

A REVIEW OF THE DEEVER-FOX DEBATE

Part 1

Inasmuch as I have been requested to review the Deaver – Fox Debate I gladly accept. The disputants, Mac Deaver and Marion R Fox, are ministers for the church of Christ. The arrangement for a discussion on the indwelling of the Holy Spirit was the consequent of opposing views. I mention this in the beginning of this review to impact upon the mind of the readers that when any two men hold opposing views it is not possible that both are correct. Thus, it becomes the responsibility of all readers to decide *if either* opponent has assembled enough evidence to substantiate his conviction. The reason I say *either*, and I do not say *which*, is because there are three possible outcomes on any particular subject wherein two disputants hold opposing views. The diligent reader must recognize this principle if he is to gain the greater good from such a discussion. Before adequate data is presented to the observer there is the possibility that disputant A is correct and disputant B is incorrect. Likewise it is possible that disputant B is correct and disputant A is in error. Last, it is possible that neither disputant A nor disputant B is correct. The reader should be aware that it is never possible that advocates of opposing views are both correct.

The proposition of this discussion was written and signed by both disputants. The proposition is **The Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian only through the Word of God.** This allows for greater clarity of the subject matter. Both disputants, Mac Deaver and Marion Fox, are acquainted with logical procedure. When men are trained in logical procedure and engage in a discussion wherein precise formal logic is applied, then the rules of engagement are quite clear. Each disputant has the responsibility to present his arguments while in the affirmative, and when in the negative he is obligated to attack the premises of the affirmative speaker. When a disputant is unable to answer an affirmative speaker, he may admit ignorance, default the remainder of the discussion, or endeavor to distract the audience. It is a sure sign that a disputant is on the run, and unable to answer an affirmative speaker, when he fails to respond to a precisely stated argument. A negative respondent must tear down the argument of the affirmative speaker. For example, if an affirmative speaker introduces a syllogism it becomes the negative speaker's responsibility to falsify one of the premises or the conclusion of the argument →

- A All birds are creatures that can fly
- B The sparrow is a bird
- C Therefore the sparrow is a creature that can fly

On the surface this syllogism may seem to demonstrate proof in behalf of the affirmative. If the negative speaker is unable to answer he may distract the audience, be extremely verbose, and never specifically address a perceived fault in one of the premises. One who has studied birds however may direct attention to a fallacy in the major premise. The dodo is a bird that cannot fly. In order to draw the conclusion that a sparrow can fly one would have to introduce more data than what is found in the major premise.

What shall we look for as we read this discussion? We shall look for detail in the negative speaker. We shall look for argumentation from affirmative speakers which will present the evidence within the domain in which it is found.

When one cannot answer his adversary's questions it may be due to ignorance of his opponent's position, but when one contradicts premises he himself has previously espoused he brings doubt upon his position. At this juncture let us depart to review the discussion at hand.

Fox, in his first affirmative, is thorough in defining the word “dwell.” He presents his case without ambiguity. Dwell, according to Fox means to reign, to have dominion, or rule. The question we must ask; “Will Fox be able to consistently maintain this view?” If he has incorrectly defined the word “dwell,” it should be apparent as he continues his argumentation. According to Fox “the dwelling of sin in man denotes its dominion over him.” (p. 3, Chart 37) Fox continues this line of thinking and brings greater clarity to his position by saying, “Sin dwelling in one is equated to sin reigning, having dominion, working and influencing...” (p. 5) The reader may ask why Fox has labored to convince others that the expression “sin dwelling in a person” is to be understood as “sin having dominion or ruling?” Fox answers this question by applying the same terminology to the Holy Spirit. Fox claims that “When the Holy dwells in us, it is merely the Holy Spirit reigning, having dominion, working or influencing by means of His word.” (p. 5, last paragraph) Next, Fox claims that God “operates in harmony with the principle of parsimony” (p.7, 2nd paragraph) Mac Deaver agrees. Here the reader needs to take special note. Remember that when disputants take opposing views both views cannot be correct. One of these two men should not believe in parsimony. Deaver and Fox agree “There is nothing that God does that is unnecessary” (bottom p. 7, see chart 46).

