

EMPOWERING FOR MISSION ONLY? AN EXEGETICAL STUDY ON THE ROLE OF  
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

BY  
LA HKAWNG

SUPERVISOR  
PROF. REIDAR HVALVIK

THIS MASTER'S THESIS IS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER IN THEOLOGY DEGREE AT

MF NORWEGIAN SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, (2013, SPRING)  
AVH 5010: MASTER'S THESIS (60 ECTS)  
MASTER IN THEOLOGY  
WORD: 30649

## TABLE OF CONTENT

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	
<b>1.1 The Problem and the scholars' discussion on Luke-Acts</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1.2 Robert P. Menzies</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>1.3 Max Turner</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>1.4 Conclusion</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. RECEIVING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AT THE PENTECOST</b>	
<b>2.1 An Exegetical work on Acts 2:1-4</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.1.1 Sections of Acts 2</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.1.2 Analysis on Acts 2:1-4</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.1.3 Conclusion</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.2 The baptism in the name of Jesus and receiving of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>2.2.1 The interpretation of Acts 2:38 by Robert Menzies and Max Turner</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2.2.2 Conclusion</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>3. THE RECEIVING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AFTER PENTECOST EVENT</b>	
<b>3.1 Empowering with the Holy Spirit after the Spirit Baptism in Acts 4:31</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>3.1.1 Interpretations of Robert Menzies and Max Turner</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.1.2 Conclusion</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>3.2 The giving of the Holy Spirit to the Samaritans: Acts 8:14-17</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.2.1 Philip and Simon Magus</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.2.2 Conversion of Samaritans and Simon Magus</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>3.2.3 Interpretation of the Samaritan pericope by Robert Menzies and Max Turner</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>3.2.4 Conclusion</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>3.3 The Giving of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles: Acts 10:44-48</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>3.3.1 God's initiation in conversion event</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>3.3.2 Conversion of Cornelius</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3.3.3 Receiving of the Spirit as conversion-initiation</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>3.3.4 Interpretation of Robert Menzies and Max Turner</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>3.3.5 Conclusion</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>3.4 The receiving of the Spirit by the twelve Ephesian disciples: Acts 19:1-6</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>3.4.1 Who are the twelve Ephesian disciples?</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>3.4.2 Are the twelve Ephesians disciples of Apollos?</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>3.4.3 Interpretation of Robert Menzies and Max Turner on Acts 19</b>	<b>65</b>

<b>3.4.4 Conclusion</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>4. CONCLUSION</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>76</b>

## ACKOWLDEGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for granting me good health, guidance and leading thorough out the whole process of writing till the end.

I would like to express my thanks to the professors, teachers and officers of MF Norwegian School of Theology for sharing of their knowledge, their warm friendship, their help during my two year study in Norway. I also would like to express my gratitude to Norwegian government for the Quota Scheme program. Without that financial support, it is not possible for me to survive in such an expensive country.

My deepest gratitude goes to my supervisor Prof. Reidar Hvalvik for his patience, motivation, guidance and suggestions. I deeply appreciate for his quick responses whenever I submit my paper or I need help. Besides my supervisor, I would like to thank Prof. Geir Otto Holmås, Prof. Karl Olav Sandnes and Prof. Tormod Engelsviken who suggested me concerning my thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my great gratitude to the staff and students of Myanmar Institute of Theology, the church members of Yangon Kachin Baptist Church, Myanmar Christian Church in Oslo, my friends and my family for their prayers and supports during my study in Norway.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

Gen	Genesis
Exod	Exodus
Deut	Deuteronomy
1 Kgs	1 Kings
2Chr	Second Chronicle
Ps	Psalms
Isa	Isaiah
Jer	Jerimiah
Ezek	Ezekiel
Mal	Malachi
Rom	Roman
1 Cor	First Corinthians
Gal	Galatians
1 Thes	First Thessalonians
B.C.	Before Christ
C.E.	Common Era
LXX	Septuagint
cf.	compare or confer with
i.e.	that is

## CHAPTER (1) INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 The Problem and the scholars' discussion on Luke-Acts

Max Turner mentions five areas of consensus on Lucan<sup>1</sup> pneumatology where biblical scholarship appears to agree (1) Luke's pneumatological material is Jewish and deeply rooted in the Old Testament. (2) The Spirit, for Luke, is the uniting motif and driving force within the Lucan salvation history and provides the legitimation of the mission to which this leads. (3) The Spirit is 'the Spirit of Prophecy' which empowers for witnessing. (4) Luke has little interest in the Spirit as the power of spiritual, ethical and religious renewal of the individual.<sup>2</sup> (5) Luke's understanding of the Holy Spirit goes beyond Judaism in giving the Holy Spirit Christocentric functions.<sup>3</sup>

Turner also points out some areas where scholars greatly disagreed with each other. The first area concerns with the question of 'the Spirit of prophecy'. Was the Spirit in Acts Joel's 'Spirit of prophecy' alone? The second area concerns with the conversion-initiation and the gift of the Holy Spirit. How did Luke relate the Spirit to conversion-initiation? The third area concerns with the question of *donum superadditum*. Is the Spirit only a *donum superadditum*, a 'second' grace distinct from the gift of salvation and granted subsequent to it, or did the Spirit also have soteriological functions?<sup>4</sup>

Concerning the gift of the Spirit and conversion-initiation, there are three positions: (1) Acts has no consistent norm, but reflects a diversity of sources, (2) the norm is a conversion-initiation pattern in which conversional repentance/faith is crystalized in baptism, and the Spirit is received in connection with the whole process, and (3) the norm is that the Spirit is given subsequent to conversion and 'salvation' i.e., *donum superadditum*.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The name 'Luke' will be used to designate the author both of the Third Gospel and of Acts.

<sup>2</sup> Matthias Wenk's work (Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*, 2000) on the study of Luke-Acts provides that the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts concerns with the ethical life of the God's people. The Holy Spirit is the source of the holiness, the power of the ministry for the restoration and transformation of the Israelite people.

<sup>3</sup> Max Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness" in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 328-332.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy'", 333.

<sup>5</sup> Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy'", 333-339.

The classical Pentecostal tradition is much in line with the third position, *donum supperadditum*. The Classical Pentecostal paradigms separate conversional ‘salvation’ from subsequent ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’. Spirit Baptism is conceived as empowerment for witness as evidenced by heightened participation in extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, especially speaking in tongues. The sanctification experience was conceived as preparatory to the empowering experience of Spirit Baptism.<sup>6</sup> This understanding fully relied on the understanding of pneumatology in Luke-Acts. Concerning Luke’s understanding of the Holy Spirit, there are two sides of standing within Pentecostal New Testament scholarship. On one hand, Gordon Fee states that reception of the gift of the Spirit in conversion-initiation is vital to the experience of all aspects of Christian existence and service. For Fee, the gift of the Spirit cannot be regarded as second gift which empowers for mission.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, defending the Classical Pentecostal paradigm, Robert Menzies argues that the function of the Holy Spirit does not concern soteriology but only empowering for mission.<sup>8</sup> The Pentecostal gift to the disciples in Acts is conceived in parallel to Jesus’ Jordan experience which is exclusively empowering for mission and the disciples’ Pentecostal experience has been taken as paradigmatic for all believers. The Spirit is always given to those who are already ‘saved’ disciples. The gift always comes as an endowment empowering witness. There is no point of receiving the Spirit by a person related to his or her own experience of salvation, or ethical transformation. Thus, for Luke, the Spirit always rather works through the believer for the benefit of outsiders.<sup>9</sup>

Contra Classical Pentecostalism, Haya-Prats and Mainville have argued for a charismatic endowment serving wider ranging including ecclesiastically orientated ends.<sup>10</sup> For Haya-Prats, the gift of Spirit is eschatological in the sense that it attests the messiahship of Jesus and inaugurates the end-time. The prophetic gift of Joel is for all flesh but it is not primarily oriented to mission. It is rather meant to the broader activity of ‘witness’ to God’s salvation-historical intent. The Spirit’s witness is seen to be direct, either as an external

---

<sup>6</sup> Frank D. Macchia, “The Kingdom and the Power: Spirit Baptism in Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspective” in *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006), 109.

<sup>7</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*, (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994)

<sup>8</sup> Menzies’ understanding of Holy Spirit will be presented more detail in the following chapter.

<sup>9</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, (London; T&T Clark International, 2004), 206.

<sup>10</sup> Max Turner, “The ‘Spirit of Prophecy’”, 339.

witness to God's will for the church, or, revealed in glossolalia, joy, courage and praise, as the effect or means of an internal witness of the Spirit to Christians.<sup>11</sup>

Menzies' arguments are greatly challenged by Max Turner. Max Turner argues that the Holy Spirit does concern the soteriological (the restoration of God) and ethical life of believers. Concerning this discussion, the theological standpoints of Robert P. Menzies (Pentecostal scholar) and Max Turner (Evangelical Baptist minister and NT professor) will be briefly presented in this chapter.

## 1.2 Robert P. Menzies

Menzies's primary concern is the development of early Christian pneumatology within the soteriological dimension. He challenges the following theological standings: the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity which is prominent in the Pauline letters was also integrated in the pneumatology of Luke (Buschel, Dunn), Luke views the gift of Spirit as the source of cleansing and moral transformation (Dunn, von Baer), the gift of the Spirit as the essential bond which links the individual Christian to God (Turner), and the foretaste of the salvation to come (Haya-Prats). In his monograph "Empowered for Witness", Menzies argues that Luke never attributes soteriological functions to the Spirit and that his narrative presupposes a pneumatology which exclude the soteriological dimension. For him, Luke consistently portrays the Spirit as the source of prophetic inspiration that empowers God's people for effective service.<sup>12</sup>

In the first part of his book, he examines the description of the Spirit in Judaism. His analysis leads to the following understanding of the Holy Spirit; as follow: in the intertestamental Judaism, no soteriological functions was attributed to the Spirit. The Spirit is *donum superadditum* granted to various individuals in order to fulfill a divinely appointed task except in the later sapiential writings 1QH and Wisdom of Solomon.

---

<sup>11</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 74.

<sup>12</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 44. Robert Menzies' work, "The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: with special reference to Luke-Acts" was published in 1991. These two works are greatly similar to each other except the difference of the third part of each book. Menzies discussed the origin of Paul's soteriological pneumatology in "The development of Early Christianity Pneumatology" whereas he discussed the significance of Luke's pneumatology from Pentecostal Perspective in the *Empowered for Witness*. In this work, I will refer to the book entitled *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*.



In the second part, he examines Luke's prophetic pneumatology. He argues that Luke consistently portrays the gift of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment which enables its recipient to participate in the mission of God. According to Menzies, Luke did not attribute miracles to the Spirit. Yet, Luke remained portraying the Spirit as the source of special insight and inspired speech. What he emphasizes in this part is that neither Luke nor the primitive church attributes soteriological significance to the pneumatic gift in a manner analogous to Paul.<sup>13</sup>

In the last part of his work entitled "The development of Early Christian Pneumatology", he analyses the origin of Paul's soteriological pneumatology. Menzies concludes that Paul is the first one to attribute a soteriological function to the Spirit. According to Menzies, neither ancient Judaism nor Luke perceived the Spirit as a soteriological necessity or as instrumental for the ethical renewal of the people of God. Like Schweizer, Menzies thinks that Luke and the most part of second temple Judaism, do not associate healings and miracles with the Spirit, they are caused by the power (δύναμις) of God.

In his analysis of the Pentecostal account, he states that the gift of the Spirit as prophesied by Joel cannot be interpreted in the light of Ezekiel's promise of a new heart (Ezek. 36:25-26) rather the primary purpose of the prophetic gift is to equip believers for the missionary task. The event of 'Pentecost' was not celebrated as a festival commemorating the giving of the law at Sinai at the time of Luke's writing. It was celebrated as a harvest festival. Luke's redactional change of the Joel passage and the list of nations emphasize the missiological significance of the disciples' experience with the Spirit. The Pentecost account indicates that Luke did not view the gift of the Spirit as the power of the new law of Christ. The Spirit of Pentecost is rather the source of prophetic inspiration and the Spirit of mission.<sup>14</sup>

### **1.3 Max Turner**

Turner's standpoint is much in line with the second position mentioned above: a conversion-initiation pattern in which conversional repentance/faith is crystalized in baptism, and the Spirit is received in connection with the whole process. He thinks that the paradigm of Acts 2:38-39 dominates the book of Acts whereas Acts 8:12-17 is exceptional. The gift of Spirit is associated with conversion, faith and baptism. He rejects that the Spirit is exclusively

---

<sup>13</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 45.

<sup>14</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 178-201.

empowerment for mission. He argues that Luke highlights the gift of the Spirit to the apostles as an empowering to witness, but that is because the expansion of the witness is a major plot in Acts. He also points out that the Spirit given to Samaritans, to Cornelius' household, or to the Ephesian 'twelve', is not exclusively an empowerment for mission. Coinciding with Haya-Prats, Turner regards the Spirit as the charismatic empowering of the church.<sup>15</sup>

Max Turner's work concerns with the soteriological and ethical discussion on the Spirit in Luke-Acts. For him, the soteriological understanding of Luke should be interpreted in light of Isaiah 61 and Joel 3 rather than Ezekiel 36. He examines Luke's pneumatology along the line of the vindication and restoration of Israel. Luke's portrait of the Spirit 'is dominated by his broader intention to portray the ministry of Jesus, and the Church which results, as the fulfillment of God's promises to restore his people Israel to make her a light to the nations'.<sup>16</sup> For Turner, the Pentecost is part of God's eschatological restoration of Israel or cleansing of Zion. It is not just a guarantee of the accomplished salvation and anticipated fulfillment of God's promise.

Turner's extensive study on the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism<sup>17</sup> provides that there is more evidence for associating the Spirit with the miraculous and with the ethical renewal of Israel than Menzies is willing to admit. For instance, the messianic figures that developed from Isa. 11:1-4 are in some passages depicted as being positively influenced by the Spirit towards the righteousness they exemplify in their own life and were also expected to restore among God's people. Turner asserts that Jesus' experience with the Spirit at his baptism (Luke 3:20, 22) must be understood more in terms of empowering for his messianic task than along the line of 'eschatological sonship'. His interpretation of Jesus' announcement in Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30) provides that Jesus is the Isaianic soteriological prophet announcing Israel's messianic Jubilee and New Exodus. In other words, Luke portrays Jesus as expected messiah of the Spirit rather than that Jesus' empowerment at the Jordan contributed to his own life before God.<sup>18</sup>

I assume that Turner's theological standpoint can be seen clearer when we compare it to Menzies's theological stand. For Menzies, Christianity emerged from a Jewish context that understood the Spirit almost exclusively as what has been called the 'Spirit of prophecy'. Turner argued that in Judaism, the 'Spirit of prophecy' performed a broader range of

---

<sup>15</sup> Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy'", 340-341.

<sup>16</sup> Turner, *Power from on high*, 188-201.

<sup>17</sup> Turner, *Power from on high*, 86-138.

<sup>18</sup> Turner, *Power from on high*, 429-430.

functions than Menzies imagines, and it was regarded as fundamental to the true ethical-religious life of the individual or the community.

Menzies claims that the Jews, at the time of Jesus, tended to think of the Spirit as giving revelation and inspired speech.<sup>19</sup> Turner argues that in Acts, the Spirit is portrayed as the source of the gifts not just for giving revelation and inspired speech but also revelatory words or instruction or guidance, charismatic wisdom or revelatory discernment, invasive charismatic praise, preaching and witness.<sup>20</sup>

Menzies conceives that the reception of the Spirit was not understood as a necessity for salvation of the individual. And such a gift has been given to a few mainly prophets, leaders and kings.<sup>21</sup> But for Turner, the Jewish hope for the widespread eschatological return of the Spirit of prophecy was also probably soteriological. The gift of the Spirit is granted to various individuals.<sup>22</sup>

Menzies regards Luke 1-2 as the beginning of the hoped-for return of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to Israel, after the relative quiet of the intertestamental period.<sup>23</sup> For Turner, Luke 1-2 (especially Luke 1:68-79 and 2:29-32) provides that the Spirit is a soteriological gift of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ in line with Isaianic new exodus (Isa 44-55, 60-61).<sup>24</sup>

For Menzies, Luke 3-4 represents Jesus as receiving the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ as the power to announce Israel’s salvation. The transitional passages between Luke and Acts (Luke 24:46-49 and Acts 1:5-8) anticipate the Spirit as the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ empowering the apostolic witness which will divide Israel into ‘the saved church’ and ‘Judaism-under-judgment’.<sup>25</sup> For Turner, Luke 1: 46-55, 68-79 and 2:29-32, expressed that Luke largely used the language and imagery drawn from Isaiah 40-55, 60-61. Luke 3-4 portrays Jesus’ Jordan experience as a unique messianic empowering to proclaim and effect Israel’s new exodus liberation. The transitional passages between Luke 24:47-49 and Acts 1:1-8 anticipate the Spirit to bring both the salvation of the community and its empowering to preach.<sup>26</sup>

For Menzies, the Pentecostal account focuses on the gift of the Spirit as the fulfillment of Joel’s promise of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to all God’s people, and the reception of this as the powerful inspiration of witness to Jesus. The chapters following the Pentecost event in Acts

---

<sup>19</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 101-102.

<sup>20</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 92-104.

<sup>21</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 101-102.

<sup>22</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 92-104.

<sup>23</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 119-122.

<sup>24</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 162-165.

<sup>25</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 155-156.

<sup>26</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 170-187, 215-232.

portray the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ exclusively as an empowering for mission.<sup>27</sup> For Turner, the Pentecost event is not just empowering to witness but it is also about how Messiah, as Lord of the Spirit, begins to exercise his saving life for and in Israel. The ‘Spirit of prophecy’ is not merely an empowering to witness but it is essential for experiencing the ‘life’ of new exodus salvation. The ‘Spirit of prophecy’, thus, also has a soteriological function.<sup>28</sup>

#### 1.4 Conclusion

This survey indicates that both Menzies and Turner acknowledge the great impact of the intertestamental Judaism towards Luke’s understanding of the Holy Spirit. Menzies’ finding provides that most of the intertestamental literature portrays the Spirit as *donum superadditum* and that the soteriological role of the Spirit is hardly found except in 1QH and Wisdom of Solomon (covenantal renewal). It was the apostle Paul who developed the understanding of the Holy Spirit in relation to soteriology, concern. Menzies’ interpretation on Acts 2 is based upon the understanding which sees the endowment of the Spirit at Pentecost (Harvest Festival) as merely an empowerment for witness to the apostles. Peter’s interpretation of the Pentecost event, based upon Joel’s promise of the Spirit, asserts that the event is the endowment the prophetic Spirit. Although Turner agrees with Menzies that the Spirit is the prophetic spirit, he thinks that the role of the Holy Spirit deals with the salvation or restoration of the Israelite people. For him, the Pentecost event reflects the Sinai theophany and the event deals with the covenant renewal which concerns the restoration of Israel.

