



06-16-2006

#41

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**
Evidence, please?

It is commonly established by scholars that the OT does not teach the holy spirit to be a person.



06-16-2006

#42

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**
*We **are** considering [Galatians 5:17](#) within the broader argument of personality, correct? The fact that the Holy Spirit is spoken of in personal terms is only **one** of many elements indicating his personality. You offered sarx, flesh in Galatian 5:17 for comparison. I merely showed this comparison to be shallow and fallacious in that sarx fails to satisfy some of the other arguments indicating the personality of the Holy Spirit.*

Actually we are considering [Galatians 5:17](#) in context, not for a systematic argument. In context it does nothing to support the Spirit having personality any more than it does flesh having personality. It is not shallow or fallacious, for Paul is paralleling the two things. The very fact that he parallels the Holy Spirit with flesh lends away from it being personal.

Quote:

Where does the Bible state that the angel is speaking in [Acts 8:29](#)? Scriptures says the Spirit spoke. That's it. The text doesn't indicate in any manner whatsoever that the angel and the Spirit are the same speaker. There is **no** basis for demanding that they are. None.

Angels are spirits and are spoken of as "spirits" in the Bible. Now if we look in the context we see an angel present shortly prior, in verse 26. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the angel is the spirit in question.

Quote:

(Emphasis above mine.) You indicate "some" commentators, meaning there is some disagreement. Shall we play dueling commentators then? Appealing to authorities for support when those authorities conflict is fallacious. Some support your position of revelation through others. Some support my position of the Holy Spirit speaking directly. Neither provides incontrovertible support...So why appeal to them?

I appeal to them as hostile witnesses to show that there is more than one way to look at the text and so that the texts don't actually prove anything at all.

Quote:

Granted, Revelation and other apocalyptic literature is loaded with symbolism and figurative language, but direct speech **is** contained within this genre.

You're begging the question.

Quote:

Is there any reason a literal voice could not have come from heaven?

I am a literalist when it comes to Bible interpretation. As a general rule, when the plain sense makes sense, seek no other sense. [Revelation 14](#) says a voice came from heaven. There's no reason to believe that a voice could not come from heaven so I believe a voice **did** come from heaven. The Scriptures also says the Holy Spirit spoke. So I believe he spoke. Period.

Only when we fail to take Scripture in its plain, literal sense can we deny the Holy Spirit spoke in [Revelation 14](#).

Well in the very same verse a voice is actually heard and we are told about it coming from heaven. Not so with the Holy Spirit. Now, we note that the verb for "speak," LALEW is not actually used. Now when we take these two points and combine them with other examples where the Holy Spirit is attributed to having had said something, it lends to understanding this text as the Holy Spirit inspired this thought or impressed it upon the mind, not that a voice was heard.

Quote:

Before I pursue this issue further, IF we pursue it further, what do you understand the name to represent in [Matthew 28:19](#)? What do you believe the name represents in [Genesis 48:16](#) (which you refer to above re the name of the fathers Abraham and Isaac, which, btw, does not use the phrase "in the name of" but "the name of" only and I was unable to pinpoint your reference to "the name of gods" at all). Do the meanings you ascribe to name in [Matthew 28:19](#) and [Genesis 48:16](#) agree or differ?

Essentially, "name" in [Matthew 28:19](#) is not really significant. To baptize into the name of the holy spirit is the same thing as to baptize into the holy spirit. This is seen within the NT where baptizing into the name of Jesus and into Jesus are used to mean the same thing. To baptize into another is to accept that one in our lives and the role and function that one fills, following the direction provided by that one.

Quote:

Frankly, I'm confused and unclear as to what point you are trying to make

here.

Simply that the use of the singular "name" doesn't mean it is one name shared by all three.

Quote:

They are not proofs, but indications of how the Holy Spirit is treated in Scripture. If none but personal beings are grieved, guide or call, then what does that say when those terms are applied to the Holy Spirit? As I said, it isn't proof, but quite indicative, especially on a cumulative basis, IMO.

If we look throughout Jewish literature we see that these types of personifications are common though. For example, the heart. Here are some personifications for the heart.

Gen

31:20 - is deceived

31:36 - is deceived

34:3 - spoke to

Ex

25:2 - impels

Num

32:7 - discouraged

Deut.

2:30 - emboldened

15:10 - grieved

Prov

5:12 - despises

6:18 - plots

14:10 - knows

15:28 - learns

16:9 - plans

18:12 - is haughty

18:15 - gets knowledge

19:3 - rages

23:15 - is wise

23:17 - envies

23:23 - speaks

24:2 - studies

24:17 - is glad

27:11 - has joy

21:11 - trusts

Ecc

1:13 - seeks and investigates

1:16 - spoken to and sees

1:17 - knows

2:10 - rejoices

7:22 - knows

8:5 - knows

11:9 - glad

Quote:

Alright. Let's discuss the heart in the context of personality. Did anyone ever mistake a heart for a person? Did the ANFs discuss the heart in personal terms, as a personal being and directly state that the heart is a person? Does the Bible give the heart the same essential attributes of personality and with the same frequency? Is the personification of the heart limited to Ecc (one of the poetic books where one can expect figurative language) -- or do we find the personification of the heart in, say, the historic books of the OT? Remember, the personification of the Holy Spirit would need to saturate the **entire** Bible and not be limited, primarily, to one book or division of books.