Fox presents two logical arguments on page 9. The inquiring reader needs to examine these arguments, impress them upon his mind, and investigate the negative respondent to see if he provides a detailed negation. Will Deaver dissect and negate the major premise, the minor, or the conclusion? Fox’s arguments are as follows →

Major Premise: All things that pertain to life and godliness are things that come through knowledge (II Pet. 1:3).

Minor Premise: The mode of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that pertains to life and godliness.

Conclusion: The mode of the influence of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that comes through knowledge.

What the reader should look for from the negative respondent, Deaver, is an argument that negates one of these three statements. Please keep in mind that it is the sum of these three statements that constitute the argument. The validity of this first argument is easily seen, even by those unacquainted with logical process. But is the argument sound? Will Deaver, the negative respondent, be able to find a flaw in the major premise? If he is doing his job well as a negative speaker then he will directly reference this argument and tear it down.

Fox’s second argument is as follows →

Major Premise: All good works are things that are furnished by the Scriptures (II Timothy 3:16-17).

Minor Premise: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a good work.

Conclusion: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that is furnished by the Scriptures.

The negative position has a responsibility to answer these arguments.

Fox believes he perceives an early contradiction in Deaver's teaching. Fox points to Chart 48 (p. 10) making specific mention that Deaver says: "I am willing to contend that the Holy Spirit personally strengthens the faithful child of God." (Mac's response)

Fox also points out that Deaver agrees that: "Conviction is a thing that the Holy Spirit does only through the word of God" (p. 11, line 12). Many arguments are offered by the affirmative speaker. If the affirmative speaker has made a legitimate case the negative speaker will either concede the discussion, or he will run from the issue, refuse to refer to the arguments, and use most of his time in the negative speaking of other things. From the wide array of arguments offered by the affirmative, Fox, the following conclusions were concisely derived from precisely stated premises →

1 All things that both the Holy Spirit and the Word of God do are things that the Holy Spirit does only through the Word of God (p. 12).

2 All things that are attributed to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit are things that the Holy Spirit does only through the Word of God (p. 13).

3 Conviction is a thing that the Holy Spirit does only through the Word of God (p. 16).

4 The Holy Spirit works only through the Scriptures to accomplish what the Scriptures are said (by God) to do (p. 17).

These four conclusions are not all the conclusions offered by the affirmative speaker. Fox also made an argument, not in precise form, concerning the ablative case, and its application to Joel's prophecy. Fox contends that the Holy Spirit Himself was not literally poured out according to the language employed by Peter on the day of Pentecost. Peter quoted the prophet Joel and said, "I will pour out of my Spirit." Fox points out that the verse does not say "I will pour out my Spirit." This is an interesting point by Fox. The grammatical construction in the Greek is ablative as he claims. Also I find it interesting that even in the English the verse does not say "I will pour out my Spirit." To give further validation of his claim he refers to W. H. Davis. I find the arguments given by Fox to be forceful. He has done an excellent job presenting his case with clarity. He is an open target for the negative speaker if his position is flawed. His position is expressed in a fashion that is honorable for anyone desiring to be associated with the term logic. This in and of itself does not imply that his position is correct. However if his position is flawed it is the responsibility of the negative speaker, Deaver, to expose his fallacy. Since Deaver is likewise one experienced in logic he will attack any faulty premises of the affirmative speaker. Do such fallacies exist? Let us turn to Deaver as he assists us in finding the error of the affirmative speaker.

Deaver now has the privilege to falsify the definition stipulated by the affirmative speaker. The question is: "Did Fox improperly define the word dwell as it is found in the scripture?" In order to falsify Fox's definition Deaver claims that: "Before baptism, sin is not reigning in the sense now of having dominion or ruling, in the sense of my submission, because as a believer who has repented of sin, I have said in my heart, 'I am not going to let sin have its way with me again.'" (p. 24). While reading these words I couldn't help but ask myself if the believer who has not repented is under the rule or dominion of sin; and if the penitent un-baptized believer is under the rule or dominion of sin? Deaver goes on to say, "So if the dwelling is the ruling and the reigning, you see, in that sense, it stops prior to one's becoming a Christian." At this juncture it is apparent that the negative speaker, Deaver, is struggling to deal with Fox's affirmative argumentation. He is struggling with Fox's definition of the word "dwell." Does Deaver write a