This thesis intends to examine whether Luke really conceives the role of the Holy Spirit as a *donum-superadditum* and only for empowering mission or whether it is related to soteriology. The methodological approach of this study is elective. It is intended to give an exegesis particularly of Acts 2:1-4; 2:38; 4:31; 8:14-17; 10:44-48 and 19:1-7 questioning how Luke portrays the receiving of the Spirit. This study will apply literary methods and pay attention to the final form of the text. The exegetical work is divided into two major parts – the giving of the Spirit at the Pentecost and the giving of the Spirit after the Pentecost.

In the narrative of Acts, the leading and guidance of the Spirit to the missionaries, specifically, Peter and Paul (Saul) are important. It is not, however, the only picture of the Holy Spirit Luke describes. In this thesis I will show how the pericopes in 2:1-4; 2:38; 4:31; 8:14-17; 10:44-48 and 19:1-7 indicate that the receiving of the Spirit is closely related with

---

<sup>27</sup> Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 178-189.

<sup>28</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 418-427.

conversion events. In other words, the receiving of the Holy Spirit concerns the restoration of the believers to the saved community.

## CHAPTER (2) RECEIVING OF THE HOLY AT THE PENTECOST

### 2.1 An Exegetical work on Acts 2:1-4

The gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostle are comprehensively regarded as a two volume works. Within these two works, there are some corresponding parallels. Among the parallels, the endowment of Holy Spirit in the very beginning of Acts can be regarded as a parallel to the baptism of Jesus in the river of Jordan (Luke 3:16-17). Jesus's followers are empowered by the spirit for mission in the beginning of Acts just as Jesus was early in Luke's Gospel.<sup>29</sup> The endowment of the Holy Spirit in Jordan is the Spirit of prophecy<sup>30</sup> to empower Jesus for the messianic task which is a liberating ministry announced in Luke 4:16-30.<sup>31</sup> Robert Menzies thinks that Jesus is empowered by the Spirit in order to proclaim the restoration of the Jewish people and the spirit-inspired preaching of Jesus effects salvation. The endowment of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecost event can be seen as the fulfillment of John the Baptist's prophecy, "he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Luke 3:16, NRSV) and of the promise of Jesus, "I am sending upon you what my Father promised; so stay here in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high." (Luke 24:49, NRSV). Menzies argues that the key transitional passages between Luke and Acts (Luke 24:46-49 and Acts 1:5-8) signify the Spirit as the 'Spirit of prophecy' empowering the apostolic witness which will divide Israel into 'the (saved) church' and 'Judaism-under-judgment'.<sup>32</sup> Contra Menzies it can be argued that the baptism of Jesus and the task of Messiah not merely concern proclamation. Luke recognized the Isaianic new exodus motif<sup>33</sup>,

---

<sup>29</sup> Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary vol.1* (Grand Rapids; Baker Academic, 2012), 780. David G. Peterson, *The Pillar New Testament Commentary: The Acts of the Apostle* (Grand Rapids; William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 130.

<sup>30</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, (London; T&T Clark International, 2004), 121.

<sup>31</sup> Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*, (New York: T&T Clark International, 2000), 48.

<sup>32</sup> In his analysis on Nazareth pericope in Luke 4, Menzies argues that Luke would have altered the Septuagint to highlight the prophetic nature of the endowment of the Spirit. He pointed out that the phrase "to heal the crushed in heart" in Isaiah 61:1 was omitted as it would relate the Spirit of prophecy with miraculous healing. The phrase "to send the oppressed into release" from Isaiah 58:6 was imported to Luke 4:18. Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 148-156.

<sup>33</sup> Turner's interpretation of Luke's infancy narrative (Luke 1-2) provides that the people of Israel expect the Davidin-Messianic restoration of Zion within history. The restoration has already been begun in the Spirit's conception of the messianic Son of

and the salvation Jesus announces primarily concerns with the release, purging, and transformation of Israel. The power is not merely to proclaim the good news related to the new exodus about releasing the poor, oppressed and the blind, but to put it into effect in powerful acts of liberation from evil forces. In addition, the redactional change in Luke 4:1 (“...he [Jesus] was led by the Spirit” while being tempted) signifies that the Spirit of prophecy has immediate ethical influence to those who are being endowed.<sup>34</sup> Besides, although the endowments of the Spirit in Jordan and at Pentecost is intended for empowering for mission, it should not be forced to mean that the apostles and other Christians receive the Spirit of prophecy in exactly the same way as Jesus did.<sup>35</sup>

In the Acts of the Apostles, Luke continues his narrative with the narrative of Jesus’s resurrection. Luke puts the Pentecost account after ascension of Jesus, the gathering of the disciples and the selection of a new apostle. There can be no doubt that Luke saw the event of Pentecost as the fulfillment of the promise in Acts 1:5 (ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίω: cf. 1:8) seeing filling with the Holy Spirit and baptism with the Holy Spirit as synonymous: “... for John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days from now.” (Acts 1:5, NRSV); “you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.” (Acts 1:8, NRSV). Although 1:8 associates the empowerment for proclaiming God’s message only with the apostles, this passage demonstrates that the empowerment is provided for all Jesus’s followers. According to Keener, this empowerment is related to the proclamation of God’s own message across cultural boundaries (2:4-11) and hence ultimately to form the church across such boundaries.<sup>36</sup> In Acts, it is obvious that the Spirit leads and guides the missionaries. It is not the only function of the Spirit, indeed the receiving of the Spirit can be seen as fulfillment of the prophecy and signs of God’s restoration task, specifically in conversion event.

---

God (1:35). This act of new creation foreshadows Israel’s New Exodus renewal (the renewal through Jesus who is the Davidic Messiah). Jesus’s receiving of the Holy Spirit in Jordan River is for the empowerment of the Isaianic restoration task mentioned in Luke 4. The receiving of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecost event is an empowerment of the disciples to continue the Isaianic restoration task. (Max Turner, *The Power from on High*, 162-163, 433-434.)

<sup>34</sup> Turner, *Power from on high*, 140-165.

<sup>35</sup> Turner, 433-434.

<sup>36</sup> Keener, 780.

### 2.1.1 Sections of Acts 2

The narrative of Acts 2 can be divided into four parts or four *Gatungen*<sup>37</sup>: (1) the narrative of the Pentecost event (2:1-13), (2) Peter's Discourse to the Assembled Israel: Explanation of the Event (2:14-36), (3) Reaction to Peter's Discourse (2:37-41), (4) a summary of community life: telling the results of the events and their apostolic interpretation (2:42-47). Acts 2:1-4 is part of the narrative of the Pentecost event. This event is so crucial in this narrative that the other three parts of Acts 2 can be regarded as the explanation of the Pentecost narrative.

### 2.1.2 Analysis on Acts 2:1-4

Since Acts 2:1-4 may be seen as the most basic text about the Holy Spirit in Acts, I will give a detailed exegesis of selected words and phrases in the pericope, i.e. words and phrases that are important for the central topic of this thesis.

Acts 2:1

Καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.

Luke uses the term ἐν τῷ with the infinitive to connote the function of a time clause (cf. 3:26; 4:30; 8:6; 9:3; 11:15; 19:1). It occurs 32 times in Luke and this usage is characteristic of historical writers from the second century B.C. to the first century C.E. The term συμπληροῦσθαι is used in LXX to express the completion of a period<sup>38</sup> or an interval. In this light, the day of the Pentecost arrived as the people expected. Turner suggests that it might mean that 'when the day of Pentecost was fulfilled.'<sup>39</sup> David G. Peterson also translates "when the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled"<sup>40</sup> With the notion of fulfillment, the term συμπληροῦσθαι indicates the fulfillment of God's promise concerning the coming of the Holy Spirit given to the prophets, reaffirmed and announced by Jesus in 1:5,8.

<sup>37</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), 40.

<sup>38</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with introduction and commentary* (Grand Rapids; William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990), 113.

<sup>39</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 280.

<sup>40</sup> David G. Peterson, *The Pillar New Testament Commentary: The Acts of the Apostle* (Grand Rapids; William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 130.



The expression of ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι is also used in Luke 9:51 “the days fulfilled for Jesus to be taken up” referring to the crucifixion, death and resurrection of Jesus. The phrase marks the beginning of a new stage in the outworking of God’s purpose and the completion or fulfillment of a critical moment of salvation history in the narrative of Luke-Acts.<sup>41</sup> Thus, when Luke uses this phrase in Acts 2, he is indicating that a new stage is fulfilled at the day of Pentecost. In this light, it is very likely that Luke regards the Pentecost as not just an ordinary annual festival but rather as an important event which marks the beginning of a new stage in the outworking of God’s purpose.

τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς

“The Feast of the Weeks” is one of the pilgrimage feasts to Jerusalem during the year. In the Rabbinic literature, it can be seen as the conclusion or completion of the Passover.<sup>42</sup> It is mentioned in Leviticus 23:15-21 (Exod 34:22; Num 28:26-31; Deut 16:9-12). This festival includes sacrificing and feasting for seven weeks and a day after the first fruits of the grain harvest had been offered.<sup>43</sup> Thus, the Pentecost is also known as the day of first fruit.<sup>44</sup> As the day is the fiftieth day counting from the day of Passover, this festival is known as πεντηκοστῆς in the Greek speaking society or Hellenistic Judaism.

Concerning the understanding of the Pentecost, it is greatly discussed whether the Pentecost event was celebrated only as a harvest festival or if it also was a commemoration of the Sinai event. Some Jewish sources associate Pentecost with God’s renewal of the covenant, three months after the original Passover and the exodus from Egypt. The day of Pentecost was celebrated as the commemorating of the moment of the giving of the law at Sinai in the third month after the exodus (Exod 19:1), that is in the third month after the (first) Passover (in Egypt).<sup>45</sup> The gift of the Law was an act of divine revelation in which the nature and the will of God were made known on the basis of his gracious act of deliverance and with the result of a covenant between himself and his people. Likewise, the event of Pentecost can be seen as the new revelation through the Holy Spirit, based upon the new act of redemption and deliverance, marking the formation of a new, or renewed, people of God, based upon a new

---

<sup>41</sup> Peterson, 131, 85.

<sup>42</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The International Critical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles vol. 1*, ed. J. A. Emerton, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 111.

<sup>43</sup> Peterson, 131.

<sup>44</sup> F. F. Bruce, 113.

<sup>45</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervon, 2012), 113.

covenant. According to the Babylonian Talmud (Shabbath 88b), the word produced out of the mouth of God divided into seventy tongues/ languages. Although only the people of Israel accepted the Torah and obeyed, it was heard by all nations in their own languages.<sup>46</sup>

The interpretation of the Pentecost as an allusion to the Sinai event is rejected by many scholars for three reasons: (1) The rabbinic material, that presents the Pentecost as commemorating of the Sinai event, is too late to be relevant and of little value for reconstructing Jewish understanding of the feast before the destruction of the temple. The first inference of this understanding can be seen in the reference of Jose ben Halafta<sup>47</sup>/ Chalaphtha<sup>48</sup> (c. A.D. 150, in *Seder 'Olam R.5*), and R. Eleazar ben Pedath, (c. 270, in b. *Pes.* 68b.)<sup>49</sup> (2) The narrative of Acts 2 does not directly allude to the Sinai theophany or the giving of the Law on Sinai. (3) Acts 2:33 should be interpreted in light of Ps. 67:19 (LXX) because of literary dependency. The text of Ps 67:19 mentions Moses, at Sinai, who ascended into heaven to receive the Torah in order that he might deliver it to the Israelite people. This text is applied in Acts 2:33 where it says that Jesus who ascended to the right hand of God, received the Holy Spirit and poured it on the disciples.<sup>50</sup>

Robert Menzies argues that the celebration the Pentecost event as commemoration of the Sinai event reflects a post temple understanding of the Feast of the Weeks. As the temple was destroyed in 70 AD, the rituals of sacrifice so central to the harvest feast could no longer be performed. Thus, a rereading of the Decalogue and commemoration of its revelation at Sinai became significant feature of the feast.<sup>51</sup>

Although there are some indications in the book of Jubilees that the Pentecost was celebrated as a covenant renewal, it was the covenant of peace tied to Noah. The commemoration of the giving of the law is subordinate or secondary. Marshall also suggests that this event is related to 2 Chr 15:10-12. The detailed development of the connection between the Pentecost and the Sinai event seems to be later.<sup>52</sup>

Other scholars do, however, see a connection between Pentecost and the Sinai event. Fitzmyer argues that there is no *direct* reference to the event of the Sinai covenant in the Pentecost story, but *indirect* allusions reveal that Luke was aware of the association of

---

<sup>46</sup> C. K. Barrett, 111. C. K. Barrett rejected this way of interpretation.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, 114.

<sup>48</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 190.

<sup>49</sup> F. F. Bruce, 113-114.

<sup>50</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 189-190.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid, 189-191.

<sup>52</sup> I Howard Marshall, 1977, 347-69, 360-365.

Pentecost with the renewal of the covenant.<sup>53</sup> Like Fitzmyer, David G. Peterson conceives that the tradition of Pentecost, as commemorating the Sinai event, is unlikely to have influenced Luke's presentation directly. But the setting of Acts 2 ("they were all gathered in one place") and the terms "wind and fire" in vv. 2-3 would allude to the giving of the law on Sinai.<sup>54</sup> Charles H. Talbert argues that the Pentecost narrative is a typological narrative. Typology is the method of referring to a person, event, or thing in the present in terms of a person, event, or thing in scripture so as to make a statement about the nature of what is described in the present. (a) "The people are all in one place together" in Acts 2:1 reflects the "Israelites at Sinai were all of one heart" in Exod 19:17. The audition ("a sound like a strong rushing wind" v.2), the vision ("There appeared to them tongues like flames of fire" v.3) echoes Exod. 19:16-19. The speech in different tongue (v.4) that was understood by those who hear it in their own language (v.8) reflects Moses' warning to the people in Exod.19: 21. Thus, the Pentecost event greatly echoes to the scene of Sinai theophany.<sup>55</sup>

Peterson also provides an argument for relating the Pentecost event with the Last Supper of Jesus. When Jesus reinterprets the Passover to signify the inauguration of a new covenant in his blood (Luke 22:15-20; cf. Jer 31:31-34), the Pentecost event, fifty days after Passover, can be regarded as the promised renewal of God's relationship with Israel through the gift of his Spirit as a direct result of Jesus' redemptive death and resurrection.<sup>56</sup> In other words, if Luke relates to the Last Supper as a fulfillment of God's gift of Passover, he would correspondingly portrayed Pentecost as a fulfillment of God's gift of the Sinai covenant. Thus, the event of Pentecost as a whole is related to the commemorating of the Sinai theophany.

v. 2 καὶ ἐγένετο ἄφνω ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦχος ὡς περ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίως καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἦσαν καθήμενοι.

ἐγένετο ἄφνω

The word ἄφνω indicates that the coming of the Spirit on this occasion was a sudden event and Luke may intend to indicate the event as 'awesome', 'wondrous' and

<sup>53</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 234.

<sup>54</sup> Peterson, 131.

<sup>55</sup> Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on The Acts of The Apostles*, (New York; The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), 41, 42.

<sup>56</sup> David, 131.

“supernatural”.<sup>57</sup> This event is unique in the sense that no such signs are associated with endowments of the Spirit recorded elsewhere in Acts. Only the phenomenon of inspired speech (v.4) is paralleled later.<sup>58</sup>

ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦχος ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίος

The term ὥσπερ ‘like’ hardly appears in his narrative except the Pentecost event. He presented the coming of the Spirit ‘like’ wind and ‘like’ fire, just as he spoke of the Spirit coming on Jesus ‘like’ a dove (Luke 3:21-22). Luke did not identify the ‘Holy Spirit’ with ‘wind’ or ‘fire’ as he does not regard the Spirit as a ‘substance’. Luke’s pneumatology is Jewish and biblical.<sup>59</sup>

The word πνοῆς (“wind”) resembles the Spirit<sup>60</sup> or creative breath of God. Luke may allude to God’s gift of the breath of life in the LXX and life giving breath reflecting Gen. 2:7 (Acts 17:25).<sup>61</sup> The usage of this term may indicate that the Spirit of the Lord is the giver of new life.

The term πνεῦμα which means both ‘Spirit’ and ‘wind’ is not used here, rather it is used the term ‘wind’ resembling the coming of the Spirit and the presence of God.<sup>62</sup> The word πνοῆς is modified with the present passive participle of φέρω (φερομένης) denoting that the sound or noise (ἦχος) is like a sound brought by a mighty wind or storm. This usage can be also found in 2 Sam 22:16; Ps 33:6; Ezek 37:9; John 3:8. A sound like the blowing of a violent wind came from heaven suggesting the powerful presence of God (cf. 1 Kgs 19:11), as it filled the whole house where they were sitting. The sound of storm reflects the event of Sinai theophany where “a very loud trumpet blast” was heard (Exod 19:16). Luke’s readers were familiar with the expression of “a rushing of wind” with the comparative particle ὥσπερ, a comparison of the actual phenomenon with meteorological phenomena.<sup>63</sup> It is noteworthy that outside Luke’s usage, the term ἦχος is used only once in the New Testament which is in Hebrews 12:19 alluding to the revelation at Sinai.<sup>64</sup> Peter makes it clear in v. 33 that the

---

<sup>57</sup> C. K. Barrett, 113.

<sup>58</sup> David G. Peterson, 132.

<sup>59</sup> Keener, 799.

<sup>60</sup> F. F. Bruce, 114.

<sup>61</sup> Keener, 800.

<sup>62</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 114.

<sup>63</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 114.

<sup>64</sup> Keener, 802.

exalted Lord Jesus has poured out the promised Spirit.<sup>65</sup> This is also a sign that God was about to accomplish a mighty work of renewal.

ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον οὓ ἦσαν καθήμενοι

Turner distinguishes three different expressions of ‘full of’/ ‘fill with’ in Luke-Acts: (1) the passive of the verb πληρώω ‘to fill’ (Acts 13:52); (2) the adjective form πλήρης ‘full of’ (Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24); and (3) the passive of the verb ‘to fill completely’ (Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8,31; 9:17). The verb πληρώω is used in the context of filled with joy and with the Spirit (Acts 13:52), with wisdom (Luke 2:40) and with rejoicing (Acts 2:28). Luke mostly used the adjective πλήρης ‘full of’ with genitive of quality to describe the state of being ‘full of the Holy Spirit’ or of some particular grace in permanent state or a long-term state rather than an immediate effect (Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5, 8; 7:55; 9:36; 11:24; contrast 13:10; 19:28). Luke uses the verb πίμπλημι with genitive of divine Spirit for events or inspiration of short duration or immediate effects rather than the inception of long-term endowments of the Spirit.<sup>66</sup> It denotes that the presence or endowment of the Holy Spirit in the disciples’ lives can be regarded as a permanent endowment.