As the examples I listed show, the heart is assigned personal characteristics as often if not more so than the Holy Spirit, and I didn't even come close to providing all of the examples. It is not limited to poetic books, but it is common. If we move outside of Scripture but remain in Jewish literature we see that such personifications are equally as common if not more so.

Quote:

I'm new on this board and will search for this thread, time permitting, but...Just off hand, I checked a few Bibles and was unable to find one that agreed with your "distributions of holy spirit". They translated it as "gifts of" rather than distributions. Is your quote from an interlinear? And if so, dare I ask why?

The translation is my own from the Greek text. The word "gifts" is entirely absent in the text and added by Trinitarian translators. Again, the text literally reads "distributions of holy spirit," strongly showing that the holy spirit is not at all a person, but God's influence that is distributed amongst his servants.

Quote:

I disagree. I don't know of any verses or texts that gives any indication that the Holy Spirit is not a person. Every verse I've seen that's been offered as a "proof" has applied figurative language that has **also** been applied to the Father, the Son, both or other personal beings (such as Paul, David, etc). If the same (or very similar) language can be used of personal beings, would you not agree that such language is no proof of impersonality?

Except in those cases where it is applied to others, it is in an entirely different context with an obvious meaning that is entirely different. (i.e. being poured out) It is the dramatic difference of use and meaning that allows those texts to remain proof against the personhood of the Spirit.

Quote:

In regards to your example, heart, however, I must say that it's not that the Scriptures explicitly state the heart is not a person. No reasonable thinking person would ever confuse the heart as a person, for one, and for another thing, the heart fails to satisfy the elements arguing for personality (attributes, ANF support, etc) that the Holy Spirit fulfills. In spades.

I agree, and I also agree that a reasonable person, upon considering everything in Scripture that is said about the Holy Spirit, would not conclude that it is a

person either.



06-16-2006

#43

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
*It is commonly established by scholars that the **OT** does not teach the holy spirit to be a person.*

You said:

Quote:

Did you ever stop and think that it was also a given **in the 1st century** that the Holy spirit was not a person?

When was the last book of the OT written? In the 1st century? No.

You said that it was a given that the Holy Spirit was not a person in the 1st century.

Okay.

Prove it.

(Btw, all emphasis above mine.)



06-16-2006

#44

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
Actually we are considering [Galatians 5:17](#) in context, not for a systematic argument. In context it does nothing to support the Spirit having personality any more than it does flesh having personality. It is not shallow or fallacious, for Paul is paralleling the two things. The very fact that he parallels the Holy Spirit with flesh lends away from it being personal.

And I presented a systematic (though hardly a complete) argument showing why such a comparison is shallow.

Quote:

Angels are spirits and are spoken of as "spirits" in the Bible. Now if we look in the context we see an angel present shortly prior, in verse 26. It is not unreasonable to conclude that the angel is the spirit in question.

The Bible says the Spirit spoke. Period. Nowhere is the speaker said to be the angel. Nowhere.

The angel appears at the start of the journey, pointing Phillip in the right direction. The Spirit appears once he has already arrived at his destination. Different times, different places. I submit that is reasonable to conclude, given

the context, that the Spirit spoke, just like the Bible said he did.

Quote:

I appeal to them as hostile witnesses to show that there is more than one way to look at the text and so that the texts don't actually prove anything at all.

Point taken. I promise not to cite commentary for this one verse. LOL. Sorry. It's late. I'm getting punchy.

Quote:

You're begging the question.

So...You're arguing that direct conversation **cannot** be found in apocalyptic literature? That is my argument. Direct speech can be found in apocalyptic lit, including Revelation. It's not **all** figurative.

Quote:

Well in the very same verse a voice is actually heard and we are told about it coming from heaven. Not so with the Holy Spirit.

So, he's not speaking because we don't know where he is? While we know where the voice is coming from?

I'm not sure I understand your point here.

Quote:

Now, we note that the verb for "speak," LALEW is not actually used. Now when we take these two points and combine them with other examples where the Holy Spirit is attributed to having had said something, it lends to understanding this text as the Holy Spirit inspired this thought or impressed it upon the mind, not that a voice was heard.

From studylight, re lego (Strongs 3004) noted above and applied to the Holy Spirit in [Rev 14:13](#) in the Nestle Aland 26 text:

1. to say, to speak

- a. affirm over, maintain
- b. to teach
- c. to exhort, advise, to command, direct
- d. to point out with words, intend, mean, mean to say
- e. to call by name, to call, name
- f. to speak out, speak of, mention

What part of the above is in any way unclear?

Quote:

Essentially, "name" in [Matthew 28:19](#) is not really significant. To baptize into the name of the holy spirit is the same thing as to baptize into the holy spirit. This is seen within the NT where baptizing into the name of Jesus and into Jesus are used to mean the same thing. To baptize into another is to accept that one in our lives and the role and function that one fills, following the direction provided by that one.

Now, I'm really confused. Do you mean that name represents that person's authority over our lives? Or am I entirely off base?

Quote:

Simply that the use of the singular "name" doesn't mean it is one name shared by all three.

Name in [Matthew 28:19](#) is singular, but...Jesus didn't really mean it as a singular, he actually meant it as a plural?

Then, why on earth didn't he use a plural?

And if he intended a singular, how else could he have expressed it?

Quote:

If we look throughout Jewish literature we see that these types of personifications are common though. For example, the heart. Here are some personifications for the heart.

...

As the examples I listed show, the heart is assigned personal characteristics as often if not more so than the Holy Spirit, and I didn't even come close to providing all of the examples. It is not limited to poetic books, but it is common. If we move outside of Scripture but remain in Jewish literature we see that such personifications are equally as common if not more so.

