style with which he wrote. His arguments and analysis benefit from verbal precision, repetition, and the inclusion of numerous Scripture citations. Those same qualities can also be tedious (chapter 35 repeats much of chapter 26), but, in this case, with Warren treating a topic so vital to us all, we affirm unhesitatingly that the tedium is worth the

trouble. This is not light reading before bedtime. Nor is it for the spiritually spineless who cannot abide the staunch claims of Scripture. But, for the reader truly interested in discovering or defending the church about which the apostles preached, then this book is a veritable *tour de force* on the composition and uncompromising stance of the church of Christ. Those who agree with Warren will applaud his contribution. Those who disagree will find precious little with which to defend themselves against the relentless case he builds. None will have difficulty seeing exactly where he stands.

One should especially note the following statements (the bolding is mine for emphasis):

1. "Thomas B. Warren was a **premier Christian philosopher** of the twentieth century."
2. "As an accomplished debater, Warren knew **the power of precision.**"
3. "His **terms and propositions** are **sharply defined.**"
4. "His **arguments** are **cogent and unambiguous.**"
5. "With a rare combination of **facts, force and feeling**, Warren demonstrates **concern for souls** while marshaling **the muscle of Scripture** to wield his thesis with the subtlety of a sledge-hammer."
6. "Those used to hearing anemic religious claims may be shocked at his vigorous writing, ignited by his understanding of **just how high the stakes are**: Every reader will **spend eternity in heaven or hell, based on his relationship to the church of the New Testament.**"
7. "Warren wrote to **win souls**, not to entertain."
8. "Firing both barrels **at the denominational concept of the church**, Warren leaves it unable to give more than a **dying gasp.**"
9. "With **an arsenal of logic and hermeneutics**, he operates as a biblical surgeon, **severing denominational from divine doctrine**, cutting away the cancer of religious creeds,



exposing the healthy tissue of a body nourished by Jesus' blood because it is governed by naught but the simple New Testament."

10. "**Warren did not intend his thesis be refuted**, and this affects the style with which he wrote."
11. "**His arguments and analysis benefit from verbal precision, repetition, and the inclusion of numerous Scripture citations.**"
12. "Those same qualities can also be tedious (chapter 35 repeats much of chapter 26), but, in this case, with Warren treating a topic so vital to us all, we affirm unhesitatingly that **the tedium is worth the trouble.**"
13. "This is **not light reading** before bedtime. **Nor is it for the spiritually spineless who cannot abide the staunch claims of Scripture.**"
14. "But, for the reader truly interested in discovering or defending the church...this book is a veritable *tour de force* **on the composition and uncompromising stance of the church of Christ.**"
15. "Those who **agree with Warren** will applaud his contribution."
16. "Those who **disagree will find precious little with which to defend themselves** against the relentless case he builds."
17. "None will have difficulty seeing **exactly where he stands.**"

I fully agree with Weylan's assessment of Brother Warren's book and of Warren himself, but Weylan's ringing endorsement of that book sounds, in actuality, the death knell of the current Deaver doctrine on Spirit baptism. Those who hold to Deaver's theory cannot continue to logically hold to Warren's case that Weylan has so eloquently praised and eulogized. A significant part of the case pertains to the very argument that I posted earlier in this serial on the force of "in Christ" and its equivalents in adverbial, locative constructions.

Weylan has admitted above that Warren's argumentation is **precise, cogent, and unambiguous**. It therefore does not suffer from any logical fallacies or imprecision in its use of terms. *Unambiguous* is a specific, universal denial of any ambiguity in argument from Tom Warren in the book. Brother Warren is therefore, according to Weylan's review and Mac's tacit endorsement of said review, not guilty of the fallacy of **ambiguity of amphiboly**, which is the basic charge that Mac has leveled against my argument posted in the first installment in this series of articles.

Weylan states clearly that Warren's use of terms and his arguments entail "verbal precision" and are supported by "numerous Scripture citations," with which Weylan obviously agrees as demonstrating the Biblical basis for the Warren's case in the thesis. In effect, Weylan has admitted that Warren taught the truth about each of the matters he discusses clearly, precisely, and without any equivocation.