ν. 3 καὶ ὄφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐφ’ ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν

διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς

The second phenomenon that the believers became aware of was an optical manifestation, flickering of light compared to tongues of fire. The term ‘fire’ can be related with the promise of the baptism of the Spirit in Luke 3:16. In the proclamation of John the Baptist, the coming Messiah would baptize Israel with the Holy Spirit and with fire. John’s usage of fire coming with wind are symbols of judgment, the wind blowing the chaff away and the fire consuming it.<sup>67</sup> Fire is a symbol of God’s presence in the Old Testament (Exod 19:18; Isa. 66:15) and it is also associated with the purification or judgment (Isa 4:4; Jer 7:20, Joel 2:30-31; Mal 3:2-4; 4:1).<sup>68</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Peterson, 132.

<sup>66</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 165-167.

<sup>67</sup> F. F. Bruce, 114.

<sup>68</sup> Peterson, 132-133.

Although the fire is related to the cleansing act of messianic judgment, David G. Peterson point out that it is uncertain whether “the tongue like fire” in Acts 2:2 is associated with John’s promise of the messianic judgment. Jesus’ report of John in Acts 1:5 is also missing the element of fire. According to David G. Peterson, the messianic judgment is mercifully delayed and offering the chance to repent by giving the spirit to the disciples in order to preach the repentance and offer the hope of salvation to all.<sup>69</sup> In other words, although the term ‘fire’ is included in the picture of the Pentecost, it does not necessarily refer to judgment. Rather it signifies the presence of the Spirit as the presence of God is expressed by “fire” at Sinai (Exod 19:18).

It is unlikely that the term fire refers to the other tongues in v. 4. The Pentecost experience concerns with God’s empowering presence with his people in a new and distinctive way, revealing his will and leading them to fulfill his purposes for them as the people of the New Covenant. When Luke says that the tongues like fire distributed and rested on each of them, it implies that the blessing of God’s Spirit was for each individual member of the believing community. The Spirit’s work in binding them together as the church is illustrated in 2:41-47.<sup>70</sup>

4 καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέροις γλώσσαις καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς.

ἐπλήσθησαν ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου

Luke uses the verb πίμπλημι in different ways, but mostly to describe filling with emotions or qualities (Luke 4:28; 5:26; 6:11; Acts 3:10; 5:17; 13:45; 19:29) or filling with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8,31; 9:17; 13:9). In Lk. 1:15, it refers to initial endowment of a person with the Spirit. This verb can also refer to the special inspiration of a person for prophetic utterance, for preaching, or for testimony to Christ in some other way (Luke 1:41, 67; Acts 4:8, 31; 13:9; cf. Luke 12:11-12).<sup>71</sup> In this context, the filling of the Spirit is for prophetic utterance, for preaching and testimony to Christ as Peter proclaims the gospel in the following event. As I have noted above (in v. 2), Luke uses the aorist indicative or participle of πίμπλημι with genitive of divine spirit for events or inspirations of short duration. For Luke, a person can be ‘filled with the Holy Spirit’ on many occasions while he

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

<sup>70</sup> Peterson, 133.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, 133-134.

was ‘full’ of the Spirit.<sup>72</sup> The disciples received the utterance of speaking in other tongue or language within certain duration of time. It is not strange for Luke that the disciples who were already full of Holy Spirit, again received a further filling or enabling for a particular ministry in Acts 4:31. ἤρξαντο connotes that the disciples now did something they had not done before. This is the first time experience of filling with the Spirit.

λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις

Speaking in *other tongue* in this context is different from the tongue mentioned in 1 Cor. 12-14 which could only be understood if someone interpreted. Speaking in tongues in an unintelligible way is unknown for Judaism as well as for Luke. The *other tongues* in Acts were intelligible languages as the crowd understands what they were saying. Although the disciples are Galilean, the crowds from different geographical areas heard their own language or dialect. The speaking in other tongues would be explained by speaking of intelligible languages, so-called xenolalia/ xenoglossia.

### 2.1.3 Conclusion

The content of the utterance is not mentioned in Acts 2. The people in Jerusalem are wondering about the event and their question was for the explanation of the event, what does this “event” mean rather than the “content” of the utterance (vv. 7-8). As the following prophetic speech of Peter is greatly concerned with the understanding of the role of Jesus, it is unlikely that the 120 disciples were preaching about Jesus Christ. In other words, the utterance of 120 disciples does not necessarily concern with the preaching of the gospel, but may rather be seen as a sign of the presence of Holy Spirit. By listening to these utterances, people recognizes the presence of the Holy Spirit among them. The filling of the Holy Spirit in the Pentecost event can be seen as the fulfillment of John’s prophecy and the promise of Jesus. The receiving of the Spirit is not just an inspiration for a short period of time, but it is permanent receiving of the Spirit. The Spirit endowed throughout the disciples’ lives and it signifies being Christians.

As Pentecost was celebrated as a commemoration of Sinai, the receiving of the Spirit with the portrayal of strong wind and fire indicates that a new covenant or restoration task is accomplished by delivering the Holy Spirit. The receiving of the Spirit is a continuation of the

---

<sup>72</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 167.

restoration of the Jewish people which is initiated by Jesus. The receiving of the Holy Spirit is the sign of the new era to anyone who turns to God.<sup>73</sup>

There are significant differences between the baptism of the disciples in the Pentecost event and the baptism of those who listened to Peter's speech (cf. 2:38-42). The disciples had experienced the taste of salvation during the ministry of Jesus. And they also had a certain period of time to grow in their faith as they lived with Jesus Christ. It is probable that the disciples had already been baptized by Jesus during his ministry. The baptism of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is the completion of Christian baptism as they have not been baptized by the Spirit.<sup>74</sup> The baptism of Holy Spirit in Acts 2 is the fulfillment of what Jesus and John had prophesied. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is not a repetition of the water-baptism because the Pentecost event supplied what was lacking in John's water baptism. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was for those who had received the baptism of John (Acts 1:5). In other words, water-baptism is not a contrast to the baptism of the Holy Spirit instead it becomes complete with it. The disciples' receiving of the Spirit indicates the task of salvation which was initiated with water baptism, is fully realized. There is a time gap between the two events. In contrast, for Peter's hearers, they are offered the water-baptism in the name of Jesus coordinated with the gift of the Holy Spirit. They do not need to wait for the coming of the Holy Spirit after water baptism.

## **2.2 The baptism in the name of Jesus and receiving of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2:38**

After Peter's sermon (Acts 2:14-36), the people asked Peter "what should they do" (v.37). Peter answered them "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is for you, for your children, and for all who are far away, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to him... Save yourselves from this corrupt generation." (Acts 2:38-40).

Concerning the interpretation of v.38, according to Schnabel, Peter's response includes two exhortations and two promises.<sup>75</sup> The two exhortations are the two imperatives of "repent" (μετανοήσατε) and "be immersed" (βαπτισθήτω). To "repent" generally means

---

<sup>73</sup> Darrell L. Bock, p. 144.

<sup>74</sup> Killian McDonnell, *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*, (Collegeville; The Liturgical Press, 1994) p, 27.

<sup>75</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 161.



turning towards God, changing the direction of one's mind towards God.<sup>76</sup> It also means that the people of Jerusalem need to regret for their involvement in the crucifixion of Jesus, feel sorrow for their rejection of Jesus, confess their tragic sin, change their attitude concerning Jesus and accept Jesus as promised Messiah and the risen and exalted Lord. Repentance is the initiation of changing the communication with God. With that repentance, Peter urged them to be "immersed" (βαπτισθῆτω) in the name of Jesus for the remission of their sins.<sup>77</sup>

The act of baptism portrays a washing and signifies what repentance produces, cleansing. The baptism with repentance is asking God for the forgiveness of sin. In other words, the baptism is a sign of repentance, 'for the forgiveness of sins'. The baptism also expresses their new faith in Jesus or new understanding of Jesus as Messiah and exalted Lord. Thus, their baptism is not only for the cleansing of sin but also confession of Jesus.<sup>78</sup> It is self expression of conversion that initiates them to be part of the saved community. The baptism "in the name of Jesus Christ" reflects Acts 2:21, "calling on the name of the Lord to be saved". The baptism is the representation of the cleansing that belongs to salvation. The baptismal washing that comes with repentance signifies an inner cleansing. The inner cleansing, being forgiven and confessing of Jesus allows the person to be indwelt by the Spirit.<sup>79</sup>

Peter proclaims two promises for those who repent and accept Jesus as Messiah- (1) they will receive forgiveness and (2) they will receive the Holy Spirit. The preposition "for" (εἰς) in the expression "for the forgiveness of sin" raises the question of the relationship between the immersion in water and the forgiveness of sins. Some scholars think that the purpose of baptism is the forgiveness of sins and others think that baptism results in forgiveness. For Schnabel, the forgiveness of sins is the cause of baptism. Although Peter does not mention clearly the relationship between repentance, baptism and forgiveness of sins, these three categories are interrelated for salvation of the believers and receiving of the Holy Spirit.<sup>80</sup> In the following narratives, Luke closely relates water baptism with the bestowal of the Spirit. The gift of the Spirit sometimes precedes and sometimes follows water baptism in other contexts (8:12, 14-17; 9:17-18; 10:44-48).

The second promise to those who repent is 'the gift of the Spirit'. Receiving of the Spirit can be seen as the fulfillment of God's promise in the last day (v.17) that God will

---

<sup>76</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 142.

<sup>77</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 161.

<sup>78</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 161.

<sup>79</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 143.

<sup>80</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 164.

render the Holy Spirit to His people. Those who receive the Holy Spirit, benefits of the new and final period of God's plan of salvation through Jesus Christ. The presence of God's Spirit is the mark of all people who repent and acknowledge Jesus as the crucified, risen, and exalted Messiah and Lord. Being forgiven of sins and receiving the Spirit is the central offer of the gospel that Peter and the other apostles proclaim.<sup>81</sup>

Although Peter calls upon his fellow Israelites to be baptized 'for the forgiveness of sins' as John did in Lk. 3:3, the significant difference to John's baptism is baptism "in the name of Jesus" (cf. 10: 48)<sup>82</sup>. The Christians are baptized in the name of Jesus who promises the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1: 5, 8). Thus, for Luke, Christian baptism is the baptism in the Holy Spirit.<sup>83</sup>

In the context of responding towards God, Peter's exhortation concerns how to turn toward God. Those who turn toward God (repent) and are baptized in the name of Jesus would receive the Holy Spirit. This is the way to enter into the eschatological community or to initiate Christian life. Repentance, baptism, forgiveness of sins and receiving of the Holy Spirit can be seen within one process of Christian initiation. In this initiation, the receiving of the Holy Spirit is closely related to the baptism in the name of Jesus with repentance. Those who are baptized in the name of Jesus and receive the Holy Spirit are restored in the eschatological community, the Church.

The future tense of the verb *λήμψεσθε* does not necessarily mean that the baptism in the name of Jesus and the endowment of the Holy Spirit as two separated phenomena. Rather it should be conceived as one process of Christian initiation, which includes repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus, forgiveness and receiving of the Holy Spirit.

### **2.2.1 The interpretations of Acts 2:38 by Max Turner and Robert Menzies**

Concerning the interpretation of v.38, Max Turner and Robert Menzies provides different interpretations. For Menzies, the promised gift of the Spirit in Acts 2:38 refers to the promise of Joel 3:1 which is a promise of prophetic enabling granted to those who repent. The collocation of baptism and reception of the Spirit in Acts 2:38 tells us little about the nature of the pneumatic gift. This text does not inform sufficiently enough to state that the rite of water baptism is normally accompanied by the bestowal of the Spirit and that the Spirit is presented

---

<sup>81</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 164-165.

<sup>82</sup> Peterson, 156.

<sup>83</sup> Killian McDonnell, 29.

as the means of salvation and life. It is better to conceive this text in the way that water baptism is bond with forgiveness of sins separately from the reception of the Spirit. Luke does not make any strong link between the rite of water baptism and the bestowal of the Spirit elsewhere. Luke normally separates the rite from the gift (e.g., Acts 8:12-17; 9:17-18; 10:44; 18:24). Most importantly for Menzies, Acts 8:12-17 establishes that the rite of baptism and the receiving of the Spirit are two separated events. The phrase *καὶ λήμψετε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* should be interpreted as a promise that the Spirit shall be granted to those who are already converted and baptized. Repentance and water baptism are the normal prerequisites for reception of the Spirit which is promised to every believer. Although Acts 2:38 may suggest that Luke viewed water baptism as the normal occasion for reception of the pneumatic gift, it does not suggest that Luke viewed the Spirit as ‘the bearer of salvation’ and a necessary element in Christian initiation. Rather Luke portrays the Spirit as a prophetic Spirit granted to those who are already converted.<sup>84</sup>

Max Turner also assumes that the Spirit is the “spirit of prophecy”. Joel’s promise of the Spirit is for all who turn to the Lord.<sup>85</sup> Contra Menzies, Turner’s analysis of Acts 2:38 provides a normative statement of the connection of the promise to conversion-initiation and the giving of the Spirit to those who repent and are baptized, without further condition and without delay. For Turner, the disciples’ experience of receiving the Spirit is not comparable to others. The disciple’s experience involved a period of growing faith and knowledge of ‘salvation’ before they received the Spirit. In the period of Jesus’ ministry, the presence of the Son, revealing the Father, in the power of the Spirit, made the disciples to have experience of ‘faith’ and ‘salvation’. After the ascension, there are a few days without the gift of the Spirit when Jesus was absent from the disciples. This few days gap between the salvation experience and the receiving of the Spirit cannot be regarded as Luke’s paradigmatic pattern of endowment of Holy Spirit. Thus, there is nothing in Acts 1-2 to suggest that those coming to faith will receive the Spirit at some point subsequent to conversion-initiation. For Turner, Luke does not feel obliged to record the reception of the Spirit by the convert who are baptized in 2:41 because Luke would have assume that his readers would know that 2:38-39 as a norm for receiving the Spirit and they can understand this event in light of (8:36-38; 16:15, 33; 18:8). When Luke speaks of individuals or groups coming to belief in Jesus, he regularly omits to state that such converts received the Spirit because he thought that his readers know 2:38-39 as the norm and the converts did receive the Spirit with the process of

---

<sup>84</sup> Robert Menzies, 203-204.

<sup>85</sup> Max Turner, 349.

conversion-initiation. AS Luke mentions the receiving of the Spirit closely related with the repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus, it is unlikely that Luke's understanding of the Spirit of prophecy is only given as an empowering for mission Turner rightly points out that Luke would have added a phrase like "all preached the word with boldness" to this text if he intended to make this point.<sup>86</sup>

### 2.2.2 Conclusion

Both Menzies and Turner conceive that the gift of the Spirit is the Spirit of Prophecy. In contrast to Turner, Menzies thinks that the receiving of the Spirit is a separated event from baptism in the name of Jesus. The gift of the Spirit is granted to those who are already been converted. The gift of the Spirit is granted to the believers as a second grace, *donum superaditum*. Turner conceives every believer conceives the Spirit as they baptized in the name of Jesus at the conversion or at the Christian-initiation. The disciples' receiving of the Spirit is different from the hearers of Peter's sermon. He considers Acts 2:38-39 as a paradigmatic formula of Luke concerning the receiving of the Spirit. In my view, the receiving of the Spirit concerns Christian-initiation. The baptism in the name of Jesus and receiving of the Spirit signifies the identities of Christian that makes the difference from John's baptism that is primarily for repentance and forgiveness of sin.

Within the narrative of Acts 2, it becomes clear that the disciples received the Holy Spirit in a different way than the audience of Peter's sermon. According to Acts 2:38, the receiving of the Spirit is closely interrelated with the baptism in the name of Jesus with repentance. The hearers receive the Spirit as they repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus. In other words, the receiving of the Holy Spirit cannot be separated from the Christian-initiation in Acts.

Even if we regard that the endowment of the Spirit to the disciples relates to the proclamation of the good news as Peter preached to the crowd after he received the Holy Spirit, in 2:38, Luke does not mention any relation between the receiving of the Spirit and the proclamation of the good news, instead, he relates the repentance, baptism and receiving of the Holy Spirit at conversion. Does Luke continue to depict the receiving of the Holy Spirit as Christian-initiation or empowering for mission in the narratives after the Pentecost event (as Menzies conceives)? In order to answer this question, I will discuss in the following chapter how Luke portrays the Holy Spirit in Acts 4:31; 8:14-17; 10:44-48 and 19:1-7.

---

<sup>86</sup> Ibid. 358-359.

**CHAPTER (3)**  
**THE RECEIVING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT AFTER PENTECOST EVENT**

**3.1 Empowering with the Holy Spirit after the Spirit Baptism in Acts 4:31**

Acts 4 starts with the arrest of the apostle Peter and John. The reasons for their arrest are the healing of a lame man (Acts 3:6-8) and teaching the people and proclaiming the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 4:2). The Jewish authority threatens them to hinder what they continue to heal and proclaim about Jesus (4:1-22)

As the apostles were released from Sanhedrin, they go back to their own people and they reported them what they have been told by the Jewish authority. Then, the believers turn to God in prayer. Second, Luke provides a summary of the content of the believers' prayer (vv. 24b-29). The prayer consists of two parts. In the first part, the believers acknowledge the sovereign power of God (vv. 24-28). They acknowledge God as the Creator of the heavens, the earth and the sea, and as the author of David's words speaking through the Holy Spirit. The quotation of Ps 2:1-2 and interpretation of it in vv.27-28 provides that everything is in God's hand and in his plan. The second part of the prayer is the petition for boldness in preaching and proclamation and a prayer about granting them miracles to confirm their preaching.<sup>87</sup> The believers' main intension of the prayer is not about asking God to do signs and wonders; rather their prayer is seen as an expressing of their faith as God had already done healing in Acts 3:1-10. Thus, the prayer is a petition for boldness to proclaim the word of God that comes along with God's visible activity and sovereign ability to heal. God is to show his compassion to the people as the community proclaims the word and faces opposition.<sup>88</sup>

The reference to the "hand of God" implies that the power to do miracles is always God's power.<sup>89</sup> The healings, sings and wonders are attributed to God and speaking with "boldness" can be seen as the gift of the Spirit. According to Turner, Luke consistently distinguishes between the power of God and the power of the Holy Spirit when it relates to the miracles. He always speaks of the "power" of God. Luke obviously does not wish to connect the activity of the Spirit with the working of miracles. For instance, in the Beelzebub

---

<sup>87</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 252.

<sup>88</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 209.

<sup>89</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 259.

controversy (Lk. 11: 20), Luke uses “finger of God” while Matthew uses the Holy Spirit (Mt.12: 28).<sup>90</sup>

After their prayer, they experience three responses from God: (1) the place where they were gathering together “was shaken” (ἐσαλεύθη). This is an unusual phenomenon as a sign of confirmation that God has heard their prayer. It may refer to a special manifestation of God’s power as in Ex. 19:18. (2) Another response was the powerful experience of the Spirit (2:4; 4:8). (3) Their petition for boldness is answered immediately, they were speaking the word of God “with boldness” (μετὰ παρρησίας). The experience of ‘filling with the Spirit’ empowers them to continue their task of proclaiming the gospel with boldness. It is the first pericope mentioned the empowerment of the Spirit again after the Pentecost endowment of the Spirit. In this pericope, the apostles, who are being filled with the Holy Spirit in Acts 2, are filled with the Holy Spirit again.