Uh huh. Now, consider heart within the broader argument of personality. As I said previously. Has anyone confused a heart with a person? Do the ANFs use personal terms for the heart, speak of the heart as a personal being, and explicitly state that the heart **is** a person? Ad nauseum.

Even better...Was the heart said to be involved in creation? Does the Bible say that the heart inspired Scripture?

Oh, I could go on and on and on.

Quote:

The translation is my own from the Greek text. The word "gifts" is entirely absent in the text and added by Trinitarian translators. Again, the text literally reads "distributions of holy spirit," strongly showing that the holy spirit is not at all a person, but God's influence that is distributed amongst his servants.

Took a bit, but I did find the thread. I didn't read it entirely through (long day, sorry), but found what I thought was the heart (no pun intended) of your argument and frankly, I think Crispus in particular refutes your premise quite soundly. Of course, I only skimmed and need to read over the debate more thoroughly, but...From what I've read, I disagree.

Quote:

Except in those cases where it is applied to others, it is in an entirely different context with an obvious meaning that is entirely different. (i.e. being poured out) It is the dramatic difference of use and meaning that allows those texts to remain proof against the personhood of the Spirit.

As I understand the above, you are saying that such figurative language is obviously figurative when applied to other persons, but when the same language is applied to the Holy Spirit, it means something else...Sorry, but this sounds a great deal like begging the question.

Quote:

I agree, and I also agree that a reasonable person, upon considering everything in Scripture that is said about the Holy Spirit, would not conclude that it is a person either.

Attack the argument, not those you disagree with, please.



06-16-2006

#45

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

And I presented a systematic (though hardly a complete) argument showing why such a comparison is shallow.

I see you avoided my last point which entirely overturns your systematic argument.

Quote:

The Bible says the Spirit spoke. Period. Nowhere is the speaker said to be the angel. Nowhere.

The angel appears at the start of the journey, pointing Phillip in the right direction. The Spirit appears once he has already arrived at his destination. Different times, different places. I submit that is reasonable to conclude, given the context, that the Spirit spoke, just like the Bible said he did.

What you're not addressing is what "the spirit" is. You are claiming that it is the Holy Spirit, which it may be and in itself is not a problem for me, but in context I'm not convinced that it is the Holy Spirit. Having said that, I would again refer you to the Trinitarian commentators on this, for they do not all agree with the argument you are putting forth here. As with [Acts 13](#), many recognize that this simply means that the Holy Spirit inspired Peter or impressed the thought to go do that upon his mind.

Quote:

So...You're arguing that direct conversation cannot be found in apocalyptic literature? That is my argument. Direct speech can be found in apocalyptic lit, including Revelation. It's not all figurative.

Rather, you're begging the question of whether or not this is direct speech.

Quote:

So, he's not speaking because we don't know where he is? While we know where the voice is coming from?

I'm not sure I understand your point here.

Rather, the point is that there is nothing that indicates that the Holy Spirit presented audible words. The Holy Spirit "says" things by placing the thoughts within the minds of people, by inspiring. This can be seen for example in Hebrews where words from OT Scripture are attributed to the Holy Spirit because they were inspired by the Spirit in writing them.

Quote:

What part of the above is in any way unclear?

You failed that point completely. There are two Greek words related to communication, LEGW and LALEW. LEGW means "say" and is used for both persons and non-persons in non-audible communication. Only LALEW is used for the Spirit when the communication is being done through another (and in one case of clear personification), but elsewhere it is always LEGW. Hence we recognize that that the Spirit "said" something does not itself mean that it "spoke" that something, because from Scripture as a whole we know the Spirit is impersonal.

Quote:

Now, I'm really confused. Do you mean that name represents that person's authority over our lives? Or am I entirely off base?

See Barnes' commentary on this text. It should clear up what I mean for you.

Quote:

Name in [Matthew 28:19](#) is singular, but...Jesus didn't really mean it as a singular, he actually meant it as a plural?

Then, why on earth didn't he use a plural?

And if he intended a singular, how else could he have expressed it?

Well a single article would have gone a long way. My point has been that the use of the singular is common but almost never refers to a name that is shared. It is similar to glory in [Luke 9:26](#), which is singular and attributed to Jesus, God and the angels.

Quote:

Uh huh. Now, consider heart within the broader argument of personality. As I said previously. Has anyone confused a heart with a person? Do the ANFs use personal terms for the heart, speak of the heart as a personal being, and explicitly state that the heart is a person? Ad nauseum.

The ANF were not inspired, so why are you dependant upon them? Scripture and the Jewish background of Scripture are the proper grounds for interpretation. Has anyone confused the heart for a person? No, because common sense tells us otherwise. The same with the Spirit though. If we look at all of Scripture, common sense tells us that it isn't a person. Yet people confuse it for a person, and it is amusing because the same arguments that they use for the Spirit also apply to the heart.

Quote:

Even better...Was the heart said to be involved in creation? Does the Bible say that the heart inspired Scripture?

There was no "heart" at creation. It belongs to man. I guess it is a second "person of man."

Quote:

Took a bit, but I did find the thread. I didn't read it entirely through (long day, sorry), but found what I thought was the heart (no pun intended) of

your argument and frankly, I think Crispus in particular refutes your premise quite soundly. Of course, I only skimmed and need to read over the debate more thoroughly, but...From what I've read, I disagree.