syllogism or offer a major premise to negate Fox's definition? Does he offer a precise argument to substantiate that sin ceases to reign at the point of belief? From a logicians point of view Deaver is wasting valuable time rambling. I endeavored to follow the negative speaker's line of reasoning with great difficulty. Is he affirming that sin is no longer ruling over a man once he believes? The fallacy of the negative speaker on this point is that he fails to recognize the point of demarcation. He seems to think that Fox has implied that the dwelling of the Spirit is equivalent to a person responding to a part of the plan of salvation. He has erected a straw man. He then beats the straw man to death leaving the impression on the non-critical reader that he has destroyed the argumentation of the affirmative speaker. If he had the ability to destroy the argumentation of the affirmative speaker then why not write an argument in precise form? Logically speaking Deaver fails to understand that if the consequences of sin are ruling, then sin is ruling. If one chooses to believe in Christ and is never baptized, the consequences of sin continue to rule his life. Deaver continues this line of argumentation by saying, "then, if that is the sense of 'dwell' and 'dominion' and all of that, then the Holy Spirit indwells the child of the Devil in a penitent state, a penitent having confessed believing state, before he is a member of the Lord's church" (p. 24, 25). This is merely a continuation of the straw man distraction from the real issue. What is the point of demarcation? The negative speaker has the obligation to show the logical connection between dwelling and obeying a component of the salvation plan. In order to negate Fox's argument, or definition of the word dwell, the negative speaker must logically show where Fox's definition implies that a person who has obeyed a component part of the salvation plan has the Spirit dwelling in him. The negative speaker is on the run. He is a logician who has embraced a position that will not allow him to be specific, or to use his skills of argumentation to formulate proper premises for proof. One expects that the negative speaker will refer specifically to the premises of the affirmative speaker and falsify those premises. This negative speaker wastes most of his time rambling in the first negative speech.

The next blatant fallacy of the negative speaker is seen on p. 27. Here he appeals to mere emotion. Deaver has a problem again answering the affirmative speaker's definitions and terms. He is now so distracted from the issue that he must appeal to the hopeful ignorance of the audience. Fox seems to have successfully defined his terms, for it is apparent that the negative respondent must criticize rather than answer. Deaver's distress is seen in the following words:

"What is all this discussion about, anyway? What is this discussion about, anyway? Is your salvation literal or figurative? Is God literal or figurative? Is your spirit literal or figurative? Is the church literal or figurative?"

This is strictly an emotional appeal to the audience. Deaver seems to overlook the fact that language may be figurative and yet have a literal impact, and a literal import. Has Fox made an argument that implies that he must believe that the church is figurative? Is the negative speaker, Deaver, able to formulate a major premise by which one may deduce that Fox believes the church is not literal? If Deaver is able then where is the argument? Is Deaver arguing that:

"All men who teach that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth are men who teach that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth"

Fox is a man who teaches that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

Therefore Fox is a man who teaches that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth?"

Deaver, the negative respondent, has replied in a most illogical fashion. He seems to confuse the nature of categorical deduction. In logic one does not begin with the partial class and deduce to the whole; rather one begins with the whole and concludes with the partial. Yet this is exactly what he must do; he must be irrational in order to attack Fox's definition. The negative respondent chooses a method of reasoning that he must now apply to himself. If Deaver applies this same methodology to himself he sees the following →

All men who teach that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth are men who teach that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

Deaver is a man who teaches that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

Therefore Deaver is a man who teaches that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

As I read and pondered the reasoning of the negative speaker, Deaver, I wonder if he would accuse God of the same fallacy. God refers to heaven as a country and as a city.

All persons who teach that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth are persons who teach that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

God is a person who teaches that some verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

Therefore God is a person who teaches that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

The fallacy in the arguments above is found in the major premise. It is not reasonable to think that deduction can be made from these premises. Yet these are the premises necessary for the negative speaker to deduce that Fox is incorrect.