The filling of the Holy Spirit here is obviously not an initial one. Those who are filled with the Holy Spirit in this pericope are those who have already received the Spirit (independent of whether τους ἰδίους refers only to the apostles or to the believers in general).<sup>91</sup> This event signifies that a periodic renewal of the original grace of the Holy Spirit is certainly possible.

The verb πίμπλημι denotes “invasive inspiration” of God’s Spirit. As they prayed for boldness to preach and teach about Jesus, the renewed filling with the Spirit is for the proclamation and the witnessing of Jesus.<sup>92</sup> Schnabel conceives that the renewed filling with the Spirit seems to be a single experience in a series of many such experiences. However, the imperfect verb ἐλάλουν “continued to speak” indicates that the preaching of the word of God with boldness is a continuous reality.<sup>93</sup> Schnabel’s understanding of filling with the Spirit seems to be different from Peterson. Peterson conceives “boldness” as a divine gift, not a moral virtue to be acquired by repeated exercise. Christians who have been bold in one context can easily be intimidated in another, unless they seek God’s enabling.<sup>94</sup> The preaching (ἐλάλουν) of the gospel will continue, however, the “boldness” of the disciples depends upon their status of being filled with the Holy Spirit. It is not a “second blessing” or “second

---

<sup>90</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 60.

<sup>91</sup> Fitzmyer, 159; Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 399; F. F. Bruce, 156.

<sup>92</sup> Eckhard J Schnabel, 260.

<sup>93</sup> Eckhard J Schnabel, 261.

<sup>94</sup> David G. Peterson, 202.

Pentecost”. It can be seen as God’s answer to their request as they pray for “boldness” not the “Holy Spirit”.<sup>95</sup>

### 3.1.1 Interpretations of Robert Menzies and Max Turner

Both Menzies<sup>96</sup> and Turner<sup>97</sup> think that the filling of the Spirit, in the narrative of Acts, is clearly repetitive for the disciples. However, Menzies thinks that the receiving of the Spirit is associated with prayer, not with water baptism (Lk. 11:13; Acts 1:14; 4:31; 8:15). Luke consistently depicts the gift of the Spirit as the driving force behind the ongoing mission of the church (cf. Acts 9:31). Lukan gift of the Spirit is closely connected to inspired speech.<sup>98</sup>

For Turner, Luke does not relate the prayer with the receiving of the Spirit consistently. For instance, the prayer of Acts 1:14 is not specifically for the gift of the Spirit. The phenomena of the disciple’s receiving of the Spirit is through their prayer for ‘boldness’ is in accordance with Lk. 11:13. However, it does not rule out all the narrative of Luke-Acts (e.g., the Samaritans’ receiving of the Spirit is through the prayer of Peter and John not through the prayer of the Samaritans). Receiving of the Spirit is rather closely related with conversion initiation than the prayer. The receiving of the gift of the Spirit through prayer can be seen in the event of further filling of the Spirit not an initial one. The filling of the Spirit and the inspired speech are not two different states of affairs rather one phenomena.<sup>99</sup>

### 3.1.2 Conclusion

Prayer of the disciples includes, as we have seen, praise for the miracles and signs performed by the hands of God and a request for boldness through the Spirit. The content of the disciples’ prayer provides that the miracles and signs are not concerned with the role of the Spirit instead empowering the disciples with boldness for mission. Thus, the filling of the Spirit intends for mission, to proclaim the gospel bravely not for

---

<sup>95</sup> David G. Peterson, 210.

<sup>96</sup> Robert Menzies, 177.

<sup>97</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 356-357.

<sup>98</sup> Robert Menzies, 121, 134, 177, 187, 250.

<sup>99</sup> Turner, *Power from on high*, 340, 402

performing miracles and signs. The prayer is closely related with the receiving of the Spirit. This text provides that receiving the spirit through the prayer is possible for Luke. The periodical filling of the Spirit to those who have already received the Spirit is certainly possible.

This text does not provide that the receiving of the Spirit is to be seen as *donum superadditum*. They are not receiving a new thing what they did not have before. They did receive the Spirit at the Pentecost event. The filling of the Spirit can be conceived as refreshing or inspiring again what have already had and it is to empower and to continue what they are doing. The filling of the Spirit is possible without any laying on of hands. The sign of filling with the Spirit is not signified with utterance or speaking in tongue rather by the speaking with 'boldness'.

### **3.2 The giving of the Holy Spirit to the Samaritans: Acts 8:14-17**

The narrative of Acts 8 begins with the persecution, execution (v.1) and imprisonment of the believers in Jerusalem led by Saul (Paul) (v.3). Because of the persecution, the believers were scattered throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria. But preaching the word of God does not cease. Instead, the believers preached the word of God as they travelled from place to place in Judea and Samaria. Philip<sup>100</sup> is one of them who preached the word of God in Samaria (v.5) for the expansion of the gospel beyond Jerusalem and the twelve apostles. As Jesus has said that the disciples should be His witness in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria and to the end of the World (Acts 1:8), the persecution in Jerusalem can be conceived as God's pushing hand towards the Christians in Jerusalem in order to scatter them outside the area of Jerusalem for the proclamation of the gospel. This short unit can be seen as a transition of the mission task towards areas outside Jerusalem as a consequent result of the persecution in Jerusalem.

---

<sup>100</sup> There are two Philips in the narrative of Acts so far: the apostle Philip (1:13) and a deacon who is responsible for taking care of the neglected widows (6:5). Luke does not make any further identification about Philip. It is likely that Philip is one of the deacons. Although his signs and wonders are comparable to Peter's (3:1-3), Luke does not describe him as one of the apostles from Jerusalem. When the apostles were praying for the Spirit, Luke does not mention Philip. Besides, the inclusion of Stephen's burial at the beginning of this chapter indicates that Luke would have thought Philip as one of the deacons like Stephen.



### 3.2.1 Philip and Simon Magus

Philip's actions of healing and exorcising recall the ministry of Jesus and Peter (Lk. 7:22-23: sign of the arrival of the new age, exorcising in Lk.4: 33-36, 41; 6:18; 8:2, 29; 9:1, 6, 42; 11:24; Acts 16:17-19, healing in Lk. 5:18; Acts 3:2; 9:33; 14:8) The kingdom of God is moving out and overcoming forces opposed to it.<sup>101</sup> Philip's signs and wonders are audible and visible as it was at Pentecost as the unclean spirit came out from the possessed with a loud voice and the healing of lame and paralyzed can be seen by the audience.<sup>102</sup> The message about the Christ (v.5) is now called the message about the kingdom (v.12), showing the relationship between the two ideas. It provides that God's rule appears in what Philip is doing.<sup>103</sup> In other words, the gospel Philip is proclaiming is in accordance with the will of God and with the apostolic mission initiated in the event of Pentecost. The mission of Philip can be seen as the initiation of God's restoration work to the Samaritans.

Luke introduces another man, Simon, a magician who enjoyed the attention of the Samaritans before Philip came to them. He is also known as Simon Magnus which means "Simon the magician/sorcerer." His magic would have involved charms and incantations. Simon's act of magic amazed the crowd throughout the nation of Samaria. Philip's performance of exorcising (v.7) and healing (v.7) can be seen as facing against the magic.<sup>104</sup> The crowd believes Simon has supernatural powers and so his face-to-face encounter with Philip is portrayed as raising the question of who really speaks and works for God.

Luke makes a difference between Philip and Simon. When Philip proclaims the message and performs miracles, the crowd pays attention to the message and to the signs not to Philip. Philip is not pointing to himself but to Jesus as Christ. In contrast, Simon calls himself great and draws the attention of the Samaritans to himself and his own work. This seems to suggest that he portrays himself as some type of heavenly power or divine. It is also likely that the claim of 'the great power' means being divine. The crowd accept Simon's claim, pay heed to his self-exaltation and give him their adoration. The crowd sees Simon as the bearer of God's power and describes that power as great.<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 326.

<sup>102</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 409.

<sup>103</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 328.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, 327.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid.

### 3.2.2 Conversion of Samaritans and Simon Magus

In this conversion pericope, the Samaritan crowd is greatly persuaded by the miracles and the proclamation of Philip. They give attention to what Philip proclaims (vv. 5, 6). They heard and saw the signs that Philip performed. As the people the paralyzed and lame were healed and the unclean spirit came out of those who were possessed, the whole city was joyful (v.8). When the people believed Philip as he proclaimed the good news of the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus, both men and women were baptized (v.12).

The aorist of ἐπίστευσαν (v.12) refers to the moment of faith that leads each one into the community. The aorist contrasts the imperfect tense for ‘taking heed’ which means that they listen for a while and then respond. This response leads them to baptism and the imperfect form of ἐβαπτίζοντο suggests that people are beginning to be baptized as they respond to Philip.<sup>106</sup> Their conversion can be comparable with the converts in the Pentecost event. Both of the two audiences saw the signs of the presence of God and heard the proclamation of the gospel. When they heard the gospel, they were baptized (v.12, cf. 2:41). The phrase ‘they believed Philip’<sup>107</sup> does not mean that they misunderstood what Philip was proclaiming. It would rather mean that they believed the good news that he proclaimed. The apostles in Jerusalem also approved the Samaritans faith as genuine- ‘Samaria had accepted the word of God’ (v. 14). The apostles were aware that a work of God had actually taken place among the Samaritans and the Samaritans truly believed, yet something was missing, the gift of the Spirit. However, they did not preach the gospel again or correct any misunderstanding, they laid their hands on them and the new converts receive the Spirit.<sup>108</sup>

Simon, who formerly amazed the Samaritan crowd, is now one of the converts who are baptized. It has been greatly questioned whether Simon truly believes and become part of the Christian community or not. Luke may have regarded Simon as a true convert. Before the apostles come, Luke portrays Simon’s response to Philip in the same way as the other Samaritans did. Simon marveled the signs performed by Philip even though he himself was a magician. He believed and was baptized (v.13) like all the Samaritans did. If the Samaritans are considered as true converts, Simon must be considered as a true convert. Bock correctly

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid, 328.

<sup>107</sup> According to James Dunn, the usage of πιστεύειν with dative τῷ φιλίππῳ indicates that the Samaritans were believing in Philip rather than in the Lord. (James Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 65) Turner points out that their baptism in the name of Jesus manifests that their faith was true. (Max Turner, *Power from on high*, 365).

<sup>108</sup> Peterson, 286.

mentions that although Simon is described like the others who responded with faith and baptism, later he wants to bargain concerning the gift of the Spirit. The answer to the question of whether his faith is genuine or superficial, rather depends upon how one reads Peter's rebuke and Simon's response in 8:20-24.<sup>109</sup> Despite the problem of receiving the Spirit before the apostle come, Simon should be regarded as a true convert. Luke would have assumed that all the believers, including Simon, should receive the Spirit as an essential part of conversion initiation.<sup>110</sup>

Luke's presentation of the Samaritans' conversion with a time gap between the baptism and the receiving of the Spirit makes the readers to raise some questions. Why did the Samaritans not yet receive the Spirit although they were baptized in the name of Jesus? Should we still regard Acts 2:38 as a norm for conversion initiation? Or should the gift of the Spirit should be conceived as a gift given only to the converts as a second grace, *donum superadditum*? Is it to conceive that there was something deficient in the faith of the Samaritans? Was it because there were no apostles present? Was it because they needed to receive the Spirit in a fuller sense, for inspiration<sup>111</sup> or for the reception of charismatic gifts?<sup>112</sup> How should we conceive this pericope?

As I have noted above, the Samaritans' faith should be conceived as genuine. The receiving of the Spirit does not depend upon the presence of the apostles. Luke later makes it clear that the Spirit can be given when the person baptizing is not an apostle (9:17-18).<sup>113</sup> Although the Samaritans' receiving of the Spirit is delayed, Luke still considers 2:38 as the norm of the conversion initiation and this event is exceptional. Luke signifies with the word 'not yet' (οὐδὲν) to indicate that the Samaritan event provides a clear break with the "norm" we might expect from Acts 2:38-39.<sup>114</sup> It is strange for Luke that the Samaritans did not receive the Spirit at the baptism in the name of Jesus. However, Luke does not exclude the

---

<sup>109</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 328.

<sup>110</sup> Peter's rebuke to Simon is different from the event of Ananias and Sapphira in chapter 5. They lied to the apostle as well as to the Spirit and died immediately. Unlike that event, Simon is still alive and his mistake can be forgiven if he repents of his wickedness and prays to God (Acts 8:22). Although Luke does not inform anything about Simon's receiving of the Spirit, it does not seem to be a problem for Luke as he conceives that all the converts should receive the Spirit. The receiving of the Spirit is essential for those who believed and were baptized in the name of Jesus. Simon was one of them who were going to receive the Spirit by laying on of apostolic hands. However, his wrong attitude towards the gift of the Spirit makes some problems in receiving the gift of the Spirit.

<sup>111</sup> Barrett, 398, 412.

<sup>112</sup> Peterson, 286.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid.

<sup>114</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 360.

receiving of the Spirit from the conversion process. Luke did include the receiving of the Spirit although it is delayed. It would be that God himself withheld the Spirit until the coming of Peter and John, in order that the Samaritans might be seen to be fully incorporated into the community of the Jerusalem Christians who had received the Spirit at Pentecost. God withheld the gift for his own revelatory and salvific purpose, not because of an inadequate response on the part of the Samaritans. The presence of the apostles approved that the Samaritan converts are included into the apostolic church. Although they prayed for the Spirit, the receiving of the Spirit is not from them but from God.<sup>115</sup>

Concerning the question of how the Samaritans should be viewed in this pericope, there are three possibilities about how to view the Samaritans, according to Bock: (1) as 'Jewish,' (2) as a 'halfway' step toward Gentiles, or (3) as part of the nations. It seems obvious that the Samaritans cannot be seen as Jewish. Those who think that the Samaritans should be seen as part of the nations argues that the expansion of the gospel from Jerusalem towards other nations parallels the 'table of nations' in Gen 10. Against this view, Luke places the conversion of Cornelius as a significant point towards the conversion of Gentiles. Although he moves geographically out of Jerusalem, the way Luke presents the conversion of Samaritans does not seem to have the same epochal character as the conversion of Cornelius. Placing the Samaritans halfway between Jews and Gentiles is the most likely position.<sup>116</sup> Understanding the conversion of the Samaritans as a halfway step toward the Gentiles is also in accordance with the mission program in Acts 1:8. The conversion of the Samaritan is in the context of Luke's narration concerning the expansion of the word of God. Luke believed God withheld the Spirit until the apostles came in order that they can approve and seal the converts as an extension of salvation beyond Judaism.<sup>117</sup> Luke's intension is to tell how the good news spread from Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria and till the end of world. The Samaritan episode is part of this program. Within this program, Luke is telling his readers how the people converted into the Church. The main message of this episode is how the Samaritans converted, not merely how they receive the Spirit. The receiving of the Spirit is part of the conversion process.

Receiving the Spirit by laying on of hands in this pericope does not connote the commissioning for mission task. In the following narrative, Luke does not mention anything about a mission task done by the Samaritan. It indicates that the receiving of the Spirit does

---

<sup>115</sup> Peterson, 287.

<sup>116</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 324-325.

<sup>117</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 294.

not concern with doing mission work. But, it does not mean that the Samaritans never witnessed about Christ in their lives. It is likely that after they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and the fellowship (as in 2:42), they witnessed to the others. In this event, however, their receiving of the Spirit should be considered as part of their conversion-initiation.

### 3.2.3 The interpretation of the Samaritan pericope by Robert Menzies and Max Turner

Although both Menzies and Turner provide conceive the conversion of the Samaritans (before the apostles came) as genuine conversion, their conclusion on the receiving the Spirit by laying on of the apostolic hands is critically different. Menzies regard that this pericope provides evidence for the receiving of the Spirit as *donum superadditum* and empowerment for mission. For Turner, Luke still regards Acts 2:38 as the norm for receiving the Spirit which is part of Christian initiation.

According to Menzies, Luke is seen to be remarkably consistent. Luke viewed the gift of the Spirit received by the Samaritans (Acts 8:17) as of the same character as the Pentecostal gift granted the converted that enabled them to participate effectively in the mission of the church. Menzies concludes that the Samaritans episode provides the following points:

- (1) For Luke, the gift of the Spirit does not constitute a Christian. The Spirit is a supplementary gift given to Christians. The Samaritan episode provides a clear break with the 'norm' of Turner which is based upon Acts 2:38-39. In this pericope, the Samaritans believed the Christ message and were baptized (8:12), but they received the gift of the Spirit subsequently at the hands of the apostles (8:14-17). Luke considered the Samaritans to be Christians (i.e. converted) before they received the Spirit. Thus, it is unlikely to assume that Luke understood the Spirit to be either the 'means of salvation' or the 'one thing that makes a man a Christian'.
- (2) The parallel usage of the terms λαμβάνειν πνεῦμα ἅγιον ("to receive" in 2:38; cf. 8:15,17), ἐπιπίπτειν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ('to come upon' in 8:16; 11:15) indicate that the Samaritan experience is associated with Pentecost and the pneumatic gift received by the Samaritans is identical to the Pentecostal gift. Luke narrates this episode with the assumption that the Samaritans, upon reception of the Spirit, began to prophecy and speak in tongues as on the day of Pentecost.
- (3) The endowment of the gift of the Spirit with the laying on of hands in Acts 8:17 suggests that Luke viewed the gift as an endowment for service in the mission of the

Church. Laying on of hand occurs in the contexts of healing (9:12, 17; 28:8) and commissioning of believers for services in the Church's mission (6:6; 13:3 cf. 9:17). It also appears in relation with the bestowal of the Spirit in Acts 8:17; 19:6. However, the gift is often given apart from the rite (2:38; 10:44) and the rite does not always confer the gift (6:6; 13:3). Thus, the reception of the Spirit is not integral to the rite but a supplementary element which concerns healing and commissioning. Since the laying on of hands in this context is not related to healing, it should be understood as empowering for mission. Thus, the Samaritans are commissioned and empowered for the missionary task, and a new center of missionary activity has been established (cf. 9:31).<sup>118</sup>

Menzies' understanding of the Samaritans' conversion agrees with the classical Pentecostal understanding - the Spirit is subsequently received after believing the gospel and being baptized in the name of Jesus. Turner argues that Acts 8:16 indicates the opposite of this understanding.<sup>119</sup> For Turner, the word "not yet" indicates that this pericope contradicts to what the readers of Luke expected. In other words, it is expected to receive the Spirit when they are baptized. Strangely, the Spirit had 'not yet' come upon them (for some marked reason) when they were baptized.<sup>120</sup> In order to provide this argument, Turner reviews seven different types of 'explanation':

1. Source-critical 'explanation'
2. The Spirit suspend from baptism due to inadequate Samaritan faith.
3. The reception of the Spirit in 8:17 as a second gift of the Spirit.
4. Acts 8 as a Hellenistic Pauline conversion initiation pattern.
5. The narrative-critical solution.
6. The gift of the Spirit in Acts 8:17 as *donum superadditum* of empowering for mission.
7. Interim conclusion on the gift of the Spirit in 8:17

#### 1. Source-critical explanation

From a source-critical perspective, it has been argued that the narrative of the Samaritan episode is Luke's clumsy redaction of his former sources. It is supposed that one source includes the narrative of Philip bringing the gospel to Samaria including Simon's

---

<sup>118</sup> Menzies, 204-213.