Funny that he couldn't even address the point. He kept side-stepping the issue, adding the thought of "gifts" to the text when the word isn't even there. Of course you thought he refuted it though, because he tried to argue the point and frankly there is no good Trinitarian response to that text.

Quote:

As I understand the above, you are saying that such figurative language is obviously figurative when applied to other persons, but when the same language is applied to the Holy Spirit, it means something else...Sorry, but this sounds a great deal like begging the question.

I'm saying the context tells us the meaning. For example, when the holy spirit is poured out it refers to it being given to individuals. Yet when a person is poured out it refers to them simply dying. Major differences and the context clearly articulates these differences.

Quote:

Attack the argument, not those you disagree with, please.

I'm not attacking, I'm making a counter point on the Holy Spirit relative to the heart. Your issue is that nobody confuses the heart with a person and in my opinion nobody should be confusing the Spirit with a person either.



06-16-2006

#46

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points



In the 1st century the OT was the inspired text that they worked with. There were no further revelations at the start of it.



06-16-2006

#47

[simonmickelson](#)

Senior Member

CATHOLIC

Join Date: Feb 2006

Location: Wollongong area

NSW Australia

Posts: 3,559

32 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
*In the 1st century the OT was the inspired text that they worked with.
There were no further revelations at the start of it.*

mondo,

Where do you source this information from?

Simon
Amen God Bless



06-16-2006

#48

tkkclark

Member


Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
I see you avoided my last point which entirely overturns your systematic argument.

What? My posts aren't long enough? LOL! As is, I hover dangerously close on too many occasions to character limits. If I don't address every point raised in one of your posts, that doesn't mean I'm avoiding your points, per se. More likely than not, it means I don't want my post exceeding the limits here or given the rather taxing length of my posts, that I limited my response to arguments I deemed most important.

In any event, re your parallelism...Exactly how does this "overturn" (there's that word again) my argument that comparing flesh and spirit in [Galatians 5:17](#) is frivolous within the broader context of personality (the argument)? Jesus was said to be a rock, bread, a light, a vine, a door, etc, etc...Does that demand that Jesus wasn't a person? God the Father was also said to be a consuming fire, a fountain of living waters...Does that demand or require that God the Father isn't a person?

Of course not.

Nor does it demand or require the same of the Holy Spirit.

Quote:

What you're not addressing is what "the spirit" is. You are claiming that it is the Holy Spirit, which it may be and in itself is not a problem for me, but in context I'm not convinced that it is the Holy Spirit. Having said that, I would again refer you to the Trinitarian commentators on this, for they do not all agree with the argument you are putting forth here. As with [Acts 13](#), many recognize that this simply means that the Holy Spirit inspired Peter or impressed the thought to go do that upon his mind.

Commentators disagreed. Fine. I won't appeal to them for authority and neither should you. Let's discuss between us (without appealing to these commentators for authority) the passage at hand then.

I repeat -- where in the text does it state that the Holy Spirit is the same speaker as the angel? And again, the angel and the Spirit appear at different times and in different locations and are never identified as the same person/speaker in Scripture. Would you care to address these arguments? At all?

Quote:

Rather, you're begging the question of whether or not this is direct speech.

Read what I posted again, please:

Quote:

Granted, Revelation and other apocalyptic literature is loaded with symbolism and figurative language, but direct speech is contained within this genre.

I said that direct speech does occur in apocalyptic lit. That's it.

My point was -- and remains -- that direct speech **is** contained with the genre and as such, we can appeal to this genre without presupposing **all** speech in a figurative sense.

Quote:

Rather, the point is that there is nothing that indicates that the Holy Spirit presented audible words. The Holy Spirit "says" things by placing the thoughts within the minds of people, by inspiring. This can be seen for example in Hebrews where words from OT Scripture are attributed to the Holy Spirit because they were inspired by the Spirit in writing them.

Please see the definition I c/p from studylight.org.

Quote:

You failed that point completely. There are two Greek words related to communication, LEGW and LALEW. LEGW means "say" and is used for both persons and non-persons in non-audible communication. Only LALEW is used for the Spirit when the communication is being done through another (and in one case of clear personification), but elsewhere it is always LEGW. Hence we recognize that that the Spirit "said" something does not itself mean that it "spoke" that something, because from Scripture as a whole we know the Spirit is impersonal.

Again, please see the c/p definition.

Quote:

See Barnes' commentary on this text. It should clear up what I mean for you.

Thank you, I will do so.

Quote:

Well a single article would have gone a long way. My point has been that the use of the singular is common but almost never refers to a name that is shared. It is similar to glory in [Luke 9:26](#), which is singular and attributed to Jesus, God and the angels.

A grammarian, I'm not. I will look into what you have said, but I must say, I don't believe I've ever come across this argument before. Does anyone else (commentators, scholars) agree with your position of an intended plural name in Mt 28:19?

Quote:

The ANF were not inspired, so why are you dependant upon them?

I do not consider them inspired, either, but they do give us the best indication (outside of Scripture) of what the early church believed, what was passed down by the apostles.

And I do not depend on them. I merely turn to them to see how they address and/or understood a particular passage or topic, much as I would more contemporary commentators such as Clarke, Barnes, Gill, etc. Unlike contemp commentators, however, the earliest ANFs were closer to the apostles, closer to what Jesus taught. Some were students of one of the apostles themselves. For example, if I remember correctly, Polycarp was a student of John.

Quote:

Scripture and the Jewish background of Scripture are the proper grounds for interpretation.

Agreed.