If on the other hand the negative respondent chooses to structure his major premise properly by using the word **all** as a modifier of the word **verses** he would be forced to argue →

DRP All men who teach that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth are men who teach that *dwelling verses* of scripture are employed to teach a literal truth

Fox is a man who teaches that all verses of scripture employ figurative language to teach a literal truth

Therefore Fox is a man who teaches that *dwelling verses* of scripture are employed to teach a literal truth

The major premise labeled **DRP** (Deavers required premise) is the premise necessary for Deaver to logically deduce that Fox has incorrectly applied the word dwell. The DRP premise proves too much.

The negative speaker, Deaver, endeavors to answer Fox's explanation for the expression: "poured out of my spirit" on pages 33 and 34. Fox had claimed that Peter's application of Joel's prophecy indicates that the Holy Spirit himself is not what was poured out. Fox understands Peter's application of the prophecy to be an inspired interpretation. Deaver seeks to dispute Fox's explanation by saying,

"But he says the ablative case there shows that it is not the SPIRIT. It came FROM the Spirit. Jesus had just said to the apostles, 'You are going to be baptized in the Holy Spirit.' Now, he says that IS not what happened. That is not what happened. I say that IS what happened. Jesus was not discussing figurative language, except in the sense that He used the word for baptism ("immerse")" (p. 33).

Deaver rants against Fox's position but never appeals to the grammar. The negative respondent's mistake is that he puts theology before grammar. He speaks against the affirmative speaker's application, but gives no additional data to negate the affirmative position. Deaver seems to think the Hebrew is an inspired interpretation of the Greek rather than the Greek being an inspired interpretation of the Hebrew. Deaver's appeal to the words of Christ begs the question. The question at hand is not what Jesus said, but what is the correct application of what Jesus said. Fox, the affirmative speaker, offers evidence from the grammar that what was poured out was not the Holy Spirit himself, but rather something(s) from ($\alpha\pi\omicron$, away from) the Holy Spirit.

At this juncture I beckon the reader to read carefully the words of the negative speaker. The negative speaker is side-stepping the issue. First, the issue is not whether or not figures of speech are at times used to describe literal things, events and people. Second, the negative speaker has not structured a single argument that gives evidence that the affirmative speaker has misused his terms. Third, the negative speaker, Deaver is forced to use a major premise that includes him as well as the affirmative speaker, Fox. Fourth, the negative speaker does not directly assault the precise arguments offered by the affirmative, he does not disassemble any of his premises.

Conclusion→ The affirmative position presented by Marion Fox is unwavering. He set forth his position with excellent hermeneutics, detailed logical argumentation, and careful handling of the original grammar. He gave his negative respondent a clear and concise target. He defined his terms and remained consistent, with no equivocation. The negative respondent lacked detail, did not attack the premises of the affirmative speaker, and used sophistry in place of precise argumentation. Deaver had a well defined target before him and could not hit the target.

A REVIEW OF THE DEAVER-FOX DEBATE

Part 2

The proposition is **The Scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian only through the Word of God.** Fox affirms this proposition and Deaver denies.

As we consider the second part of this review I beckon the readers to remain objective, examine arguments carefully, weigh the evidence, and draw only those conclusions warranted by that evidence. Please remember that these men embrace views that are in opposition. Both men cannot possibly be right, though it is possible that both could be wrong. Marion Fox contends that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian only through the word—that is representatively. Mac Deaver contends that the Holy Spirit dwells in us directly and personally, and never through the word.

Fox presented arguments in the affirmative to demonstrate that the Holy Spirit dwells in the Christian only through the word. Fox's first affirmative is forceful and precise. He explains that the expression "only through the word" describes the manner of the Spirit's dwelling. At this point of the discussion Fox's arguments stand. The negative respondent has neither assaulted the premises nor the conclusions of the affirmative speaker. This brings a degree of doubt upon the negative position held by Deaver.

Deaver contends that Acts 2:41 proves that the expressions "*receiving the word*" and the "*Spirit dwelling*" always mean different things. He iterates this view by saying,

"When you became a Christian, whom were you obeying? Now, he tries to make some sort of point: Yes, but you have not totally obeyed it yet in the penitent having confessed believing state" (p.50).