<sup>119</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 360.

<sup>120</sup> Ibid.

conversion and the other includes the confrontation between Peter and Simon without the assumption of the Philip narrative that Simon was baptized. Turner rejects this argument because this explanation does not solve the problem of how Luke understood the conflated version of the narrative. The two stories had been told without giving the impression that Peter was actually bestowing the Spirit on the converts. The link between the two stories (vv. 14-17) that describes that the disciples of Philip had not received the Spirit is exceptional verses. These verses are replete with characteristically Lukan language and themes.<sup>121</sup>

## 2. The Spirit suspended from baptism because of inadequate Samaritan faith

Dunn's explanation of the Samaritans' failure to receive the Spirit at the initial conversion is that they misunderstood the preaching of Philip. According to Dunn, the Samaritans had not yet attained authentic Christian faith because of Philip's failure to distinguish his Christian proclamation from ordinary Samaritan hopes for the coming of the *Taheb* (who would introduce a period of divine favour, a second Kingdom) and the Samaritans' 'belief' was centered on Philip's signs.

According to Dunn, Luke intended his readers to know the following points:

- (a) For Samaritans, Philip's preaching about Christ and the kingdom of God with Jewish expectation (1:3,6; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31) could be about the *Taheb*. They would welcome his preaching enthusiastically (v.8), they would have understood baptism as the rite of entry into the kingdom (v.12) and token of allegiance to Jesus as *Taheb*. Unintentionally, the Samaritans' faith was wrongly directed.
- (b) The Samaritans responded to Philip with very little discernment and depth (vv. 9-11) and they were a superstitious people. Their response seems to have been caught up in a wave of mass emotion. Their response to Simon and to Philip was described with the same word (προσέχω vv.6, 10 f.). It implies that their reaction to Philip was for the same reasons and of the same quality as their response to Simon that is focused on his ability to perform signs. Thus, the Samaritans' acceptance of baptism was prompted more by the herd-instinct of a popular mass-movement than by the self-commitment.
- (c) The usage of the πιστεύειν in this context does not mean that they have faith in the Lord. By using πιστεύειν with dative (τῷ φιλίππῳ), Luke indicates that they believe in Philip and their response was simply an assent of the mind to the acceptability of what Philip was saying.

---

<sup>121</sup> Ibid, 361-362.

- (d) Luke includes the Simon's case to show that Simon and the Samaritans were not saved or became Christians before 8:17. Although Simon is said to have believed and been baptized, he never had become a member of the people of God. He emerges as one who has no part in the Christian message (8:18-24). Peter's response upon his understanding of the Spirit indicates that he was a Christian in outward form only. His belief was centered on humans – first Philip (v.13) then Peter (v.24); he had no idea of what it was to repent before God and to put his trust in the Lord. Like Simon's faith and baptism, the other Samaritans' faith and baptism were not genuine. They went through the form of faith and baptism but did not experience the reality.
- (e) Luke mentions the conversion of the Samaritans and Simon in parallel. For Luke, the possession of the Spirit was not inferred from baptism, but the genuineness of the faith expressed in baptism was proved by the reception of the Spirit. Both Simon and the other Samaritans turn from magic, believe Philip and were baptized by Philip. But the major difference is that the Samaritans receive the Spirit whereas Simon receives only a curse because the Samaritans have come to genuine faith, but Simon was interested in only the external. Luke's major intension is to illustrate the difference between the Christian who receives the Sprit and non-Christian who does not receive the Spirit.
- (f) The full realization of the Samaritans' faith was delayed by the racial animosity between Jews and Samaritans. The Samaritans were not so sure that they were really accepted into a Christian community composed of Jews and proselytes until the arrival of the Jerusalem apostles.<sup>122</sup>

Turner argues that although Dunn's interpretation may provide historical insights, it is unlikely that Luke expect his reader to understand the text as Dunn proposed. It is unlikely that Luke considered Philip's preaching and ministry as either deficient or misunderstood. Luke does not intend to lead his readers to believe that Philip's preaching was deficient or that the Samaritans misunderstood his message with the coming of Taheb. There is no evidence that either Luke or his readers knew of such belief. Even if they misunderstood, the Samaritans' understanding of Taheb is closely in line with Luke's own Christology of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses.

Dunn considers that the sign performed by Philip leads the Samaritans' and Simon's conversion to be shallow. For Turner, it is unlikely that Luke considered Philip's miracles as a

---

<sup>122</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation of Pentecostalism Today*, second edition, (London; SCM Press, 2010), 63-68.



stumbling-block to true faith in Samaria. Simon's misunderstanding of the gift of the Spirit would rather indicate that Christianity transcends magic. In vv. 6 and 12, the Samaritans' response is attributed to the impact of the message heard, and only secondarily in v.6 to signs.

Luke regards what Philip preached is valid as much as the apostles of Jesus did. If he considered Philip's preaching wrong or misinformed, he would inform how Peter and John corrected Philip and the Samaritans. Instead of correcting Philip, Luke describes him as 'the evangelist' (21:8) and his activity and message in Samaria is recorded with the same terms that he describes the apostles' ministry.

Luke intends to mention that the Samaritans genuinely believed the kerygma and they were prepared for their baptism, a baptism in the name of Jesus (8:16). It is unlikely that Luke have thought that the Samaritans' faith was overshadowed by the fears that they might be rejected by the Jerusalem community. Luke plays down the gap between Samaritans and Jews. Besides, the acceptance or rejection of the Jerusalem community cannot hinder the Samaritans' response to the kerygma.

Contra Dunn, Turner thinks that Luke does not make any difference between the phrases 'believing in Philip' and 'believing in Christ.' The phrase 'Samaria had received the Word of God' (8:14) indicates that they genuinely believed (cf. 11:1, 18; 2:41). Concerning the conversion of Simon, Simon's belief, baptism and initial discipleship should be conceived as real as anyone else's. Peter's rebuke in v.21 ('your heart is not right before God') does not mean that he is considered still to be a pagan rather he is behaving like one who deserves God's wrath. The phrase 'you have neither part nor lot in this matter' in v. 21a intends to mean that Simon cannot have any part in bestowing God's Spirit.<sup>123</sup>

### 3. The reception of the Spirit in 8:17 as a second gift of the Spirit

If the Samaritans truly believe in Jesus, why does Luke make the separation of conversion from reception of the Spirit? G.R. Beasley-Murray argues that there is no separation of conversion from reception of the Spirit. He argues that (1) the New Testament understanding of the Spirit in general and Acts 2:38 in particular does not provide the concept of the separation between water baptism and receiving of the Spirit; (2) the fruit of the Spirit, 'joy', is already experienced by the Samaritans (8:8); and (3) the term πνεύμα ἁγίου is used without article in 8:15. This usage implies that what was lacking was the Spiritual gifts, not the Spirit himself.

---

<sup>123</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 363-367.

Turner disagree with the second and the third arguments of Beasley-Murray because Luke does not make any differences between the usage of the phrase πνεύμα ἅγιον with article or without article.<sup>124</sup> ‘Joy’ in v.15 is not attributed to the Spirit rather to the effect of Philip’s exorcisms and healings.

Turner agrees with Beasley-Murray that he conceives the gift promised at ‘conversion’ in Acts 2:38-39 as the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ which is the ‘charismatic Spirit.’ Both of them conceive that the Samaritans receive the Spirit at 8:17.

For Turner, the gift should be a matter of immediate perception, corporate, plainly visible to observers and sufficiently spectacular as Simon responses wrongly to receive the Spirit when Philip’s miracles had merely impressed him. Thus for Turner, the gift is charismatic and can be seen obviously when the Spirit endows. It is confirmed by Luke’s terminology at 8:16, ‘the Spirit ‘had not yet fallen (ἐπιπετωκόσ) upon any of them.’ This expression is not found in other narratives of Acts but is very closely paralleled at 11:15.

The promise of 2:38 is met at 8:17, not at the baptism of the Samaritans. Neither Acts 2:38, nor any other passage in Acts, speaks of a ‘gift of the Spirit’ to Christians after Jesus’ ascension except the one gift of the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ promised by Joel. That the Spirit ‘had not yet fallen on any of them’ (8:16b) and that through the laying on of apostle’s hands with prayer, they ‘received the Spirit’ (8:17-19) do not suggest that Luke thought that the gift of the Spirit had indeed already been granted at their baptism. Luke does not know of two separate ‘reception’ of ‘the Spirit’ Acts 8:17 describes the Samaritan’s first and only reception of ‘the promise of the Spirit.’<sup>125</sup>

#### 4. Two different understanding of conversion: Jewish conversion and Hellenistic-Pauline conversion

According to M. Quesnel, a scholar referred to by Turner,<sup>126</sup> Luke has two different understandings of conversion. The first one is a baptism ἐπί (upon) or ἐν (in) the name of Jesus Christ as in 2:38-39 and 10:44-48 which is developed from the baptism of John. This baptism includes repentance, conversion, ‘the forgiveness of sins’ and ‘the receiving of the Holy Spirit’ as well. The other type of conversion is Hellenistic rite of baptism which is a baptism εἰς (into) the name of Jesus. The preposition εἰς (into) means ‘union with’ the Lord

<sup>124</sup> Turner, 369. James Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 70. Gonzalo Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*, ed., Paul Elbert, Scott A. Ellington (translate)(Eugene; CASCADE Books, 2011), 3-29.

<sup>125</sup> Max Turner, 369.

<sup>126</sup> Max Turner, (p. 369) refers to Quesnel’ book, written in French, *Baptisés dans L’Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 87.

Jesus. In this paradigm, the baptism does not relate to conversion/repentance and does not confer the Spirit but rather the union with the Lord Jesus.<sup>127</sup> In it, the laying on of hands was understood to be conveyor of the Spirit.<sup>128</sup> For him, “in the name of Jesus Christ” represents a Jewish-Christian understanding and “into the name of the Lord Jesus” a particular Pauline, gentile-Christian understanding of baptism without any parallel in LXX or other early literature. According to Quesnel, the Hellenists and Paul were cautious of the “Spirit of prophecy”. Therefore, they developed their rite centered on union with the death of Jesus excluding the receiving of the Spirit. Philip’s baptism in this event is Pauline/Hellenistic baptism. Although Luke’s understanding of baptism is Jewish baptism which conveys the Holy Spirit, he was trying to preserve the two different traditions (mentioned in 18:16 and 19:6). By telling 18:12-17, Luke’s reader would conceive Luke’s understanding of the baptism conveying the Spirit.<sup>129</sup>

Turner argues that it is not convincing that no one before Paul spoke of “into union with Christ.” Acts 8:12-17 cannot easily indicate the Pauline/Hellenistic tradition of baptism. Besides, Luke does not consider Philip and the apostles from Jerusalem as two separate groups. Philip is also expressed as a man richly endowed with the ‘Spirit of prophecy.’ It is more likely that Luke uses the form ‘into the name of the Lord Jesus’ as a stylistic variant of “upon/in the name of Jesus Christ.” Luke may not know any other tradition of baptism. Comparing the conversion of Samaritans and Ephesian would suggest that Quesnel’s reconstruction would be unlikely.<sup>130</sup>

MacDonnell also argues that Quesnel’s reconstructions are difficult to sustain. In the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch, Philip must have used the same procedure as he did in the event of Samaritans’ conversion and it must be considered that the Ethiopian did not receive the Spirit. However, the indication of the Ethiopian’s rejoicing, a Lukan mark of the Spirit, shows that Quesnel’s reconstruction is unlikely.

It is implausible to maintain that the conversion of Paul/Gentile baptism did not include conversion/repentance in the baptism of Saul (Paul). In 22:16, Ananias tells Saul “Get up and have yourself baptized and your sins washed away.” Besides, in the Pauline literature, there is no reference to Paul or any person laying on hands for the initial gift of the Spirit.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>127</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 369.

<sup>128</sup> Killian McDonnell, 33.

<sup>129</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 369.

<sup>130</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 369-370.

<sup>131</sup> Killian McDonnell, 33-34.

## 5. A narrative-critical solution

F.S. Spencer tries to explain the story of Acts 8:4-24 in term of “forerunner-culminator” paradigm as he conceives the Philip-Peter relation as a parallel model with the John-Jesus relationship in the gospel (also parallel with the Apollos-Paul relationship). Turner argues against this position that the relation of John and Jesus is within the moment of changing from the time of the Law and prophets to the time of fulfillment. It is not comparable to the Philip-Peter relation or Apollos-Paul. This typology provides more of a literary description of the narrative structure than it does as an explanation of how the Spirit is conveyed within Philip’s ministry to the Samaritan.<sup>132</sup>

## 6. The gift of the Spirit in Acts 8:17 as *donum-superadditum* of empowering for mission

The understanding of the gift of the Spirit as *donum-superadditum* is much in line with the Pentecostal model advocated by Stronstad<sup>133</sup> and Menzies. This model does not create any problem for those who inherit a Confirmationist model. The promise/gift of the Spirit is conceived as a distinct set of activities of the Spirit that fuel for mission. For Turner, as I have mentioned above, the separation of “the baptism in the name of Jesus” from “the gift of the Spirit” is anomalous to Acts 2:38 and Luke also considers it as an exception.

First, nothing in the text specifically connects the gift of the Spirit to mission. The bystanders also do not ask ‘what does this mean?’ Luke does not inform anything about the Samaritan converts’ involvement in the task of witnessing about Christ. The “laying on of hands” does not necessarily mean to confer an ordination for missionary task. The “laying on of hands” in the New Testament period connotes (1) transfer of power, (2) invocatory prayer (e.g., for healing, cf. Acts 28:8), and (3) identification, representation and legal or quasi-legal transfer of authority. The notion of ‘commissioning’ rests on the third paradigm. But the Samaritan conversion event in 8:16-19 does not suggest any legal transfer of authority or the ‘right of representation’ from the apostles to the converts. Simon Magus’ response confirms that the ‘laying on of hands’, in this context, relates to the paradigms (1) and (2). Secondly, it is too narrow to assume that the gift of the Spirit is exclusively for mission. For Luke, the gift of the Spirit is very crucial in the life of the Church. It is difficult to perceive how Luke would envisage ‘salvation’ as an ongoing experience in the church without the gift if the gift of the Spirit is exclusively for mission and *donum-superadditum*. In other words, the gift of the

---

<sup>132</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 371.

<sup>133</sup> Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1977), 63-65.

Spirit was not just to empower the Church to draw outsiders into her ranks, but also for the benefit of those in the Church. Thirdly, the view of the gift of the Spirit as empowering for mission could well explain why the Spirit is given some time after initial faith expressed in baptism. But it fails to explain the text like 2:38-39 where Spirit-reception is tightly linked with conversion and baptism.<sup>134</sup>

#### 7. Interim conclusion on the gift of the Spirit in 8:17

According to Turner, there was nothing wrong with the baptism of the Samaritans in 8:4-13 from the narrator's point of view. But from the writer's perspective, the Samaritans had surprisingly 'not yet' received the Spirit. Luke would have expected that they would have a kind of charismatic gift. Yet, they did not receive any gift apparently. A satisfactory answer for this text is difficult to obtain. The view of empowerment for mission (separated from conversion) finds no support in the text and fails to explain why 8:16 assumes the norm of 2:38-39.

Luke does not articulate an explanation of why the Samaritan converts did not receive the Spirit in the baptism. According to Turner, Luke has no doubt about the faith of the Samaritans. For Luke, the apostles themselves experienced 'salvation' through Jesus' Spirit-empowered ministry before they received the Spirit at the Pentecost day. Like the experience of the apostles, the Samaritans did experience the salvation when Philip, empowered by the Spirit, brought the initiation of salvation. They were baptized in the name of Jesus and became part of the messianic congregation. That this happened without the reception of the Spirit may be assumed as 'anomalous' - since the sign of the Spirit is among them through Philip. It is possible that Luke believed God withheld the Spirit until the apostle from Jerusalem came in order that they can approve and seal the converts as an extension of salvation beyond Jerusalem. The success of Philip's ministry approves the apostles to assure that God would confirm the acceptance of these 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (the Samaritans) by granting the gift of the Spirit.<sup>135</sup>

#### 3.2.4 Conclusion

The discussion of both Menzies and Max Turner makes it clear that the Samaritan's faith should be regarded as genuine. The Samaritans did not misunderstand Philip, and the gospel that Philip was preaching is also the true gospel. The healing miracles performed by

---

<sup>134</sup> Max Turner, 371-373.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid*, 373-357.

Philip can be seen in parallel to what Peter had done (cf. 3:1-14). If the Samaritans misunderstood the gospel or Philip wrongly preached to the Samaritans, the apostles Peter and John would correct them. Both Menzies and Turner see the receiving of the Spirit in parallel with the Pentecost event. The gift of the Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy and it is visible to the observers. It is likely that the new converts speak in tongues or prophesize as they receive the Spirit.

The time gap between the baptism and the receiving of the Spirit lead Menzies to regard the gift of the Spirit as a second grace added to salvation and the gift of the Spirit as empowerment for mission or preaching of the gospel. However, Turner thinks that this event is an exceptional event or special occasion where the salvation is rendered to the people who live outside Jerusalem/Judea, as a non-Jewish people. For me, Turner's interpretation is convincing. Luke's main intention of this pericope might be to present how the Samaritans converted to faith in Christ or how they became part of the eschatological community rather than how they become missionaries. In the conversion process, for Luke, the receiving of the Spirit must be included. Without receiving the Spirit, it is unlikely that Luke would regard them as Christians. If the emphasis of this pericope is conversion, the gift of the Spirit should not be regarded as empowering for mission, rather as a part of conversion. The lack of information concerning the mission done by the Samaritans indicates that the gift of the Spirit is unlikely for empowering mission, but rather it is part of conversion initiation.

### **3.3 The Giving of the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles: Acts 10:44-48**

Acts 10 is part of the mission to the Gentiles (8:4-12:25). If the conversion of the Samaritans is considered as a first step towards the conversion of non-Jewish people, the pericope of Cornelius' conversion is the first Gentile conversion within the narrative of Acts.<sup>136</sup> Cornelius is described as a centurion who is devoted to the God of Israel or as a 'God-fearer'. It implies that Cornelius appears to be a synagogue adherent, but not a full convert to Judaism. He is a bridge figure, 'standing at the boundary between Judaism and paganism and living in a very Hellenized city full of Gentiles, yet in Holy Land'.<sup>137</sup> The

---

<sup>136</sup> According to Eckhard J. Schnabel, the date of Cornelius' conversion is plausibly dated before AD 41 to the reign of Caligula. Since Saul/Paul probably converted in AD 31/32 and was active as a missionary in Cilicia since AD 34, there may have been earlier conversions among Gentiles before Cornelius. Luke also does not claim that Cornelius was the first Gentile convert. However, in the narrative of Acts he is the first pagan who came to faith in Jesus (473-474).