### **Thomas B. Warren's Argument Decimates The Deaver Doctrine On Holy Spirit Baptism**

On page 147 of his book, Tom Warren wrote:

The Bible teaches that *salvation is in Christ* (II Tim. 2:10). To be in Christ is to be in His church (Gal. 3:26-27; I Cor. 12:13; Mk. 16:15-16; Acts 2:38; Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7; et al.). The Bible teaches that it is *impossible* for one to "*cross the line*" into *salvation* without "*crossing the line*" into *Christ*. The Bible also teaches that it is impossible for one to "*cross the line*" into Christ without "*crossing the line*" into the *church*.

This is simply a statement of the same argument in other terms than what I used in showing the falsity of the teaching of Mac Deaver on present-day Holy Spirit baptism as shown above. Brother Warren equated being "in Christ" with being "in the church," the body of Christ. It will be observed also that he cited Ephesians 1:7 as a text involved in proving that precise point. Again, Weylan noted how precisely stated the arguments of Brother Warren are, and indeed he is correct in that, but he

clearly failed to see that very point refutes his own father's and his teaching on present-day Spirit baptism! When one receives the remission of sins, at that same, precise time he enters into the church (the kingdom, Mat. 16:18-19) becoming a child of God. Cleansing, as I have contended all along, then does not precede regeneration, but the two are simultaneous in nature. It is indeed "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit" or "the washing produced by regeneration, even the renewing of the Holy Spirit" as Titus 3:5 affirms in the genitive chain it employs. Mac has never addressed that construction in the original text, and, I strongly suspect, he never shall. The Greek construction does not fit his theory, and he knows it.

Warren is not done relative to the locative use of "in Christ" and its equivalents. He adds on pages 152-153:

(11) I know that *the Bible teaches* that when a man obeys the gospel (being baptized, as a penitent believer in Christ, in the name of Christ) he enters Christ and—at the very same moment (not *before* or *after*)—becomes a child of God, becomes a Christian, becomes a member of the church of Christ (see: Acts 2:38; Rom. 6:3-5; Gal. 3:26-27; Acts 2:41, 47; Eph. 2:13-16; cf. Acts 11:26; et al.).

So, Warren affirmed that he knew that at the same precise point in time one receives the remission of sins he also enters into Christ and becomes a child of God, a Christian and a member of the church of Christ. That leaves no room for "the first a saint and then a Christian" theory of Mac Deaver. One becomes both a saint, one forgiven of sins, and a Christian at the exact same time. Thus, cleansing does not precede regeneration. They are simultaneous in nature, as I have consistently affirmed. It is astonishing that neither Mac nor Weylan have realized this simple fact affirmed by Thomas B. Warren in his precisely stated and argued book! I stand where Warren stood on the subject. Mac and Weylan have left that position to affirm their Spirit baptism heresy.

The evidence of Warren against Mac Deaverism is not yet complete even here. He notes at the bottom of page 153:

(20) I know that *the Bible teaches* that salvation is in Christ (II Tim. 2:10).

(21) I know that *the Bible teaches* that to be in Christ is to be in His body, the church (see above).

Warren showed no hesitancy, no vacillation, and no confusion on the matter. He clearly is affirming here the same basic point I have made in refuting the current teaching of Mac and Weylan Deaver on present-day Holy Spirit baptism. It should also be noted that the comments thus far cited from Brother Warren were made in chapter 26, a chapter specifically cited by Weylan in his review as one that was well worth reading and studying along with chapter 35 that repeats much of the same basic argumentation. Obviously, Weylan did not pay attention to either chapter nearly as intently as he affirms he did, or else he was pandering to those who greatly respected the work of Brother Warren in the book and are in agreement with that work, as though he too were in full agreement, when in fact he is not. Maybe, he will tell us which was the case, if he ever determines to respond to this material.

### **Works Cited**

Deaver, Weylan. "Book Review: The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians." *Biblical Notes Quarterly*. Oct. 10, 2013. Mar. 13, 2014. <<http://biblicalnotes.com/2013/10/10/book-review-the-bible-only-makes-christians-only-and-the-only-christians/>>.

Warren, Thomas B. *The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians*. Jonesboro, AR: National Christian Press, 1986.