Quote:

Has anyone confused the heart for a person? No, because common sense tells us otherwise. The same with the Spirit though. If we look at all of Scripture, common sense tells us that it isn't a person.

Implying I lack common sense because I disagree with you. Just as you have said that reasonable people must reach your position as well, thereby implying I am unreasonable.

This is precisely what I mean by attacking the argument rather than those who disagree with you.

Quote:

Yet people confuse it for a person, and it is amusing because the same arguments that they use for the Spirit also apply to the heart.

Not **all** the same arguments. There are other considerations, which I have clearly and repeatedly demonstrated, of which the heart fails to satisfy. The fact that the Holy Spirit is spoken of in personal terms is not the **only** element of my argument for his personality.

Also...Isn't the fact that people "confuse" the Holy Spirit for a person rather telling? George Smeaton, in "The Personality and Procession of the Holy Spirit" (available at: <http://www.graceonlinelibrary.org/ar...=13%7C20%7C243>) addresses this issue:

Quote:

It would be the most violent and far-fetched of all conceivable modes of interpretation, to lay it down as a rule — as this theory must do — that whenever the speakers or writers, either in the Old or New Testament, turned their mind toward the doctrine of the Spirit, they instantly abandoned all the plain and easy style familiar to them, and resorted to rhetorical personification, prosopopœa, and the most high-wrought figures which language can sustain, when their object was to be understood in the language which they used. To suppose such a thing is a sufficient refutation of that whole mode of interpretation. If Jesus and His apostles uniformly represented the Holy Spirit as a Person when He is not a Person, it would be the boldest personification ever found in any literature upon any subject.

Actually, I highly recommend reading the entire article, as it also addresses issues neither you or I have raised as yet or have not addressed to any degree of detail as yet.

Quote:

Funny that he couldn't even address the point. He kept side-stepping the issue, adding the thought of "gifts" to the text when the word isn't even there. Of course you thought he refuted it though, because he tried to argue the point and frankly there is no good Trinitarian response to that text.

I think the thread (and Crispus) quite clearly contradicts your stated position, but will refrain from analyzing your position or his here. Such analysis and comments properly belongs in that thread.

Quote:

I'm saying the context tells us the meaning. For example, when the holy spirit is poured out it refers to it being given to individuals. Yet when a person is poured out it refers to them simply dying. Major differences and the context clearly articulates these differences.

I disagree. The same language is used for dramatic effect for people. Why must we presume the same language is not used for dramatic effect of the Holy Spirit? The writers' intended meaning may differ, but that does not preclude one or the other from a figurative application.

The Holy Spirit fills, per [Luke 1:41](#). God fills in [Eph 3:19](#). In [Acts 10:38](#), Jesus was annointed with the Holy Spirit whereas in [2 Cor 1:21](#) believers are annointed...Were we literally annointed? Or were we figuratively annointed, assigned to God's service? The verbs used in both these passages, chrio rather than aleipho, is quite revealing. The Holy Spirit is a gift ([Acts 2:38](#)). God gave his Son ([Jn 3:16](#))...

Quote:

I'm not attacking, I'm making a counter point on the Holy Spirit relative to the heart. Your issue is that nobody confuses the heart with a person and in my opinion nobody should be confusing the Spirit with a person either.

You have indicated that "reasonable" people with "common sense" must agree with your position. This implies, since I disagree, that I lack either or both.



06-16-2006

#49

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
*In the 1st century the OT was the inspired text that they worked with.
There were no further revelations at the start of it.*

If so, this should simplify supplying evidence that supports your position that the Holy Spirit would be assumed to be impersonal in the 1st century.



06-16-2006

#50

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006

Posts: 275

18 Reputation Points

Last edited by tkkclark : 06-16-2006 at 11:10 AM. Reason: seriously off-topic, LOL




06-16-2006

#51

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
 Posts: 275
 18 Reputation Points



Btw, mondo, since you've offered an explanation for the alleged personification of the Holy Spirit in another passage previously, would you mind explaining the following as well? I've asked, repeatedly, what purpose these personifications serve IRL, but...Nada.

Romans 8:26 *In the same way the Spirit also helps our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we should, but the Spirit Himself intercedes for us with groanings too deep for words; (KJV)*

As I understand it, the Holy Spirit is a force of some kind that comes from God. But here, this force would be coming from God and interceding for us with God? How can an impersonal force be said to intercede with its source?

I'm not being deliberately obtuse here. I genuinely don't get it.




06-16-2006

#52

[Crispus](#)


Member



Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 771
 32 Reputation Points




Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
By using Galatians you must also insist that flesh is an independant person too.

Since a persons leads and desires the burden does not lie with those who believe that the Spirit is a person but with those who don't. Since it's antithetical, to use proper exegesis we should examine the various meanings of the word flesh.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo** 
Did you ever stop and think that it was also a given in the 1st century that the Holy spirit was not a person?

When I first read the bible and every time since it never crossed my mind that the Holy Spirit was being personified dozens of times throughout the bible. This belief is being forced into the bible.

"Jesus Christ coming in the flesh." Present middle participle of erxomai treating the Incarnation as a continuing fact which the Docetic Gnostics flatly denied."
 A.T. Robertson on 2 John 7




06-16-2006

#53


[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark** 
Btw, mondo, since you've offered an explanation for the alleged personification of the Holy Spirit in another passage previously, would you mind explaining the following as well? I've asked, repeatedly, what purpose these personifications serve IRL, but...Nada.