<sup>137</sup> Witherington, 340-346.

conversion of Cornelius can be considered as Jesus' programmatic prophecy in Acts 1: 8 continues to be fulfilled, as the apostolic witness moves decisively to the Gentile world.<sup>138</sup> Luke describes the Cornelius event in parallels with Acts 2 and depicts it as a 'Gentile Pentecost'.<sup>139</sup> In this Gentile Pentecost, God significantly acts differently. God gave the Spirit first and then the water baptism follows. Besides, God's guidance and initiations are also obviously seen.

### 3.3.1 God's initiation in conversion event

As the gospel spreads towards the non-Jewish world, God's initiative and directions of the events become evident. Before they meet each other, God prepared Cornelius and Peter well in order that both of them may clearly see what God is going to do when they meet. Cornelius's vision (an angel appeared to him) includes two parts (1) recognition of his prayer and pious life and (2) God's direction to send men to Joppa in order to summon Simon Peter. This vision ensures Cornelius that Peter is God's missionary and what Peter is going to preach is also from God. Peter's vision concerns with unclean food according to the Jewish purity law (Lev. 11; Deut. 14). In the vision, a voice commanded him, three times, to slaughter and eat the unclean animals (13-16). It is not said who spoke to Peter, except "a voice" φωνή. In v. 19, it is mentioned that the Spirit instructs to Peter to go downstairs and go with the people that are sent from Cornelius. It can thus be assumed that the voice in Peter's vision is the voice of the Spirit and it implies that the Spirit was leading Peter in the whole event.

In this conversion narrative, Luke refers to Peter's companions as the "believers out of circumcision" (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοί).<sup>140</sup> Luke's usage of the significant word "the circumcised" connotes Luke's articulation of the relation between Jewish law and conversion. Besides, when Cornelius and his households received the Holy Spirit, Peter's companion were amazed and said that the Holy Spirit was poured out "even" or "as well" or "also" on the "Gentiles" (καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη). The vision of Peter also concerns with dietary law. All these reflect Luke's articulation on the issues of Jews and Gentiles barrier. In Peter's vision, it is declared that all animals are clean. This assertion implies the abolishment of the dietary laws.<sup>141</sup> A three fold vision, the visit of the men sent by Cornelius, and the clear leading of the

---

<sup>138</sup> Peterson, 323.

<sup>139</sup> F.F. Bruce, 264.

<sup>140</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 401.

<sup>141</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 491.

Spirit enable Peter to overcome his prejudice and take the gospel to a Gentile home.<sup>142</sup> By the meeting of Peter and Cornelius and God's acceptance through giving the Spirit, long-standing barriers between Jews and Gentiles were removed and Jewish believers like Peter had to learn to welcome Gentiles into the church on the basis of their faith in Christ alone.<sup>143</sup> Witherington remarks that this pericope concerns two sorts of conversions – Cornelius and his household were converted to a new view of Jesus Christ, and Peter was also converted to a new point of view about Gentiles as part of God's people.<sup>144</sup> Peter stays with Cornelius for several days (Acts 11:3), implying that he sees these Gentiles now as “clean”.<sup>145</sup> If the event is also about the conversion of Peter, that conversion should be attributed to the Holy Spirit.

### 3.3.2 Conversion of Cornelius

At the beginning of the narrative (Acts 10:1-2), the pious life of Cornelius is mentioned. Cornelius's pious life is described in v.2 with five phrases: (1) he was “a devout man” (εὐσεβής); i.e., he was recognizably religious. (2) He was a God-fearer (φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν); i.e., he worshiped Israel's God. (3) He practiced his piety with his entire household (οἶκος). (4) He generously gave alms to people (ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας). (5) He prayed (δεόμενος) to God constantly, which probably means that he observed regular prayer times.<sup>146</sup> It is discussed among the scholars whether God-fearer is technical term for Luke and whether he used the term ‘proselyte’ for the same group.<sup>147</sup> Proselytes embraced Judaism and all its rituals fully, including circumcision. According to Witherington the term “God-fearer” is not Luke's creation. The “God-fearers” should also not be identified with the proselytes. Inscriptions and other evidence show that there are many Gentiles in the first century who did not become proselytes in the full sense, but who frequently attended the synagogues and sought to live as much as they could by Jewish law. Cornelius was such a person, as indicated by all that is said about him in this verse, rather than by identification with the title ‘God-fearer’.<sup>148</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> Peterson, 324.

<sup>143</sup> Ibid, 327.

<sup>144</sup> Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids; The Paternoster Press, 1998), 361-362.

<sup>145</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 401.

<sup>146</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 485-486.

<sup>147</sup> Peterson, 326.

<sup>148</sup> Witherington, 344.



Can the description of Cornelius's pious life mean that he was converted before he met with Peter? Since the conversion process normally includes repentance, baptism in the name of Jesus and receiving of the Spirit according to Acts 2:38-39, his pious life has some similarities with "repentance". The pious life of Cornelius indicates that he was searching for God. According to Darrell L. Bock, to 'repent' means turning towards God, changing the direction of one's mind towards God.<sup>149</sup> James Dunn argues that Luke uses three principal words to describe man's act of faith: μετανοεῖν, ἐπιστρέφειν and πιστεύειν. For Dunn, μετανοεῖν means turning away from (ἀπό) sin. The word ἐπιστρέφειν has the sense of turning to (ἐπί) God and πιστεύειν connotes the sense of commitment to (εἰς) Christ.<sup>150</sup> Cornelius's pious life can be comparable to μετανοεῖν turning away from sin or ἐπιστρέφειν turning toward God as he was searching God through his life and always turning away from sin. However, Luke does not consider him as a convert until he met with Peter. He is pictured as a God-fearer who is very likely to become Christian among the Gentiles. However, it should not be considered that he has already converted before he meets with Peter. The visions of Cornelius and Peter make it clear that Cornelius and his households must hear the good news of Christ. The missing part, in light of Dunn's understanding, in Cornelius life is πιστεύειν (commitment to Christ). How can they commit to Jesus without hearing about him? Haya Prats also mentions that conversion event in Acts generally includes the apostles' proclamation of the resurrection of Jesus, culminating in an exhortation to repentance (μετανοέω) and conversion (ἐπιστρέφω). The water baptism follows as an expression of faith. Conversion-faith-baptism leads to the forgiveness of sins or opens the door to life. The laying on of apostle's hands normally led to the manifestation of the gifts of the Spirit.<sup>151</sup> Thus, for Luke, repentance without hearing the gospel of Jesus is nonsense. It is unlikely that Luke regards Cornelius and his households as being converted without hearing the good news preached by Peter. Cornelius' conversion should be set at the time when Peter preached the good news of Jesus (10:44) and he received the gift of the Spirit.

Turner rightly points out that the pious life of Cornelius is not mentioned anymore when Peter retells this event in Acts 11 and 15.<sup>152</sup> Therefore, the pious life does not mean that they are saved. Instead, Cornelius and his households became true believers when they heard the good news preached by Peter - although Luke does not explicitly mention when

---

<sup>149</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 142.

<sup>150</sup> James Dunn, 91.

<sup>151</sup> Gonzalo Haya Prats, 134-135.

<sup>152</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 385.

Cornelius believed or had faith. Luke's primary intension of this conversion event would be to highlight God's acceptance of the Gentiles into the eschatological community through giving the Spirit when they heard the good news of Christ.

After Cornelius and his household received the Spirit, Peter asks, "Can anyone withhold the water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?" (NRSV). Bock points out that the interrogative particle μήτι tells us the expected answer: "No, nothing should prevent this". So baptism follows in the name of Jesus Christ. Peter calls for immediate baptism since the Gentiles have received the Spirit just as they received it at the day of Pentecost.<sup>153</sup> Peterson mentions that water baptism is closely connected in Acts with the bestowal of the Spirit, though the gift sometimes precedes and sometimes follows baptism (cf.8: 12, 14-17; 9:17-18; 10:44-48; 19:5-6). Even after the receiving of the Spirit, baptism still remains an important means of calling upon the name of Jesus with repentance and faith and identifying with the community of believers. The initiation sequence is not complete without water baptism.<sup>154</sup> It appears that Peter himself does not perform the baptism but that it was done by the believers from Joppa. He ordered that they be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.<sup>155</sup>

The allusion to repentance (Cornelius' pious life), the abrupt intervention of the Spirit while Peter was still preaching the gospel and the mandatory inclusion of water baptism signifies that Luke regards Acts 2:38-39 as the paradigmatic pattern of conversion-initiation although the sequence is not the same.

### 3.3.3 Receiving of the Spirit as conversion-initiation

Cornelius and his households received the Spirit when Peter was still preaching the gospel of Jesus. The presence of tongues and the praise of God make it obvious that the Spirit is present. The description of the arrival of the Spirit as "falling" (ἐπέπεσεν) is Luke's way of distinguishing unusually dramatic irruptions of the Spirit. The outpouring of the gift of the Spirit on this group of people was dramatic in the sense that it was perceived immediately as an indisputable reality.<sup>156</sup> They were speaking in tongue and "magnifying God". It is not clear if the manifestation of the Spirit's outpouring in tongues entailed other languages or is simply

---

<sup>153</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 401.

<sup>154</sup> Peterson, 340.

<sup>155</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 401.

<sup>156</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 504-505.

praise of God, as in 1 Cor 12-14.<sup>157</sup> Schnabel thinks it is likely that some of the new converts spoke unlearned language that Peter's companion could understand – speaking in tongue as xenolalia. Luke does not say, however, that all the new converts spoke in tongues.<sup>158</sup>

It is almost a universally agreement that Luke describes the Cornelius event to draw out the parallels to Acts 2 and to depict a 'Gentile Pentecost'. Turner provides three factors for this statement: (1) the phrases 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' and 'poured out upon' the Gentiles in 10:45 can be seen in parallel with Acts 2:17-18, 38-39. Besides, the Jesus' logion 'you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit' in Acts 11:16 appears only in Acts 1:5 anticipating Pentecost. (2) Both events include a dramatic irruption of the Spirit and immediate manifestation of glossolalic praise or speaking in tongue. (3) The apostles compare their Pentecost experience with the conversion experience of Cornelius and his households: 'they received the Spirit as we did' (in Acts 10:47, cf. 11:15, 17; 15:8).<sup>159</sup> In addition, Bock also thinks that Luke's usage of ἐξέστησαν in 10:46 can be seen in parallel with ἐξίσταντο in 2:7 (the observers were astonished in both events,) and the word "magnifying God" (μεγαλουνούτων τὸν θεόν) are included in both events (Acts 2:11, cf. 10:47).<sup>160</sup>

As the Spirit given at the Pentecost event is the Spirit of prophecy, the Spirit given to Cornelius and his households is also the Spirit of prophecy. This Spirit of prophecy should be seen within the context of conversion-initiation. The phrase "all who heard the word" signals the relation of hearing the gospel with responding to the gospel with faith. Peter's retelling of this event provides that through 'listening' or 'hearing' (ἀκούοντας) to the word of the gospel, Cornelius and his friends came to faith in Jesus as Christ and Lord (cf. Acts 11:17).<sup>161</sup> Although Luke does not explicitly mentions that Cornelius and his households believed the gospel, the receiving of the Spirit indicates that they ("all who heard the word") responded to the gospel with faith. For a God-fearer who has already seen a vision about this event and God's guidance, there would be no hesitation to respond to the good news with faith. Therefore, the paradigmatic pattern of Acts 2:38-39 is still implied in this event. Luke still regards repentance and faith as prerequisites for receiving the Spirit. The reason for Luke not to describe their faith would be that his main intension in this event is to highlight God's initiative in acceptance of the Gentiles. Peterson also thinks that Cornelius and his households had not openly professed faith in Jesus as Lord and Christ, but the Spirit enabled them to

<sup>157</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 400-401.

<sup>158</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 505.

<sup>159</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on high*, 380.

<sup>160</sup> Darrel L. Bock, 400-401.

<sup>161</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 504.

respond appropriately to the gospel.<sup>162</sup> When Luke mentions “all who heard the gospel” he particularly refers to “Cornelius and his household,” excluding Peter and his companions. The outpouring of the Spirit is particularly to those who have just heard the good news. Thus, the receiving of the Spirit in this pericope concerns conversion-initiation.

There are two narratives in Acts 11 and 15 where Peter retells this event. How does he describe the receiving of the Spirit in this event? In Acts 11, Peter was defending why he stayed and had fellowship with Gentiles. Peter explained the event to the believers in Jerusalem step by step - the vision he had in the city of Joppa which concerns the purity law (vv. 4-10), God’s directive to go to Caesarea (vv. 11-12), Cornelius’ vision which led him to send people to summon Peter (vv.13-14) and his proclamation of the gospel and the Gentiles’ reception of the Holy Spirit (vv. 15-17). In his retelling, he mentions God’s initiation and giving of the Spirit in the conversion of Cornelius. Eckhard remarks that the word “as I begin” signifies God’s initiative in the salvation of the Gentiles in Caesarea. Besides, the verb “fell” also indicates that the Holy Spirit fell in a dramatic and recognizable form. The comparative particle “just as” (ὡσπερ) relates the receiving of the Spirit in Cornelius’ house to the apostles’ receiving of the Spirit “at the beginning” i.e., at Pentecost. The receiving of the Spirit reminds Peter of what Jesus had said, “John immersed in water, but you will be immersed in the Holy Spirit” (cf. Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5). It does not mean that the believers of Jesus are no longer immersed in water; rather the point is that Jesus brings fulfillment of God’s promise regarding the Spirit of prophecy. The followers of Jesus are granted “immersion in the Holy Spirit” because Jesus, Israel’s Messiah, is the agent of God who cleanses sinners through the presence of God’s Spirit.<sup>163</sup> For Peter, what Jesus has said concerns cleansing and restoration of Israel through the Spirit. Jesus’ promise of “immersion in the Holy Spirit”, therefore, implies that the Gentiles who had come to faith in Jesus and who had received the Holy Spirit should be considered “clean.” Therefore Peter was justified to associate with Gentiles who had come to faith in Jesus. Besides it is also justified for Peter to incorporate them into the congregation of “Israel” by immersion in water.<sup>164</sup>

Again in 15:8, Peter mentions that God accepted the Gentiles without prior circumcision and submission to the Mosaic Law. God “who knows the human heart” confirmed that he accepted them by giving them the Holy Spirit. The conjunction “just as” (καθώς) indicates that Peter compares the receiving of the Spirit with the bestowal of the

---

<sup>162</sup> Peterson, 339.

<sup>163</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 508-512.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid, 511.

Spirit on the apostles at Pentecost. God cleansed the hearts of Gentiles and made no distinction between Jews and Gentiles by giving the Spirit. They no longer need to be clean by means of the Law and there is no reason to make any “distinction” between profane Gentile sinners and ritually pure Jewish sinners.<sup>165</sup>

### 3.3.4 Interpretations of Robert Menzies and Max Turner

According to Menzies<sup>166</sup>, the receiving of the Spirit in the conversion event of Cornelius is a ‘sign of salvation’, but not the ‘means’ for salvation. This conversion event demonstrates that the Gentile mission was initiated and validated by divine revelation. A profusion of heavenly visions, angelic visitations and interventions of the Spirit provides that this event is validated by divine revelation. The sign of God’s favor on Gentiles is manifested by their reception of the gift of the Spirit which is evidenced by inspired speech. The manifestation of inspired speech marks the speaker as a member of the end-time prophetic community. Because of this sign, Peter justifies his table-fellowship with the uncircumcised (11:3, 15-17) and their admission into the church (15:8-9).

The emphasis on Spirit-baptism as a sign of God’s acceptance, accords well with Luke’s distinctive pneumatology. Luke viewed the Gentile’s reception of the Spirit as the decisive sign of their acceptance by God. Although reception of the Spirit accompanies conversion, the text does not imply that the gift is the means by which the uncircumcised are actually cleansed and forgiven.

The similarities between 11:17a and 11:18b lead James Dunn to regard the gift of the Spirit as God’s gift of repentance unto life (μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν). Contra Dunn, Menzies considers that repentance is a prerequisite for receiving the Spirit and obviously distinguished from the gift itself (2:38-39, cf. 5:31-32). For Menzies, the receiving of the gift of the Spirit indicates that they have already been given μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν and they are eligible for the baptismal rite. Menzies disagrees with those who assume that God’s giving of the Holy Spirit is equivalent to his cleansing of their hearts. For Menzies, Peter’s argument in 15:9 is similar to 11:16-18 and in each text the gift of the Spirit and repentance/cleansing is separated. The ‘forgiveness’ granted to those who respond with faith/repentance, is always attributed to Jesus but never to the Spirit. Luke equates the gift of Spirit granted to Cornelius’ households with the Pentecostal gift of prophetic inspirations not with the repentance/forgiveness.

---

<sup>165</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 505, 634.

<sup>166</sup> Robert Menzies, 215-218.

Luke equates the gift of the Spirit rendered to Cornelius, not with cleansing and forgiveness, but with the prophetic inspiration as it was at Pentecost. As the Pentecost inspiration of the Spirit is for mission, the manifestation of the prophetic gift by the Gentiles, the climatic event in a series of divine interventions, is also to initiate and validate the Gentiles' mission. Since it is Luke's main intention, he does not make any further notification that the gift of the Spirit is for missionary activity. The receiving of the gift of the Spirit in this event should be conceived that they participated effectively in the missionary task like the communities in Samaritan and Antioch.

Max Turner discussed the conversion event of Cornelius with the other texts from Acts 11:11-18 and 15:7-11. Max Turner considers that the narrative of Cornelius' conversion deals with two problems: (1) table-fellowship with Gentiles and (2) the Gentiles inclusion in God's people. For Luke, God himself impels the church to take this step and his Spirit legitimates it at each stage.<sup>167</sup>

As the Spirit given at the Pentecost event is the Spirit of prophecy, the Spirit given to Cornelius' household is also the Spirit of prophecy promised by Joel and fulfilled through the Christ-event at Pentecost. Turner raises the question of whether this Spirit of prophecy is just a *donum-superadditum*, as Menzies considered, or whether the Spirit enables the believers to receive forgiveness and to enter salvation, as James Dunn thinks. His discussion shows that Turner agrees with James Dunn's conclusions. However, he points out that Dunn's arguments have some weaknesses.

James Dunn provides three factors concerning the conversion event of Cornelius: (1) Cornelius receives the Spirit when Peter was preaching about the forgiveness of sin. Cornelius reached out in faith to God for forgiveness and received the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Spirit is not an additional gift added to God's acceptance and forgiveness but the bearer of God's acceptance and forgiveness. (2) The gift of the Spirit is also God's gift of *μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν*. Acts 11:14-18 concentrates on Cornelius' conversion and the phrases, "Cornelius was saved", "was baptized in the Spirit", "was given the Spirit", "was granted repentance unto life", are synonymously used to mean that Cornelius became a Christian. In other words, the sentence in v.18 'then God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life' should be interpreted by v.17 'God gave them the same gift that he gave us'. The gift of the Spirit is the gift of repentance that leads to life. (3) Dunn considers that Peter is saying the same thing in two different ways in Acts 15:8 and 15:9. In other words, the cleansing of

---

<sup>167</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 380.

hearts by faith (v.19) is equivalent to and clarifies the description of ‘God, who knows the human heart, bore witness to them by giving them the Holy Spirit.’<sup>168</sup> In other words, Dunn considers the receiving of the Spirit as cleansing of the hearts by faith.