Notice that the difference in Deaver's view and Fox's view is that Fox contends that the "dwelling of the Spirit" and the "dwelling of the word" begin at the point of complete obedience; whereas Deaver contends that the "dwelling of the word" begins when one responds to a component part of the salvation plan. This part of the discussion is critical. Deaver, the negative respondent, tries to force this argument on Fox. But is it necessary that Fox is logically compelled to the conclusion that *receiving the word* is equivalent to *the word indwelling*. This conclusion is easily escaped by understanding that *all dwellings of the word are receptions of the word but not all receptions of the word are dwellings of the word*.

Deaver's use of the aorist participle

Deaver's view is seen more precisely in the following words; "You are either bound to say that the having received word constituted the having received Spirit in the heart of the alien sinner, or you had to say these folks are already Christians" (p. 50, lines 14-16). Deaver relies heavily upon Acts 2:41 for the foundation of his teaching on the Holy Spirit. Deaver says, "That was the point of Acts 2:41" (p.50, line 14). Deaver contends that Fox's view that the "Holy Spirit indwells you only through the word" is incorrect by saying, "Acts 2:41 and the argument on that disproves that contention" (p.50, line 25). The reader needs to notice that the negative respondent speaks as though he is in the affirmative—and he has not referred to, identified and torn down the premises of the affirmative speaker. The persistency of the negative respondent using his time to speak in the affirmative indicates weakness in his position and a great lacking of confidence to negate the arguments of the affirmative speaker. He proceeds to make lengthy speeches in the affirmative position constantly referring to Acts 2:41. Deaver says,

"There is an aorist participle in Acts 2:41, and the Greek never uses this aorist participle for subsequent action. That is, those having received the word—"having received," that is your participle. It is aorist, and never connotes action that is subsequent to the action connoted by the lead verb. The verb is 'were baptized.' They were baptized. What they were baptized? They that received the word, they that gladly received the word. So, whatever you have in the reception of the word takes place prior to what is received after it. Not after it, before it" (p.56).

Deaver, the negative respondent, continues his affirmative argumentation while in the negative position on p. 57. He claims,

"So, you have either got them in a saved state prior to baptism receiving God's Holy Spirit, or they are alien sinners who have the indwelling of God's Holy Spirit. That is what he cannot get over. That is what he cannot dodge. And, when this discussion is over, that argument will still stand, because the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action. No example of that has ever been shown, so says A. T. Robertson, by the way, who is quoted by brother Fox quite often in his book on the Holy Spirit" (p.57, lines 10-18).

While reading these arguments from Deaver I am compelled to pause and apply some principles of logic to his statements regarding the use of the aorist participle. Deaver claims his argument will stand **"because the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action."** Dear reader, are these words of the negative speaker logical? If this contention is true it will be seen in the following logical form →

If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then *receiving the word* is an act that occurs prior to baptism

The Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action

Therefore receiving the word is an act that occurs prior to baptism

The reader should easily recognize that the above argumentation is valid. By valid it is meant that the conclusion would necessarily follow the major premise. But there seems to be a fallacy in his major premise. Notice that Deaver said, “**Because the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action.**” In order for his major premise to be true the following statement would also have to be true →

“If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then the Greek never uses the aorist participle for simultaneous action.”