### **Further Evidence from Warren**

In chapter 35 of Thomas B. Warren's book *The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians*, the discomfiture for Mac Deaverism on Spirit baptism becomes even more acute, as Brother Warren sets out his case in more detail relative to the

locative use of the phrase “in Christ” and its equivalents. On page 204, he notes:

There are those today who claim that the Bible teaches there are *Christians* who are *not* members of the *church of Christ*. But I have no hesitation in affirming that the *Bible teaches* that *every* person who is a *Christian* is a member of the church of Christ. This means, obviously, that I am affirming that the *Bible teaches* that there are *no* Christians who are *not* members of the church of Christ. The church of Christ is the body of Christ (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18). The *saved* are those who have been reconciled unto God, and those who have been *reconciled* unto God are members of the *body* (church) of Christ (Eph. 2:13-18). The matter is really just that simple, but in the light of the importance of the matter, let us say a bit more about it.

It will be observed that Warren has affirmed that to be “in Christ” is to be in the body of Christ. He has also affirmed that the body of Christ is the church of Christ. He affirms elsewhere that the church of Christ is also the same institution known as the kingdom of God. He affirmed that when one enters into Christ he instantly becomes a child of God, a Christian, and a member of the body of Christ, which is the church. He just as clearly has affirmed also that salvation is only “in Christ” and thus in His spiritual body, the church. Among the texts he has utilized are Ephesians 1:7 that teaches that forgiveness is in Christ and Acts 2:38, which text shows that forgiveness is received by virtue of baptism in water for that very purpose. He has equated receiving the remission of sin with being saved. This is the same argument that I have made in falsifying the Mac Deaver doctrine of present-day Holy Spirit baptism, which Mac claimed was too imprecise. But Weylan, with Mac’s tacit approval, has endorsed Warren’s argumentation, which is the exact same thing I have presented, as being precise, cogent, and unambiguous. Do I hear the dying gasp of the Deaver doctrine coming across the prairie from Sheffield, Texas?

Yes, indeed, Thomas B. Warren knew “the power of precision,” which is why I made an argument falsifying Mac’s Spirit baptism heresy **using the same argument** that Warren made against the errors of Rubel Shelly and his compatriots, which is the historical background for his book. The argument refutes a lot of false doctrines, including the current teaching of Mac and Weylan Deaver on Holy Spirit baptism. Mac and Weylan simply have not grasped that fact, as yet.

Brother Warren is still not done in making his case, and so immediately adds:

The Bible teaches that *salvation* is in Christ (II Tim. 2:10). To be in Christ is to be in His church (Gal. 3:26-27; I Cor. 12:13; Mk. 16:15-16; Acts 20:28; Eph. 1:7; et al.). The Bible teaches that it is *impossible* for one to “*cross the line*” into *salvation* without “*crossing the line*” into *Christ*. The Bible also teaches that it is impossible for one to “*cross the line*” into Christ without “*crossing the line*” into the church (204).

On pages 208-209 he states that he is, among other things, affirming the following:

(11) that *the Bible teaches* that when a man obeys the gospel (being baptized, as a penitent believer in Christ, in the name of Christ) he enters Christ and—**at the very same moment (not before or after)**—becomes a child of God, becomes a Christian, becomes a member of the church of Christ.

(12) that *the Bible teaches* that the church of Christ is the body of Christ.

(13) that *the Bible teaches* that the body of Christ is the church of Christ.

(14) that *the Bible teaches* that there is *one* body.

(15) that *the Bible teaches* that there is *only* one body with God’s approval.

(16) that *the Bible teaches* that there is *one*—and *only* one church—of which God approves (that is, the church for

which Jesus died and shed His blood—the church which He purchased with His own blood.

(17) that *the Bible teaches* that every saved person now living on earth is a member of the church of Christ.

(18) that *the Bible teaches* that reconciliation unto God is in the one body, the one church (the church of Christ).

(19) that *the Bible teaches* that since no one can be saved apart from the shed blood of Jesus Christ and that, since the church has been purchased by the blood of Christ, **no one living today can be saved from his sins without becoming a member of the church of Christ.**

(20) that *the Bible teaches* that salvation is in Christ.

(21) that *the Bible teaches* that to be in Christ is to be in His body, the church [*italics in the original, bold added*].