Concerning Dunn’s first point, Turner disagrees with Dunn when he equates receiving the Spirit with God’s forgiveness. It is possible that the Spirit is the ‘embodiment or transmitter of forgiveness’ but Turner argues that Luke thinks of faith as recognition of God’s forgiveness and acceptance through Jesus. The hearers received it from the Spirit-empowered preachers rather than consequent on reception of the gift of the Spirit. In the Cornelius’ conversion event, it happens too rapid to elicit how they receive the Spirit. In light of 11:14 and 15:7, the hearers’ faith was ignited by Peter’s preaching and God gave them the Spirit of prophecy (15:8).<sup>169</sup>

In response to Dunn’s interpretation of 11:18 in light of 11:17, Turner argues that the gift of the Spirit in v. 17 should not be equated with the gift of repentance in v.18 because 11:18b is a conclusion drawn from the whole narrative of 11:3-17 not just a conclusion of v.17. The Gentiles’ receiving of the Spirit of prophecy connotes that God allows them the same ‘repentance’ that was only known to Israel and set them on the same path leading to ‘life’ as he did in the Pentecost event. However, the gift of the Spirit or the Spirit of prophecy cannot be equated with repentance that leads to life (μετάνοια εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν) because Luke conceives μετάνοια as a preparatory condition for receiving the gift of the Spirit, not the gift itself (2:38-39). The “life” receiving through the repentance is broader in scope than the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit.<sup>170</sup>

Turner also argues against Dunn when Dunn equates ‘giving them the Holy Spirit’ (15:8) with ‘cleansing their hearts by faith’ (15:9). Turner conceives that the subordinate clauses, ‘God bore witness to them’ (15:8) and ‘he did not distinguish between us and them’ (15:9) indicate that these two verses play different roles in the overall argument. In other words, 15:9b does not clarify 15:8b; rather it provides the grounds for the conclusion in 15:10-11. The main argument of this pericope is that God cleansed the hearts of these Gentiles by faith that implies that they do not need the Mosaic Law in order to be accepted into the prophetic community. The function of 15:8 is to guarantee that God has really cleansed the hearts of the Gentiles. The receiving of ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ itself signifies that the Gentiles were already cleansed because it is widely accepted that Israel’s sin was the

<sup>168</sup> James Dunn, *Baptism*, 79-82.

<sup>169</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 381-382.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid*, 382.

cause of God's removing the Spirit of prophecy from Israel and the gift would only be returned after God restored Israel in obedience.

Concerning Menzies' understanding, Turner makes two points concerning the relation between the Spirit and salvation: (1) it is crucial to note that the 'norm' of the gift of the Spirit being immediately associated with conversional repentance and baptism, even if the order within that complex differs from the one presupposed at Acts 2:38. (2) Luke attributes greater significance to the Spirit in salvation than Menzies allows in 11:16.

Concerning the first point, it was questioned when Cornelius did convert - as Cornelius was positively portrayed in 10:2, 4, 22, 31, 33. Peter declared that God has shown him that he should call none profane or unclean (10:8). Cornelius is also described as a man who fears God (10:2) and is acceptable to him (10:34-35). The language 'acceptable (to God)' and its contrasting 'profane' and 'unclean', were terms used by Jews to denote the community of God's people and those outside of it. For U. Wilckens, Cornelius has already been converted before Peter preached to him. The phrase 'you know what happened through out the Judea' in 10:37 indicates that Cornelius has already known the gospel. Peter came to Cornelius to be a witness to God's confirmation of the faith of this Gentile and oversees his admission to the Church. U. Wilckens sees this conversion event in parallel to the Samaritan incident.<sup>171</sup> But Turner argues that Cornelius was not converted before he met with Peter. Turner mentions that there are three accounts of the Cornelius episode (Acts 10, 11 and 15). In the latter retelling of Cornelius event in 11: 13-14, 18; 15:7-9, Cornelius' piety is not mentioned. It provides that he receives salvation only through the faith elicited by Peter's preaching. Luke's portrayal of Cornelius with high praise does not mean that he is already a 'Christian' but a pious Jew. In other words, Cornelius is presented as a 'God-fearer' or 'semi-proselyte,' a kind of person likely to convert to the Christian faith.

Concerning the second point, Turner argues that the conversion of Cornelius and his households reminds Peter of Jesus' logion "For John baptized with water, but in a few days you will be baptized in Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:5). The fact that Peter only remembers this saying provides that the terminology "baptism in Holy Spirit" was not likely to be used widely in the church of Luke's or Peter's day. If the term had been commonplace, Peter could have used it in this event. The lack of the terminology "baptism in Holy Spirit" and the use of the Jesus' logion for Cornelius' conversion indicate that Luke understood the logion to imply that the

---

<sup>171</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, (384) refers to U. Wilckens' book, written in German, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1963), 46-50, 63-70.



Messiah cleanse and restores his Israel through the executive power of the Holy Spirit which he pours out. This text not only explains Luke 3:16-17 and Acts 1:5 but also provides two factors to the argument in Acts 11. (a) It justifies Peter's association with the Gentiles who are regarded as "unclean" by the "circumcision party" because God has cleansed them by the Spirit. The Spirit manifest in them is the power by which the Messiah purges 'Israel'. (b) It also justifies Peter's incorporation of the Gentiles converts into the Church because they are already restored by receiving the Spirit. For Turner, Acts 11: 16 indicates that the Spirit of prophecy is the soteriological Spirit in so far as it is the power of Zion's cleansing/restoration.<sup>172</sup>

### 3.3.5 Conclusion

Both Menzies and Turner conceive faith as a preparatory for the receiving of the Spirit, and the receiving of the Spirit should not be equated with the repentance that leads to life (μετάνοια εἰς ζωήν). They considered that receiving of the Spirit indicate that the new converts are included into the eschatological community. However, Menzies does not assume the receiving of the Spirit as cleansing and forgiveness of sin but rather as a second grace to the believers, *donum-superadditum* and for the mission. Turner also thinks that Cornelius must have faith before he received the Spirit - although Luke does not explicitly mention that Cornelius converted before he received the Spirit. In this conversion event, Luke presents the receiving of the Spirit (dominant part) and the repentance or faith of Cornelius so closely that James Dunn wrongly identified the gift of the Spirit with repentance. Thus, it is not reasonable to conclude that Luke's understanding of the Spirit is an additional gift to the believers especially in this event. Rather it is a sign of God's acceptance of new converts into the eschatological community. For Turner, God accepts the Gentiles by giving the Spirit. The Spirit's role includes purging and restoring the people (Luke 3:16-17; Acts 1:5).

There are two factors in this conversion event which support the conclusion that Luke still regards Acts 2:38-39 as a paradigmatic pattern of conversion. First, God's initiation and preparation enable Cornelius to respond to the gospel with faith (although Luke does not clearly mention it). Cornelius' pious life also indicates that he is very likely to respond the gospel with faith. Secondly, after receiving the Spirit, Peter asked the new converts to be baptized. Peter's order indicates that every new believer should be baptized. Peter's statement confirms the norm of 2:38-39, which stated the association between baptism and the reception

---

<sup>172</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, pp. 386-387.

of the Holy Spirit.<sup>173</sup> Thus, water baptism is an essential part of conversion. It also implies that receiving of the Spirit should not be considered as the final factor in the conversion-initiation or an additional grace after conversion. Therefore, despite the different order of repentance, forgiveness, baptism in Jesus and the receiving of the Spirit in various contexts, Luke always includes these three factors in the conversion events. In this conversion event, the receiving of the Spirit is the most significant moment. Without it, the conversion narrative does not make sense anymore. It shows that the Holy Spirit plays an important role in conversion-initiation.

If the receiving of the Spirit is exclusively for mission, Luke fails to mention how the new converts did the task of witnessing about Christ. On the historical level, it is very likely that the new believers proclaimed the good news of Jesus. However, in the narrative of Acts, Luke may not expect every believer to witness about Christ. The apostle Peter, the apostle Paul and other missionaries like Philip are significantly designated for the task of witnessing. Turner provides that Luke uses the word “witness” only for quasi-legal testimony, that is, of an eyewitness. Only the apostles are mentioned to be witnesses or to bear witness.<sup>174</sup> It is possible to think that the apostles’ receiving of the Spirit is empowering for mission. However, the receiving of the Spirit at the conversion event should be considered as conversion-initiation rather than for mission. Therefore, Menzies’ position of the gift of the Spirit is “only for mission” is not eligible.

In the narrative of Acts, the expansion of the good news can be conceived within the program of Acts 1:8 - from Jerusalem, to Judea, Samaria and till the end of the world. The expansion of the good news can also be conceived as the events of breaking the barriers between Jews and Samaritans and the Gentiles. God acts in a new way whenever the gospel reaches to a new people. In the Samaritan event, God upheld the Spirit until the apostles from Jerusalem came in order that there may be no hesitation about the acceptance of the Samaritans into the eschatological community which initially is composed of the Jewish people. In the conversion of Cornelius’ household, God distinctly plays a major role communicating to both Cornelius and Peter before they met. God’s manifestation to Peter concerning the food law prepares Peter (as well as the apostolic community) to accept, without any hesitation, the conversion of Cornelius and his household. The sign of the Spirit affirmed that they are truly saved and cleansed by God. Receiving the gift of the Spirit, before water baptism or before clear response of faith, provides that the whole conversion event is

---

<sup>173</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, p. 506.

<sup>174</sup> Max Turner, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Cambridge; Grove Books Limited, 2000), 12.

conducted by God. Peter also mentions in Acts 11:17 that “who was I that I could hinder God?”

### **3.4 The receiving of the Spirit by the twelve Ephesian disciples: Acts 19:1-6**

This pericope is set within the third missionary journey of Paul. This is the second time Paul came to Ephesus during his third missionary journey. When he first came to Ephesus (Acts 18:19-21), he went into the synagogue and had a discussion with the Jews. But he did not stay any longer and left Ephesus. Paul said that he would return to them if God wills (Acts 18:21). As he comes to Ephesus, his presence and his meeting with the twelve disciples are in accord with God’s will. The meeting with the twelve Ephesians, their conversion and receiving of the Spirit can be seen as significant events of Paul’s starting mission in his second time coming to Ephesus.

Concerning the receiving of the Spirit, the question of whether these Ephesian disciples are true Christians or not before they met with Paul is crucial. Some scholars, such as Robert Menzies<sup>175</sup>, thinks that they have already been Christians who need some correction (by Paul) and the laying on of hands and receiving the Spirit is an empowerment for the mission. Those who think of the twelve Ephesians as true Christians based their view upon three factors: (1) the twelve Ephesians are described as *τινες μαθηταί* (‘certain disciples’ in 19:1). The term might strongly suggest that they are Christians because *οἱ μαθηταί* in Luke is a technical term for believers. (2) The fact that these disciples only knew the baptism of John (19:4) may suggest that they were Apollos’ disciples for Apollos is mentioned as the one who only knew the John’s baptism. Luke portrays Apollos as a Christian missionary who only needs some correction. Thus, his disciples should be considered as Christians.<sup>176</sup> (3) The verb “believe” (*πιστεῦέν*) in 19:2 means the act of Christian faith which underscores that they are true believers.<sup>177</sup> However, the conclusion based upon these three factors is not convincing.

I will start by giving an interpretation of the text. Thereafter I will give a further presentation of the exegesis of Menzies and Turner and evaluate their respective views.

---

<sup>175</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 224.

<sup>176</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, 388.

<sup>177</sup> Killian McDonnell, 37.

### 3.4.1 Who are the twelve Ephesians?

In Acts 19:1, Luke mentions the twelve Ephesians (Acts 19:7) as “some disciples.” In Luke-Acts, the term μαθηταί is extensively used for Christians disciples.<sup>178</sup> It leads some readers to conceive that these Ephesians must have been Christians. James Dunn argues that it is the only place in Luke-Acts where the word μαθητής is used without the definite article. Luke uses the relative pronoun τινες with μαθητής in order to underscore the Ephesians’ lack of a relation to the church in Ephesus. In other words, Luke does not regard them as Christians.<sup>179</sup> Menzies argues that Luke uses the same pronoun τίς when he refers to Ananias in Acts 9:10 and Timothy in 16:1. Therefore, the disciples in this pericope should be considered as Christians.<sup>180</sup> Then, James Dunn’s argument collapses. However, James Dunn’s reading is along the right line. Luke uses the term “disciples” in Luke 5:33; 7:18-19 referring to John’s followers.<sup>181</sup> Therefore the word μαθητής can also refer to the disciple of John. Concerning the usage of the relative pronoun τίς, Luke uses the word τίς in Acts 9:10, 16:1 and 19:1 in order to introduce new characters whom he has never mentioned before in his narrative. Whether they are Christians or not is decided based upon how Luke portrays the new character(s) in his following respective narratives. When he used the word τινες in 19:1, Luke would like to refer to some particular group or disciples distinguished from the Jews who have already met with Paul in Acts 18:19-20. In this narrative, Luke would like to mention that there are some uncommon disciples in Ephesus. Although they are mentioned as “some disciples”, the following conversation with Paul indicates that Luke might not consider them as Christians.

In the conversation with the Ephesians, Paul asked the most crucial question “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed or became believers?” (v.2) Robert Menzies thinks that the aorist participle πιστεύσαντες refers to Christian conversion which is in parallel with the experience of Samaritan believers in Acts 8:14-16.<sup>182</sup> Peterson argues that the word πιστεύσαντες is used to refer the Samaritans who had already received Christian baptism, but

---

<sup>178</sup> Luke 5:30; 6:1, 13, 17, 20, 40; 7:11; 8:9, 22; 9:14, 16, 18, 40, 43,54; 10:22, 23; 11:1; 12:1, 22; 14:26, 27, 33; 16:1; 17:1, 22; 18:15; 19:29, 37, 39; 20:45; 22:11, 39, 45; Acts 6:1, 2, 7; 9:1,10,19,25,26, 38; 11:26, 29; 13:52; 14:20, 22, 8; 15:10; 16:1; 18:23, 27; 19:9, 30; 20:1, 30; 21:4, 16. Peterson, 529.

<sup>179</sup> James Dunn, 84-85.

<sup>180</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 222-223.

<sup>181</sup> Ben Witherington III, 570.

<sup>182</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 224.

the Ephesian disciples had received only John's baptism (19:3).<sup>183</sup> In other words, even if they believe, their faith would have been based upon insufficient information or teaching about Jesus. Moreover, when Paul asked them, 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?' the Ephesian disciples answered that they have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit. Ben Witherington argues that their lack of the Spirit indicates that they are not Christians.<sup>184</sup> According to the Pauline letters<sup>185</sup>, Paul believed and taught that being a Christian and receiving God's Spirit is one and the same reality. His question to the twelve Ephesians expresses suspicion and intended to reveal whether they are Christians or not. Paul's question addresses the point of what it means to be a Christian.<sup>186</sup> The disciples' answer confirms Paul's suspicion that they are not Christian, as they answered, "We have not heard that there is a Holy Spirit" (19:2). Paul would certainly not regard them as Christians. Luke sets the conversion of the Ephesian disciples within Paul's missionary journey and these disciples' theological understanding is greatly different from the gospel Paul is proclaiming. Thus, it is unlikely that Luke would regard the Ephesian disciples as Christians.

It is puzzling that people who had received John's baptism did not know of the Spirit because John had proclaimed that the Messiah would soon baptize his followers with the Spirit (Luke 3:16).<sup>187</sup> If they were disciples of John, they would have known about this. For Ben Witherington, it is understandable that if their reply means that they had not heard that the Spirit is now manifest, present, given, or poured out. But they are claiming that they have not even heard about the Spirit. It is hardly likely that they were Jews, much less if they were disciples of the Baptist, who spoke of the Spirit.<sup>188</sup> Luke does not explain the reason they miss this important proclamation of John. It is likely, as Peterson suggests that they know the teaching of John in a secondhand way and were baptized by someone else rather than having direct contact with the Baptist himself.<sup>189</sup> Fitzmyer also argues for a reference to Gentile followers of John the Baptist who may not know about the Spirit at all.<sup>190</sup>

Paul asks another question "Then what baptism did you receive?" (19:3) as they have not heard about the Spirit and his coming. Paul's question assumes that baptism is part of a conversion event in which people come to faith in Jesus as Messiah and Lord and in which

---

<sup>183</sup> Peterson, 529-530.

<sup>184</sup> Ben Witherington III, 570.

<sup>185</sup> Rom 8:9; I Cor 12:3; Gal 3:2-3; I Thess 1:5-6; Titus 3:5.

<sup>186</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 788; Peterson, 530.

<sup>187</sup> Peterson, 530.

<sup>188</sup> Ben Witherington, 571.

<sup>189</sup> Peterson, 530.

<sup>190</sup> Fitzmyer, 643.

God's Spirit is received (cf. 2:38-39).<sup>191</sup> These disciples had been baptized merely "with the baptism of John" (19:3) without receiving the Holy Spirit. Their lack of the Holy Spirit indicates their lack of faith in Jesus. In other words, it confirms that they are not Christian.<sup>192</sup>

Paul explains them that the baptism of John is "repentance" of sins and his proclamation concerns faith in the coming Messiah. Peterson mentions that Paul's teaching barely refer to the Holy Spirit but emphasizes on the name of Jesus as the one who fulfilled the prediction of John the Baptist.<sup>193</sup> Paul's informing about Jesus is new information for them. Paul urges them to believe in Jesus. If they do, they will receive the Holy Spirit (cf. Luke 3:16).<sup>194</sup> The fact that the lack of knowledge about the Spirit leads Paul to teach about Jesus indicates that the receiving of the Spirit is within the process of believing in Jesus and the baptism in the name of Jesus.

When they heard Paul's explanation, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus (19:5). Peterson remarks that this is the only instance of re-baptism recorded in the NT.<sup>195</sup> Their baptism in the name of the Jesus indicates that they acknowledge Jesus as Lord who has the power to cleanse them from sin and to convey the presence of God's Holy Spirit. Paul would not have baptized them if they did not professed faith in Jesus.<sup>196</sup>

After the water baptism, as Paul laid his hands on them, they received the Spirit and began to prophesy and speak in tongues. This is the final mention of tongues in Acts.<sup>197</sup> The receiving of the Spirit, speaking in tongues and prophesy, in this pericope can be seen in parallel to the reception of the Spirit by Jesus' followers on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). He affirms the fulfillment of Joel 2:28-29 for this particular group of people. As their baptism indicates their commitment to the Lord Jesus, their reception of the Spirit signifies their conversion and they are now Christian believers.<sup>198</sup> The speaking of tongue and prophecy confirm that the Spirit has come and shows how John's disciples are completed in their faith as John pointed to Jesus. Concerning laying on of hands and receiving the gift of the Spirit, there are only two accounts in Acts (the Samaritan conversion event in Acts 8:17 and the conversion of the twelve Ephesian in Acts 19:6) where laying on of hands is specifically linked with the coming

---

<sup>191</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 599.