But where is the logical connection for these two statements? Would one necessarily follow the other? What if the aorist participle indicates action simultaneous to the leading verb? What if the receiving of the word is merely a description of the act of baptism? First, it should be noted that it is not true, not technically true, that the aorist participle denotes time prior to the leading verb. It is technically correct to say that the aorist participle is the participle of choice if action prior to the leading verb is already indicated by the context. The aorist participle may as easily indicate time coincidental to the leading verb as time prior to the leading verb. For example in Matthew 27:4 Judas says, “I have sinned in that I betrayed innocent blood” (Matt.27:4). In the Greek text this verse reads, “I have sinned delivering up guiltless blood.” The reader needs to recognize that the word *sinned* **is the verb** and the word *delivering* **is the participle**. Furthermore it needs to be understood that the *sin* and the *delivering* are words describing the same activity. Thus, in this verse not only does the aorist participle describe *action simultaneous to the leading verb*, but it also describes *identical action*. The sin was the delivering. This fact seems to give plausible reason to not only reject Deaver’s logic, but also to question his hermeneutics. But we must retain a degree of fairness concerning this observation, for it remains possible that this is a rare exception. Let’s continue to examine some additional aorist participles to see if his position is plausible. In Acts 10:33 we observe the statement, “and thou didst well having come.” The word *didst* is derived from the verb *εποισας*, and the expression *art come* is derived from *παραγενομενος*. “*Art come*” is the aorist participle that describes the action of the leading verb *didst*. Deaver is correct that this is not subsequent action, but the only alternative he offered (antecedent action) is incorrect. That the aorist participle of simultaneous action is not uncommon we need only to observe *σωσον καταβας* (Mk.15: 30-Nestles Text), *ηλθαν σπευσαντες* (Luke 2:16), and *εμαρτυπησεω δους το πνευμα* (Acts 15:8). In each of these instances

the aorist participle denotes action simultaneous to the leading verb. This being true Deaver's necessary major premise →

If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then *receiving the word* is an act that occurs prior to baptism is faulty. This is an assumption that is not in agreement with the common use of the aorist participle. The aorist participle is commonly used to describe action simultaneous to the leading verb. →

Robertson “(δ) But Simultaneous Action is *Common* also” (A.T. Robertson, p. 860).

Burton “139. **The Aorist Participle of Identical Action.** The aorist Participle agreeing with the subject of a verb *not infrequently denotes* the same action that is expressed by the verb” (Burton, p. 64).

Wallace “The aorist participle, for example, usually denotes antecedent time to that of the controlling verb. But if the main verb is also aorist, this participle *may indicate contemporaneous time*” (*Greek Beyond the Basics*, p. 614).

Dana and Mantey “Nevertheless, the aorist *frequently* expresses contemporaneous (Mt.22: 1) or subsequent action (Heb.9: 12)” (p.230).

Consider in particular Acts 24:22 where *ανεβαλετο* is precisely described by three successive aorist participles, *ειδως—ειπας—διαταξαμενος*.

In Acts 24:22 the word *deferred* (*ανεβαλετο*) is an aorist verb. The grammatical force of the participle-verb connection is “he deferred knowing, saying, and ordering.” These three aorist participles describe the act of deference. Thus the preponderance of evidence from the grammarians is that the aorist participle frequently describes action *simultaneous* to the leading verb, and that when an aorist participle is used with an aorist verb it often describes action *identical* to the leading verb. This leads us to the question → “What is the verb tense of Acts 2:41? The verb tense of Acts 2:41 is aorist. The verse reads, “Then they that gladly received the word were baptized.” The word *received* is an aorist participle that describes the action of the leading verb *baptized* which is an aorist verb. This being true the grammatical force is as follows → “They received the word by being baptized.” While it is true that the word *receive* in this text may include their believing and repenting, it did not exclude, and could not exclude, baptism, for it is the word “baptism” that is the leading verb. Let us now observe once again the logic presented by the negative respondent, Deaver →

If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then *receiving the word* is an act that occurs prior to baptism

The Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action

Therefore receiving the word is an act that occurs prior to baptism

The fallacy is in the major premise, for his if-then relationship is untrue. He has asserted for his major premise an untrue statement. If the Greek uses the aorist participle for identical action, then it is not true that receiving the word is an act that occurs prior to baptism. I state the case in this fashion to avoid confusing the issue. Nevertheless his statement, and the inconsistency thereof, may be seen by the following. →

A If the Greek uses the aorist participle for identical or simultaneous action then the statement “If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then *receiving the word* is an act that occurs prior to baptism” is an untrue statement

B The Greek uses the aorist participle for identical or simultaneous action

C Therefore the statement “If the Greek never uses the aorist participle for subsequent action then *receiving the word* is an act that occurs prior to baptism” is an untrue statement

The negative respondent, Deaver, spent far too much time wasting his opportunity to negate the affirmative speaker. The affirmative speaker had made several precisely stated arguments untouched by the negative respondent, Deaver. Fox’s arguments have yet to be answered. His arguments are

Major Premise: All things that pertain to life and godliness are things that come through knowledge (II Pet. 1:3).