Warren affirmed that salvation from sin entailed one becoming a child of God and entering into the church “at the very same moment (not **before** or **after**).” He stated precisely that “no one living today can be saved from his sins”—that refers to cleansing, forgiveness of sins—“without becoming a member of the church of Christ.” That refers to regeneration—to becoming a child of God, a Christian. The two actions—cleansing and regeneration—occur then simultaneously, according to the teaching of Thomas B. Warren, which teaching Weylan Deaver, with his daddy’s tacit permission, endorsed as precise, cogent, and unambiguous.

### Warren on Baptism

On pages 81-82 in chapter 16, Brother Warren describes what occurs in the process of salvation and especially in water baptism. He writes:

One must *hear* the word, he must *believe*, he must *repent*, he must *confess* Jesus as Lord, and he must be *baptized*. It is at *this* point of his obedience that man obtains or receives the remission of his sins. The believer is to be baptized “*unto the remission of sins*” (Acts 2:38). He is to be baptized that his sins may be washed away (Acts 22:16). He is to be bap-

tized in order to enter Christ (where salvation is, II Tim. 2:10, where he becomes a *new* creature, II Cor. 5:17), Romans 6:3; Galatians 3:26,27. This fact having been clearly established, wherever (in the New Covenant) a believer is spoken of being saved, that believer must be understood as being a *baptized* believer (Mark 16:16).

Then in a conclusion to the chapter, he is emphatic:

Let no man claim God's promised blessing of salvation until he has obeyed the Gospel (Rom. 6:17,18; II Thess. 1:7-9). Let no believer claim remission of sins before he has been baptized into Christ. To do so is to delude oneself (Matt. 7:21; Prov. 16:25).

Brother Warren viewed the process of baptism as a seamless act in which one is simultaneously cleansed of his sins and regenerated as a new creature, a child of God in the spiritual body of Jesus Christ. There is no doubt of that from his book.

### **A Child of God or A Child of the Devil**

Warren also argued quite cogently that every accountable person is either a child of the devil or a child of God. That argument is a strong disjunctive and does not admit of a third category as envisioned by Mac Deaver, when he contends that between these two categories is a third which entails individuals who are saints (and thus no longer alien sinners or children of the devil) but not yet Christians (and thus not yet children of God). Deaver's contention was necessitated by two things in his current belief system: (1) his assumption that cleansing precedes and is distinct from regeneration, and (2) an effort to avoid the obviously false conclusion that there must be a direct operation of the Spirit upon the heart of the alien sinner (child of the devil) to regenerate him. As we have already seen, Warren refutes the first point—the assumption that cleansing precedes regeneration and is distinct from it—by showing that at the very moment one is cleansed he becomes a child of God and so is regenerated.

In chapter 17, Warren, writing on “God's law of inclusion” relative to who is a child of God, makes the following observation:



2. *God's law of inclusion briefly explained.* Every person who has reached the age of accountability is either a *child of God* or a *child of the devil* (cf.: Eph. 2:1-3; Gal. 3:26-27; John 1:11-13). An "*alien sinner*" is one who is still a child of the devil; he has not yet become a child of God. The alien sinner comes into *fellowship* with God at that point in his life when he actually becomes a child of God—*not* merely when he thinks he has become a child of God (85).

There is no third category that lies between one being a child of the devil and a child of God, according to this argument by Thomas B. Warren. It is false then to conclude, according to this argument, that one first becomes a saint and then a Christian. Rather one becomes a saint and a Christian at the same exact point in time, because all New Testament saints are Christians, i.e., children of God. It is absurd to affirm that an accountable human being on earth today can be a saint under New Testament law without being a child of God also. Yet, that is what Mac Deaver is precisely affirming, contrary to the teaching of Warren, which teaching has been implicitly endorsed by Mac's eldest son, Weylan Deaver.