Romans 8:26 *In the same way the Spirit also helps our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we should, but the Spirit Himself intercedes*

for us with groanings too deep for words; (KJV)

As I understand it, the Holy Spirit is a force of some kind that comes from God. But here, this force would be coming from God and interceding for us with God? How can an impersonal force be said to intercede with its source?

I'm not being deliberately obtuse here. I genuinely don't get it.

Take a look at Albert Barnes' comments on this text. Though a Trinitarian, he properly describes what the Holy Spirit is doing in this text. (going from memory anyway)



06-16-2006

#54

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006

Posts: 816

13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **tkkclark**

In any event, re your parallelism...Exactly how does this "overturn" (there's that word again) my argument that comparing flesh and spirit in [Galatians 5:17](#) is frivolous within the broader context of personality (the argument)? Jesus was said to be a rock, bread, a light, a vine, a door, etc, etc...Does that demand that Jesus wasn't a person? God the Father was also said to a consuming fire, a fountain of living waters...Does that demand or require that God the Father isn't a person?

What does what Jesus is called have to do with anything? Nothing. You're building a strawman here. The fact is not that the Holy Spirit is identified as something as a metaphor, but that it is paralleled with something that is contrasting to it.

Quote:

Commentators disagreed. Fine. I won't appeal to them for authority and neither should you. Let's discuss between us (without appealing to these commentators for authority) the passage at hand then.

If the commentators that agree with your doctrine do not agree with your application of this as a proof text, how can you honestly argue that it proves anything?? They are those that support your doctrine!

Quote:

I repeat -- where in the text does it state that the Holy Spirit is the same speaker as the angel? And again, the angel and the Spirit appear at different times and in different locations and are never identified as the same person/speaker in Scripture. Would you care to address these arguments? At all?

You err here in your question. The text does not say "The Holy Spirit," it says "the spirit," definite because it would be referring back to what was already mentioned, which is the angel.

Quote:

I said that direction speech does occur in apoclyptic lit. That's it.

Yes it does, but that does not prove what you are attempting to prove. As you are trying to prove something, the burden of proof remains upon you.

Quote:

My point was -- and remains -- that direct speech **is** contained with the genre and as such, we can appeal to this genre without presupposing **all** speech in a figurative sense.

Thus you beg the question. Is it literal or not?

Quote:

Please see the definition I c/p from studylight.org.

Which does not address my point at all.

Quote:

Again, please see the c/p definition.

Still not addressing the point...

Quote:

A grammarian, I'm not. I will look into what you have said, but I must say, I don't believe I've ever come across this argument before. Does anyone else (commentators, scholars) agree with your position of an intended plural name in Mt 28:19?

It is not a plural name but it is a name that belongs to each one. Similar to Genesis. As I said, to be baptized into the name of one is the same thing as being baptized into that one. So if we are to say that it is one name, this would be Modalism not Trinitarianism.

Quote:

I do not consider them inspired, either, but they do give us the best indication (outside of Scripture) of what the early church believed, what was passed down by the apostles.

Not really. Even during the life of the apostles we read many accounts of false teachings within the church. By the time the early church comes around the apostles are dead and thus no longer around to fight against this apostasy.

Quote:

And I do not depend on them. I merely turn to them to see how they address and/or understood a particular passage or topic, much as I would more contemporary commentators such as Clarke, Barnes, Gill, etc. Unlike contemp commentators, however, the earliest ANFs were closer to the apostles, closer to what Jesus taught. Some were students of one of the apostles themselves. For example, if I remember correctly, Polycarp was a student of John.

And yet they disagree rather commonly amongst themselves.

Quote:

Implying I lack common sense because I disagree with you. Just as you

have said that reasonable people must reach your position as well, thereby implying I am unreasonable. This is precisely what I mean by attacking the argument rather than those who disagree with you.

In reality it is no different than what you would be doing were somebody to argue that the heart has a distinct personality.

Quote:

Not **all** the same arguments. There are other considerations, which I have clearly and repeatedly demonstrated, of which the heart fails to satisfy. The fact that the Holy Spirit is spoken of in personal terms is not the **only** element of my argument for his personality.

And what else is there, because the truth is that I've never seen any other argument from the Trinitarian side.

Quote:

Also...Isn't the fact that people "confuse" the Holy Spirit for a person rather telling? George Smeaton, in "The Personality and Procession of the Holy Spirit" (available at: <http://www.graceonlinelibrary.org/ar...=13%7C20%7C243>) addresses this issue:

Well they do not uniformly speak of the Holy Spirit as a person, but personification was a normal part of Jewish thought, so the mix of personal and nonpersonal verbs for the holy Spirit is natural.

Quote:

I think the thread (and Crispus) quite clearly contradicts your stated position, but will refrain from analyzing your position or his here. Such analysis and comments properly belongs in that thread.

Very well. I saw him disagree, but I did not see him actually engage what the text explicitly states.

Quote:

I disagree. The same language is used for dramatic effect for people. Why must we presume the same language is not used for dramatic effect of the Holy Spirit? The writers' intended meaning may differ, but that does not preclude one or the other from a figurative application.

Because the point of the passages are that the Holy Spirit is given to people, and thus it is said to be poured out and fill people. I can't come up with a figurative aspect to this. Can you?

Quote:

The Holy Spirit fills, per [Luke 1:41](#). God fills in [Eph 3:19](#). In [Acts 10:38](#), Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit whereas in [2 Cor 1:21](#) believers are anointed...Were we literally anointed? Or were we figuratively anointed, assigned to God's service? The verbs used in both these passages, chrio rather than alepho, is quite revealing. The Holy Spirit is a gift ([Acts 2:38](#)). God gave his Son ([Jn 3:16](#))...