Minor Premise: The mode of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that pertains to life and godliness.

Conclusion: The mode of the influence of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that comes through knowledge

Major Premise: All good works are things that are furnished by the Scriptures (II Timothy 3:16-17).

Minor Premise: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a good work.

Conclusion: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that is furnished by the Scriptures.

Deaver, the negative respondent never assaults these premises. He is in the negative and he needs to address these premises in particular. Instead he chooses to argue from the affirmative position. Though Fox does not give a detailed explanation of the grammar in Acts 2:41 he uses logic well to refute the conclusions drawn by Deaver. Fox's argumentation is detailed and to the point. In order to demonstrate that "receiving" and "dwelling" are not equivalent expressions in relationship to a given time frame he presents the following arguments

Major Premise: All those who received the word of God are those who had the word of God dwelling in them

Minor Premise: Those of Acts 2:41 are those who received the word of God

Conclusion: Those of Acts 2:41 are those who had the word of God dwelling in them (p.63).

Note: Please take note that Fox does not offer this argument to prove "receiving" and "dwelling" are equivalents but to indicate in logical form the nature of Deaver's argumentation.

Fox further clarifies his point that "dwell" and "receive" are not equivalent expressions by pointing to Acts 28:30 which reads, "And he abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went unto him" (p.62). Fox forcefully argues that Paul's house would have been very crowded if "receive" is equivalent to "dwell." Fox says about Deaver, "he equates 'to receive' and 'to dwell,' and they do not mean the same thing. So, the house that Paul was living in really got crowded" (p.62). Fox challenges Deaver to provide the middle term necessary to give him the major premise required to prove that the word "dwelling" is equivalent to the word "receive" (p.63). This is an open door for Deaver to drive his case home. But the negative respondent replies not at all to this argument. Fox points to this very argument again much later in the discussion:

"I want to look at Acts 28:30. I want to show you what Mac did. I brought this passage up as showing the definition of the word. Mac has yet to address this passage one single time. He cannot. Look at it. 'And he abode two whole years in his own hired dwelling, and received all that went in unto him.' Now this gets back to his Acts 2:41 argument last night, which he has not made tonight" (p.109).

Notice dear reader the response of the negative speaker to the argument made by Fox in Acts 28:30.

Deaver responds, "Acts 28:30 says 'receiving' there is not 'indwelling.' And, I will tell you that is not a parallel to the Christians receiving the Holy Spirit. If he thinks that is

parallel, let him prove it is parallel” (p.122). There is your answer dear reader. First, it seems the negative respondent is overlooking some important matters of logic and interpretation. Fox did not make an argument based on parallelism. His argument was predicated on the use of the words “dwell” and “receive.” It is not Fox who has made unwarranted assertions concerning the use of these words. Deaver has an obligation as a negative speaker to respond to this argument. He criticizes instead of responding.

In the first part of this review the following observation was made concerning Fox’s application of Joel’s prophecy:

Fox also made an argument, not in precise form, concerning the ablative case, and its application to Joel’s prophecy. Fox contends that the Holy Spirit Himself was not literally poured out according to the language employed by Peter on the day of Pentecost. Peter quoted the prophet Joel and said, “I will pour out of my Spirit.” Fox points out that the verse does not say, “I will pour out my Spirit.” This is an interesting point by Fox. The grammatical construction in the Greek is ablative as he claims. Also I find it interesting that even in the English the verse does not say, “I will pour out my Spirit.”

The above paragraph reflects my thoughts concerning Fox’s use of the Greek grammar made on p. 20. As I reflect I wonder how deep will the negative respondent dig himself before conceding this point of the discussion. The answer is found on p.125. Deaver, continuing to be troubled by Fox’s arguments from the grammar, replies,

A *“The Old Testament passage, Joel 2:28 says, ‘God was not going to send something from the Spirit’ though that would happen. The passage said, ‘God would pour forth His Spirit.’ Now, any interpretation of Acts 2:33 that contradicts the claim that God said there He would pour forth His Spirit is an erroneous interpretation of Acts 2:33”* (p.125, lines 10-13).