In 1954, Tom Warren engaged in a written debate with E. C. Fuqua on the subject of divorce and remarriage in which debate Fuqua affirmed that alien sinners (non-Christians) were not amenable to the law of Christ (the New Testament). In arguing his case against Fuqua's error, Warren presented a version of this same strong disjunctive argument excluding a third category. He argued that all accountable persons are either "in the world" (in the sense, they are of the world and still in sin) or "in the church." There is no middle ground. There is no halfway point. The law of excluded middle holds that one is either a Christian or not a Christian. He cannot be both in the same sense, at the same time, and in all of the same relationships. Otherwise one would be affirming a self-contradiction, if he contended that a person is a Christian and yet not a Christian at the same time under such conditions. The law of non-contradiction, upon which the law of

excluded middle is based, will simply not permit both propositions to be true in that way. As Warren, in making certain observations concerning Fuqua's own teaching relative to salvation and applying that teaching to divorce and remarriage, notes:

In my last article, I used *Fuqua's very own argument* to show that one remains *in the World* until *baptized into Christ*. I will here repeat a part of that argument. Remember, I am quoting from *E.C. Fuqua* (and giving my "Amen" to it): "To be in the world is to be out of Christ—out of the family of God. To be in the church is to be *out* of the World—saved from the destiny of the World. The line of demarcation is crossed in baptism, for we are 'baptized *into*' the Church (which is the body of Christ); and baptism has the significance to taking a person *out* of one condition and *into* another. In baptism we die to the world; are then 'buried in baptism,' and from that burial raised to walk in the new life in Christ. (Rom. 6:1-5; Col. 2:12). Therefore, until one is 'baptized into Christ' he is still in the World—and lost." (Nov., 1953, p. 2 of the *Vindicator*). Now, Bro. Fuqua, you wrote the truth in November, 1953! It was a *bitter pill* for sectarians on the plan of salvation and worship and it is a *bitter pill for you on "marriage."* Fuqua, you ought to be a "man" and renounce what you wrote here if you insist on holding your *present* position. *You cannot hold to both!* We are either in the world or in the church! (73-74).

Ironically, brethren, Mac Deaver, as Warren does here, has argued the same point on marriage in Mac's own debates with various false teachers who have affirmed that alien sinners are not amenable to the law of Christ. But he has done in reverse on the subject of salvation the same thing that Fuqua did on marriage to try to extricate himself from his own self-created dilemma. He invented a third category between one being in or of the world and being in Christ or the church. In each case the new category was devised to avoid the obvious. As Warren called upon Fuqua to be a "man" and renounce his error on marriage, we now call upon Mac Deaver to be a "man" and renounce his error on salva-

tion. He needs to give up the false doctrine of Holy Spirit baptism as necessary to one's salvation. He cannot have it both ways. He cannot affirm there are only two categories relative to marriage as to accountability and so on, but three relative to salvation. He is caught in a vivid and vicious self-contradiction. He either needs to give up his current error on Holy Spirit baptism or else apologize to those whom he has debated on the subject of divorce and remarriage.

### **Conclusion**

Thomas B. Warren, who was indeed precise in his writing of this book, is directly at odds with the teaching of Mac and Weylan Deaver, as well as Glenn Jobe, Marlin Kilpatrick, and Michael Hildreth, in this matter. Weylan's endorsement of the book shows that they either have not realized the self-contradiction in which they find themselves or they do not care anything about their logical plight and desire only to spread their theories at all cost, even if it means recognizing the work of a beloved and deceased mentor who would be appalled at where they really are in their teaching today on these very matters.

We call upon Mac and Weylan Deaver, as well as their followers, to repent of their false teachings and come back to the firm ground their mentor, Thomas B. Warren, held when he wrote this great book with such "power of precision," as Weylan himself noted. It is certainly the case, brethren, that Thomas B. Warren did not hold—and never did hold as a Gospel preacher—the doctrine of present-day Holy Spirit baptism for salvation. He rejected it firmly. His book does not affirm it, but rather implicitly refutes it. Weylan Deaver's own endorsement of Warren's book just as implicitly falsifies his father's false doctrine, whether Weylan (and Mac's followers) will admit it or not. It also does so with the tacit approval of Mac Deaver himself, whether Mac will admit it or not.

Sad it is when two men, Mac and Weylan Deaver, who were once known for their command of logic, must be lectured by a former student in the same field of their father and grandfather

respectively on matters that they ought to know so well and indeed formerly did! I pray that they will return to the truth and give up the absurd, self-contradictory position in which they have placed themselves.

### **Works Cited**

Warren, Thomas B. *The Bible Only Makes Christians Only and the Only Christians*. Jonesboro, AR: National Christian Press, 1986.

Warren, Thomas B. and E. C. Fuqua. *Divorce and Remarriage: Are Non-Christians Amenable to the Law of Christ?* Jonesboro, AR: National Christian Press, rpt.