[Ephesians 3:19](#) does not say that God fills, but the fullness that belongs to God fills people. This is similar to [Col. 2:10](#). As for being anointed, we are both figurative and literally. The literal was visibly seen what the Holy Spirit came upon him at his baptism.



06-16-2006

#55

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816
 13 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Take a look at Albert Barnes' comments on this text. Though a Trinitarian, he properly describes what the Holy Spirit is doing in this text. (going from memory anyway)

Crispus or somebody mentioned this article earlier. You might want to read it before we go forward as it will likely address many of your questions.

<http://www.scripturaltruths.com/teachings/holyspirit/>



06-16-2006

#56

simonmickelson

Senior Member

CATHOLIC

Join Date: Feb 2006
 Location: Wollongong area
 NSW Australia
 Posts: 3,559
 32 Reputation Points

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mondo**

Crispus or somebody mentioned this article earlier. You might want to read it before we go forward as it will likely address many of your questions.

<http://www.scripturaltruths.com/teachings/holyspirit/>

Agh the good ol let it slide technique?
 how about in a cut and paste you isolate the part that proves your position mondo?
 I for one would like to be presenting evidence to support my argument post haste!

Wouldnt anybody else do the same if in the right!?

Pssst I see you are silent on the other thread?

"My Lord, My God, The One True Lord, The One True God"



Simon
 Amen God Bless

Last edited by simonmickelson : 06-16-2006 at 05:53 PM.



06-16-2006

#57

mondo

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
 Posts: 816

Quote:

Originally Posted by **simonmickelson**

13 Reputation Points

mondo,

Where do you source this information from?

*Simon
Amen God Bless*

The Bible canon.



06-16-2006

#58

[simonmickelson](#)

Senior Member

CATHOLIC

Join Date: Feb 2006
Location: Wollongong area
NSW Australia
Posts: 3,559
32 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
The Bible canon.

May I see the reference please?



Simon
Amen God Bless



06-16-2006

#59

[mondo](#)

501-1000 Posts

Join Date: Mar 2006
Posts: 816
13 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [simonmickelson](#)
May I see the reference please?



*Simon
Amen God Bless*

Open any Bible and look at the index where the book names are listed.



06-17-2006

#60

[tkkclark](#)

Member

Join Date: Apr 2006
Posts: 275
18 Reputation Points



Quote:

Originally Posted by [mondo](#)
What does what Jesus is called have to do with anything? Nothing. You're building a strawman here. The fact is not that the Holy Spirit is identified as something as a metaphor, but that it is paralleled with something that is contrasting to it.

My point is -- and remains -- that association with impersonal entities does not demand nor require impersonality.

Quote:

If the commentators that agree with your doctrine do not agree with your application of this as a proof text, how can you honestly argue that it proves anything?? They are those that support your doctrine!

I disagree with the commentators. LOL.

Quote:

You err here in your question. The text does not say "The Holy Spirit," it says "the spirit," definite because it would be referring back to what was already mentioned, which is the angel.

When I said Holy Spirit, I was not quoting Scripture. (For future reference, when I quote Scripture, I use italics.) My position is the Spirit referred to in [Acts 8:29](#) is the Holy Spirit. I'd hardly agree that commenting on my own position is an error.

Furthermore, you failed to address my point(s). The angel tells Phillip where to go at the start of the journey. The Spirit appears later, once Phillip reaches his destination. Different places, different times. Nothing in the text demands or requires us to refer back earlier in the account, to an entirely different place and time.

Btw, unless I am mistaken, commentators are in agreement on this.

Quote:

Thus you beg the question. Is it literal or not?

Unless I am mistaken, you think I am arguing the specific quotations I referred to in the book of Revelation? I am not. I said what I originally said to argue that appealing Revelation was not a bad idea (or however you phrased it). I **did not** say that the fact that direct speech is in apocalyptic lit proves the Holy Spirit spoke. Only that direct speech exists in apocalyptic lit so we **can** appeal to apocalyptic lit when considering direct speech.

Quote:

Which does not address my point at all.
...
Still not addressing the point...

The point is -- and remains -- what the definition of "says" in that particular passage means. I c/p the definition and it indicates "to say, to speak." The definition does not include "to impress upon the mind by inspiration" or some such.

Quote:

It is not a plural name but it is a name that belongs to each one...So if we are to say that it is one name, this would be Modalism not Trinitarianism.

I apologize. I have not yet read through Barnes commentary as you suggested. Since your argument still pretty much flies right over my head, I imagine this would be rather necessary for me to understand your position and will wait to comment until I have done so.

But...Would you care to elaborate as to why sharing a single name is modalism? Modalism is the belief that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are the same person. Trinitarianism is the belief that the Father, the Son, and the Spirit are

distinct persons, yet one God. Multiple persons sharing the same name does not demand that each is the same person. My position is that the Father, the Son and the Spirit are distinct persons who share the same, singular name as one God. Then again...Given that this thread is about the Holy Spirit, not the Trinity, perhaps we're sidetracking the thread.

Quote:

Not really. Even during the life of the apostles we read many accounts of false teachings within the church. By the time the early church comes around the apostles are dead and thus no longer around to fight against this apostacy.