Deaver continues to answer Fox by saying,

“All right. Chart F-40 (Fox’s Denial Of Joel And Jesus). Joel said God ‘would pour out my Spirit,’ (Joel 2:28). Jesus said the apostles would be baptized in the Holy Spirit. Has he dealt with that yet-Acts 1:5? It may be an oversight. I have overlooked some things. Jesus said the apostles would be baptized in the Spirit. Were they or not? He says they were not” (p.128, lines 1-6).

I beseech the reader to examine carefully the logic of Deaver in the section labeled **A**. He says, ***any interpretation of Acts 2:33 that contradicts the claim that God said there He would pour forth His Spirit is an erroneous interpretation of Acts 2:33*** In precise form this argument reads→

All interpretations of Acts 2:33 that interpret the *pour forth His Spirit* to mean *pour forth of His Spirit* are erroneous expression interpretations of Acts 2:33

Peter's interpretation of Acts 2:33 interprets the expression *pour forth His Spirit* to mean *pour forth of His Spirit*

Therefore Peter's interpretation of Acts 2:33 is an erroneous interpretation

Brethren please consider the following before seriously considering the words of the negative respondent, Deaver.

All men who deny the inspired interpretation of Peter are men who deny that Peter was inspired

Mac Deaver is a man who denies the inspired interpretation of Peter

Therefore Mac Deaver is a man who denies that Peter was inspired

The question is not whether Fox believes that the apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. The question is what does the expression: "*baptized in the Holy Spirit,*" mean? The question is not did God "*send the Holy Spirit?*" The question is what does the expression "*send the Holy Spirit,*" mean? Fox uses inspired men to interpret for him. This seems wise to me. Does this seem wise to the critical and diligent student of the inspired text? The question for both disputants is "Do you believe in inspired interpretation?" Dear reader, Which disputant do you consider to be relying on the inspired interpretation of New Testament writers?

These arguments were offered by Fox in precisely stated form →

Major Premise: All things that pertain to life and godliness are things that come through knowledge (II Pet. 1:3).

Minor Premise: The mode of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that pertains to life and godliness.

Conclusion: The mode of the influence of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that comes through knowledge

Major Premise: All good works are things that are furnished by the Scriptures (II Timothy 3:16-17).

Minor Premise: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a good work.

Conclusion: The manner of the influence of the Holy Spirit in sanctification is a thing that is furnished by the Scriptures.

B Major Premise: All those who are sons of God are those who have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit

Minor Premise: All Christians who sin are those who are sons of God

Conclusion: All Christians who sin are those who have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit

Conclusion

Fox has successfully defended his premises and conclusions. In the section I have labeled **B** Fox successfully negates the reasoning of the negative respondent. Please keep in mind that the argument labeled **B** is not what Fox believes, but rather he is using the major premise of Deaver against him. Fox is illustrating for us how that if the major premise is true, then one is forced to deduce that all apostates have the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. This premise is the premise that Deaver must embrace to teach his view concerning the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Fox has been tedious, technical, and tenacious. His argumentation has not been assaulted, much less answered. I am persuaded by the arguments to believe that Peter is correct and that Fox is wise to follow Peter.

Notes: This writer uses the expression *Major Premise* whether the argument is *categorical* or *conditional*. Thus the expression *Major Premise* refers to the first premise of any argument.

The word *valid* refers to the reasoning process being correct whether used in composition or in a precise logical argument.

The expression *reasoning process* refers to the method of deduction, not implying whether or not the argument is sound.

Gary S Smith
Fairfield Bay, Arkansas

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Burton, Earnest De Witt (1966). *Syntax of the moods and tenses in New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Dana, H. E.; Mantey, J. R. (1955). *A manual grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto: The Macmillan Co.

Robertson, A. T. (1934). *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in light of historical research*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

Wallace, Daniel (1996). *Greek grammar beyond the basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House.