Mondo, in a previous thread you cited Origen as a proof for the archetypal sense of alethinos in [John 17:3](#). Origen was an ANF. Are you now saying we should disregard what Origen (and other ANFs) wrote because they were heretics? Turning to the ANFs for insight into the beliefs of the early church is rather common and you have done so yourself.

Quote:

And yet they disagree rather commonly amongst themselves.

The ANFs were human, fallible, their writings uninspired. Contemporary commentators disagree at times as well. I disagree with fellow Christians on certain points, for that matter. The fact that Christians at times disagree does not mean we should toss out a blanket accusation of heresy and totally disregard them, at least not without evidence supporting such an accusation.

I consult the ANFs, just as I consult contemp commentators like John Gill. There is nothing wrong with that.

Quote:

In reality it is no different than what you would be doing were somebody to argue that the heart has a distinct personality.

I beg your pardon, but have I implied you are unreasonable or lacked common sense because you disagree with my position in regards to the Holy Spirit?

Every time you say a reasonable person or anyone with common sense **must** agree with your position, you attack the opposing party, not the merit of the argument. Rather than addressing the issue, you denigrate the intelligence, reasoning capacity, etc of the opposing party him/herself.

You say, in doing so, you are doing no more or no less than **I** would arguing against the personality of the heart. 1) My mother always said two wrongs don't make a right. 2) Given that I am a new poster on this board, I fail to understand how you (or anyone else here) could predict or guess what my behavior might be under any circumstance as yet. I've posted what? 20 times? We've just met. And yet, you know me well enough to presume what my behavior might be and the behavior you suggest I'd pursue (insulting the party of whom I'm arguing with) isn't flattering.

Frankly, I'm offended at your presumptuousness.

If I have at any time inferred you were unreasonable, etc, please point this out to me. I'll apologize immediately.

Quote:

And what else is there, because the truth is that I've never seen any other argument from the Trinitarian side.

I have been presenting other arguments. The essential attributes of personality, ANF support (which is why we are arguing as to the legitimacy in looking to the ANFs above)...

Quote:

Well they do not uniformly speak of the Holy Spirit as a person, but personification was a normal part of Jewish thought, so the mix of personal and nonpersonal verbs for the holy Spirit is natural.

Re "uniformly"...I haven't read a single commentary that indicated that the Holy Spirit is an impersonal force. I haven't read any creeds that indicated the Holy Spirit is an impersonal force. I haven't seen any indication that the ANFs believed the Holy Spirit is an impersonal force...

Personification is a common figure of speech. The fact that this figure of speech was common does not demand nor require that **every** writer, from OT times through NT times, through the ANFs who consistently referred to the Holy Spirit in personal terms **all** applied this figure of speech. In fact, quoting the article "Faith of Our Fathers" by Robert U. Finnerty (part two) located at http://www.cephasministry.com/jw_fai..fathers_2.html :

Quote:

With the exception of the allegorical Shepherd of Hermas, the church fathers rarely employed the literary technique of personification, yet they repeatedly spoke of the Spirit in personal terms.

The article further discusses the personality of the Holy Spirit in the early church. Admittedly, I haven't studied personification in the ANFs, but limited my study to the Bible, but...Exactly how common is personification in simple narrative? How common outside the poets and the prophets? In the historical books of the OT? Hm.

Quote:

Because the point of the passages are that the Holy Spirit is given to people, and thus it is said to be poured out and fill people. I can't come up with a figurative aspect to this. Can you?

Ephesians 4:10 *He who descended is Himself also He who ascended far above all the heavens, so that **He might fill all things.*** (NASB; emphasis mine)

Jesus (who descended and ascended) fills all things. He's a person.

Acts 5:3 *But Peter said, "Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back some of the price of the land?"* (NASB)

Satan filled Ananias' heart. Satan's a person.

Quote:

Ephesians 3:19 does not say that God fills, but the fullness that belongs to God fills people.

Ephesians 3:19 *and to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, that you may be filled up to all the fullness of God.* (NASB)

Please consult Barnes' commentary for his analysis, as it very much agrees with mine.

Quote:

As for being annointed, we are both figurative and literally. The literal was visibly seen what the Holy Spirit came upon him at his baptism.

How are believers literally annointed, per [2 Cor 1:21](#)? I don't know about you, but to date, no one has used oil on me. And again, please note the verbs used. If you like, I'll c/p the definitions.

Also, in regards to Jesus' baptism:

Mt 3:16 ...and he saw the Spirit of God descending **like** a dove, and lighting upon him: (KJV; emphasis mine)

You're presuming that the Holy Spirit's role was described in literal rather than figurative terms. Was the Holy Spirit a literal dove? Or is the Holy Spirit described to be **like** (Strong's 5616; Gr. hosei) a dove?



Post Reply

Page 3 of 4 < 1 2 **3** 4 >

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

Quick Reply

Message:

Please click one of the Quick Reply icons in the posts above to activate Quick Reply.

Options

Quote message in reply?

Post Quick Reply

Go Advanced

Posting Rules

You **may** post new threads
 You **may** post replies
 You **may not** post attachments
 You **may** edit your posts

[vB code](#) is **On**
[Smilies](#) are **On**
[\[IMG\]](#) code is **On**
 HTML code is **Off**

-- Default Style



[Contact Us](#) - [Christian Discussion Forums](#) - [Archive](#) - [To](#)

Powered by vBulletin® Version 3.6.7
Copyright ©2000 - 2007, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.
copyright CARM 2006,2007

Get Weather for any City, State, Zipcode, or Country:

Fast Forecast