<sup>192</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 789.

<sup>193</sup> Peterson, 531.

<sup>194</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 789.

<sup>195</sup> Peterson, 531.

<sup>196</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 789.

<sup>197</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 600.

<sup>198</sup> Eckhard J. Schnabel, 789-790.

of the Spirit.<sup>199</sup> Thus, Paul's laying on of hands can be considered in parallel with Peter and John's laying on of hands in Samaria. The twelve Ephesians' receiving of the Spirit can be considered as legitimation of Paul's mission and teaching.<sup>200</sup> There are some minor differences between the two events. There is no record of tongues and prophecy in the Samaritan episode. In this Ephesus event, there was no significant delay between baptism and the laying on of hands. However, Luke does not describe the gift of the Spirit as a supplement to baptism.<sup>201</sup> As the receiving of the Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues and prophecy affirms that they became Christians, the receiving of the Spirit is part of the conversion event rather than commission for mission. Since the twelve Ephesian disciples only knew the baptism of John, did not know fully what John the Baptist had proclaimed, had not heard about the Holy Spirit and had just received the baptism in the name of Jesus, it is unlikely that Paul laid his hands on these new converts to send them for mission.

### 3.4.2 Are the twelve Ephesians disciples of Apollos?

The fact that these disciples only knew the baptism of John (19:4) seems to suggest that they were Apollos' disciples for Apollos is mentioned as the one who only knew John's baptism (Acts 18:25; cf. 19:3). Since Luke portrays Apollos as a Christian missionary who only needs trivial instruction, his disciples, the twelve Ephesians, should be considered as Christians, according to Menzies.<sup>202</sup> In fact, there are more differences than similarities between Apollos and the twelve Ephesians.

Luke informs that Apollos is a Jew from Alexandria. The term "Jew" indicates his ethnicity, not religion. It does not imply that he is not a Christian. Apollos was described as *ἄνθρωπος λόγιος* which could mean that he was a learned man or an eloquent man, more likely in rhetoric skill. In vv. 25 and 28, it is mentioned that he knows the Scripture well.<sup>203</sup> Besides, he was instructed in the way of the Lord. He was speaking and teaching accurately the things concerning Jesus (Acts 18:25). He knows about God's work of salvation through Jesus and God's plan tied to it.<sup>204</sup> He also is fervent in Spirit *ζέων τῷ πνεύματι*. The word literally means "boiling" or "seething" which also implies that the person is enthusiastic, excited, or

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid.

<sup>200</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 600.

<sup>201</sup> Peterson, 532.

<sup>202</sup> Robert Menzies, 220.

<sup>203</sup> Ben Witherington III, 562-569.

<sup>204</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 591.

“on fire.” According to Bock, there are two views on the meaning of the reference to Apollos as being fervent in Spirit: (1) Is this a reference only to Apollos’s emotions? Some scholars such as Schneider and Larkin, consider Apollos as a Jewish follower of Jesus but not yet a Christian. The expression indicates the emotion Apollos brings to his message without questioning his spiritual status. (2) Or should we see it as an allusion to the work of the Spirit in Apollos’s life? The point that he only knew the baptism of John negates this position. Bock argues that the expression includes the article so that the description can be read as “fervent in the Spirit”. This expression can be seen in parallel with Rom. 12:11 where it describes Christians. If the phrase means “fervent in the Spirit”, Luke indicates that Apollos is gifted by the Spirit in his ability to preach effectively.<sup>205</sup> Besides, the way Priscilla and Aquila instruct Apollos does not suggest that Apollos has yet to believe or repent and be baptized, which is how Luke describes conversion. Even if the expression ζέων τῷ πνεύματι indicates Apollos’ enthusiasm, he should be considered as a Christian for the fact that he is teaching accurately about Jesus, which is unlikely to be said of a non-Christian who preaches.<sup>206</sup> Robert Menzies also argues that τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου and ζέων τῷ πνεύματι indicate that Luke would like the readers to consider Apollos as a Christian preacher<sup>207</sup>

Concerning the knowledge of John’s baptism, Peterson argues that some of John the Baptist’s disciples maintained their distinctive beliefs for a while after his death and continued to urge other Jews to prepare for the coming of the Lord by accepting the baptism offered by John. While many of the Baptist’s disciples recognized in Jesus the fulfillment of their expectation, others may have had a mixture of beliefs and practices that fell short of the understanding and experience of mainstream Christianity as portrayed in Acts. Apollos and the Ephesian ‘disciples’ appear to have emerged from that sort of background.<sup>208</sup> The fact that Priscilla and Aquila do not require him to be baptized in the name of Jesus indicates that Apollos is considered as a Christian. Concerning the correction of Priscilla and Aquila to Apollos, Bock suggests that Apollos might be a missionary who ministers in the Diaspora and thus needs to be brought up to date. His preaching is not inaccurate, merely incomplete.<sup>209</sup> Despite the similar fact that both Apollos and the twelve Ephesians only knew the baptism of John, their differences indicate that the twelve Ephesians are not compatible with Apollos and Luke does not consider them as Christians when they met with Paul.

---

<sup>205</sup> Ibid, 591-592.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid, 592.

<sup>207</sup> Robert Menzies, 219.

<sup>208</sup> David G. Peterson, 524.

<sup>209</sup> Darrell L. Bock, 592.



### 3.4.3 Interpretation of Robert Menzies and Max Turner on Acts 19

In this pericope, according to Menzies, Luke closely related Apollos (18:24-28) with the Ephesian disciples (19:1-7). Apollos is described as a powerful evangelist ('instructed in the way of the Lord') and yet knowing 'only the baptism of John'. It is matched by the portrait of the twelve Ephesians as μαθηταί ('disciple') who have received neither Christian baptism nor the gift of the Spirit. Menzies discusses E. Käsemann and Eduard Schweizer's interpretations. Käsemann and Schweizer's arguments on the portrayal of Apollos is important for Menzies as he thinks that the portrayal of Apollos is strongly related to the depiction of the Ephesian disciples. According to Käsemann, Luke was writing at a time when the church was battling against the heretics. Luke was trying to portray the Church without division unified under the authority of the apostles by modifying his sources. In Acts 18:24-28, Apollos is described as freelance Christian missionary. In order to connect Apollos to the *una sancta apostolica*, Luke portrayed him as deficient in understanding and in need of correction by Paul's associates. Apollos is mentioned in parallel with the disciples in Ephesus who only knew the baptism of John and were seen as immature Christians. This transformation event enables Luke to smooth over the rivalry which existed in the early days between the Baptist community (who only knew the baptism of John) and the apostolic church. Käsemann considers Acts 8:14-17 as a parallel event which offers this *Tendenz* in Luke's composition.<sup>210</sup>

Eduard Schweizer challenges Käsemann's position that Luke presents an idealized picture of the church unified under Jerusalem. He argues that Acts 18:24-28 is about the conversion of a Jewish missionary. Luke misinterpreted τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου and ζέων τῷ πνεύματι as references to 'the teaching of Jesus' and 'the inspiration of the Holy Spirit', and wrongly presented Apollos as a Christian who simply received further instruction from Priscilla and Aquila. If Luke intended to describe Apollos' incorporation into the *una sancta*, he would have had Paul baptize him. For Schweizer, The primary intension of Acts 19:1-7 is

---

<sup>210</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, (218-219) refers to E. Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus", in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (1964), 136-148.

the displacement of water baptism by Spirit baptism and the continuity that characterizes salvation history as it moves from Judaism to Christianity.<sup>211</sup>

Menzies argues that Schweizer's reconstruction of the tradition-history of Acts 18:24-28 and 19:1-7 is not convincing. Although Apollos is described as Ἰηδαῖος, Luke would probably mean that he was a Jewish Christian like Aquila (18:2; cf. 10:28). Besides, the expression τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου reflects Lukan style rather than a Jewish *vorlage*. In Acts, Luke frequently uses the words ἡ ὁδός referring the Christian belief and practice and κύριος connoting the Lord Jesus. The phrase ζέων τῷ πνεύματι is also Christian origin.

Menzies argues that it is likely to exist groups of John the Baptist's disciples who had come to believe in Jesus as the Coming One without receiving Christian baptism or instruction concerning the nature and availability of the Pentecost gift. Apollos might be converted by a member of such a group and the twelve Ephesians were probably converted by Apollos. Luke relates the two accounts in order to present the origin of Ephesian Church and the achievement of Paul's missionary career which Apollos served as a precursor. Although the twelve Ephesians believed in Jesus by the preaching of Apollos, they expressed their commitment to Jesus through Christian baptism after they met Paul. After baptism, though the laying on of hands, Paul commissions the Ephesians as fellow-workers in the mission of the Church.<sup>212</sup>

Menzies provides two factors that support his arguments – (1) the twelve Ephesians and Apollos were disciples of Jesus; (2) and they became Paul's fellow-workers in the mission of the church after they met Paul. The phrase 'instructed in the way of the Lord' and 'taught accurately about Jesus' (18:25) indicates that Apollos knew the chief points of Jesus' ministry and teaching. Descriptive of Paul's preaching in 28:31 also suggests that Apollos preached the Christian gospel. Moreover, he preached under the inspiration of the Spirit. Menzies thinks that Luke understands the gift of the Spirit unbounded to the rite of baptism. Therefore, there is no contradiction in the portrait of Apollos as a Spirit-inspired preacher who had not received Christian baptism. It also suggests that Apollos' experience of spirit does not presuppose an awareness of the Pentecostal event of promise. Thus, his experience of the Spirit does not exclude the association of the Ephesians who does not know about the Spirit. On the contrary, Luke carefully constructed the narrative in order to indicate the

---

<sup>211</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, (219) refers to E. Schweizer, 'Die Bekehrung des Apollos', 18, 24-26', in *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (1955-1970) (1970), 71-79.

<sup>212</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 219-220.

relationship between Apollos and the Ephesians. Menzies points out that all of them only knew ‘the baptism of John’ (Acts 18:25; 19:3). The Ephesians were disciples of Jesus like Apollos. It is supported by Luke’s description of the Ephesians as μαθηταί (Acts 19:1). Moreover, the description of the Ephesians as ‘believers’ in 19:2 provides that they are true disciples of Jesus.

According to Menzies, Luke does not consider the receiving of the Spirit as a necessary element in conversion. Conversion centers on God’s gracious act of forgiveness. Although faith, repentance and water baptism are seen very closely, faith-repentance is the decisive element in conversion. Luke considers the Ephesians as the people of faith before they received the gift of the Spirit as they are described as disciples and believers. Therefore, for Menzies, Luke separates the conversion of the twelve from the receiving of the Spirit.

Concerning the receiving of the Spirit, the phrase ἐλάλουν τε γλώσσαις καὶ ἐποφήτευσον indicates that they are receiving the prophetic endowment which is granted only to the converted. The laying on of hands suggests that the prophetic gift enabled the Ephesians to participate effectively in the mission of the Church. In the following narrative, the disciples remain in close company with Paul in Ephesus (Acts 19:9, 30; 20:1) and they were active in mission during the two years Paul stayed in Ephesus (Acts 19:10). Luke mentions the purpose of giving the Spirit in 20:28 ‘keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers...’ (NRSV). Therefore, the giving of the Spirit is equipping them for the tasks which lay ahead. In other words, the Spirit enables the recipients to participate effectively in mission.<sup>213</sup>

According to Turner, those who think the receiving of the Spirit in this pericope as a second gift based upon two factors - (1) τινες μαθηταί (‘certain disciples’ in Acts 19:1) might strongly suggest that they are Christians because οἱ μαθηταί in Luke is a technical term for believers. (2) The fact that these disciples only knew the baptism of John (Acts 19:4) may suggest that they were Apollos’ disciples for Apollos is mentioned as the one who only knew the John’s baptism. He is mentioned as a Christian missionary who is slightly corrected by Paul’s co-workers in Ephesus (Acts 18:26). Turner points out some problems if we consider these disciples as Christians. He argues that Luke is not connecting the Ephesian believers with Apollos. Luke appears to be contrasting them with him. Apollos is mentioned as a man zealous in the Spirit (Acts 18:25), but the disciples do not even know about the Spirit

---

<sup>213</sup> Ibid, 220-225.

(Acts 19:2). The most significant factor is that the disciples were rebaptized but Apollos was not.

Turner argues that when they ‘heard’ Paul, they are baptized ‘into the name of the Lord Jesus’ (Acts 19:5). If they were already believers, there would be no need for rebaptism. Paul would have only laid on of hand and prayed for the Spirit. When Paul first meets them, he would have thought they were baptized as messianic disciples and would have the Spirit. But in Acts 19:4, Paul explained them that John’s baptism was of repentance, and they had to have faith in the Coming One. If the baptism in the name of Jesus is a Christian baptism, these disciples were formerly not Christians at all. Turner identified these ‘disciples’ as people who were baptized by John and awaiting the messiah John promised. When Peter identifies this hope as fulfilled in Jesus, they accepted Paul’s proclamation. Their conversion-initiation is complete by the baptism and they received the gift of the Spirit as Paul laid his hand and prayed.

Turner makes four further observations on these passages:

- A. Paul’s question in Acts 19:2 – ‘Did you receive the Spirit when you believed?’ seems to suggest that there is a possibility of some sort of believing without receiving the Spirit (as in Acts 8:12-17). Unlike the Samaritan episode, Paul was leading the twelve to belief in Jesus as the messiah they hoped for and re-baptized them. One might assume that those who have already been baptized by John do not require Christian baptism. However, they are those who are confronted with the kerygma and brought to conversion and rebaptized. In other words, they are newly converted believers.
- B. Although the twelve are mentioned as ‘almost’ Christians up to Acts 19:4, the Spirit is granted as part of their conversion-initiation package without any delay. The fact that Paul immediately asked, ‘Into what, then, were you baptized?’ when the disciples replied that they do not know the Spirit, shows a usual association between baptism and reception of the Spirit. It can be assumed that Luke still hold Acts 2:38-39 as the norm.
- C. In this pericope, Luke portrays the receiving of the Spirit in parallel to the Pentecost event (‘the Holy Spirit came upon them’ Acts 19:6; cf. ‘when the Holy Spirit comes upon you’ Acts 1:8, and in both events the coming of the Spirit is manifest in tongue). Thus, the gift of the Spirit in this pericope is the Christian Spirit of prophecy that Luke has in mind. Turner argues that Luke expects having received the Spirit to be a matter of immediate perception. He also argues against Menzies position of the gift of the Spirit as empowerment for mission. Menzies thinks that the disciples mentioned in

Acts 19:9, 30 and 20:1 are these Ephesians disciples. In the historical level, it is probably that these believers became fully involve in Paul's evangelism. However, Turner argues that Luke does not mention anything about the mission done by the Ephesian disciples. The 'disciples' in Acts 19:9, 30 and 20:1 are the increasing band of believers, not merely the twelve. Besides, none of the texts links them directly with witness. In other words, Luke does not consider the laying on of Paul's hand to the Ephesians and receiving the Spirit as an empowerment for mission.

- D. Turner questions whether Luke considered the gift of tongues to be 'normative' to reception of the Spirit. In Judaism, according to Turner, the reception of the Spirit would only be anticipated to be accompanied by initial outburst of charisma with either a dramatic one or public attestation for legitimation of the recipients. Pentecost event is unique and speaking xenolalia remarks the extension of the Gospel in the power of the Spirit to the ends of the earth. The event in Acts 8:17-19 marks the end of an anomalous delay and the Spirit has come upon a group whose status with respect to the Israel of fulfillment was uncertain. At Acts 10:46, the receiving of the Spirit is so closely mentioned with the Pentecost event and it ensures Peter and Jewish Christian church that the gift of the Spirit could be bestowed even on Gentiles. In each event, the immediate inception of the Spirit is not provided and the issue of legitimation is greatly occupied in the later two cases. However, these events would not suggest that Spirit-reception should normally be attested by initial charismata. There would be no need for 'initial evidence' for such groups, but for ongoing experience of the Spirit of prophecy. The receiving of the Spirit in Acts 19 is slightly different for those who receive the Spirit belong to uncontroversial social class, a 'normal' group. Yet, Luke mentions that 'the Holy Spirit came upon them; and they began to speak with tongues and to prophesy.' It could suggest that Luke considered 'initial tongues' as a manifestation of Spirit receiving as normative for the Church. However, Turner argues that Luke does not say that each of the twelve began to speak in tongues and to prophesy. Rather the group as whole manifest diverse gifts – some may experience glossolalia while others experience invasive prophecy/praise. If Luke intends to mention each individual spoke the tongue, he would have needed to make further clarification. Besides, he fails to mention tongues at Samaria when it is clear there were charismatic manifestation (8:17-19). Therefore, Turner thinks that speaking in 'tongue' is not the general rule.

Turner provides the reasons Luke mention the receiving of the Spirit. Luke locates the account of Ephesian at the end of the fourth division of Acts and Luke gives his final picture or mission as a crescendo to the theme which had dominated the early four parts.<sup>214</sup> Luke depicts Ephesus as a place where God's Spirit was strikingly active. Luke stresses that God worked 'out of the ordinary miracles through the hands of Paul' (19:11). Paul lays his hands on the Ephesian 'disciples' and the effect is immediate and dramatic. Paul had previously been forbidden by the Spirit to speak the word in Asia (16:6) and he was not sure whether he may evangelize in this area, 'I will return to you if God wills' (18:12). Luke may consider the sign of charismatic gift to be a form of attestation and sign of encouragement to Paul that it was now appropriate time for the important ministry based in Ephesus. Luke may also intend to depict Paul as at one with Peter (or one of the Jerusalem apostles). Luke makes numerous parallels between Peter's speech and actions and those of Paul. The receiving of the Spirit by laying on of hands in the event of Samaritan conversion (by Peter and John) can be seen in parallel with Paul's laying on of hands to the Ephesians. The manifestation of speaking in tongue by Paul's laying on of hands highlights that the same Spirit that works through Peter and John, works through Paul too. Speaking in tongues in this conversion event suggests that Luke regards it as regular phenomena where God was working with special power but it is not normative. In other words, some external expression of the receiving of the Spirit is normal, but it would be a mistake to make the charismatic expectation into a rigid law.<sup>215</sup>

### 3.4.5 Conclusion

Robert Menzies considers the twelve Ephesians as the disciples of Apollos and as Christians. In contrast, Max Turner does not think the twelve Ephesians as Christians although he thinks it likely to regard Apollos as a competent missionary. For Menzies, the twelve Ephesian disciples have already believed in Jesus by the preaching of Apollos. They expressed their commitment to Jesus through Christian baptism after they met Paul.<sup>216</sup> If they have already believed in Jesus, why did Paul need to explain them about the Coming One? If they have already believed in Jesus, Paul would not have explained them about the Coming

---

<sup>214</sup> The book of Acts can be divided into five parts (1) introduction (1:1-26), (2) the foundation of the Church in Jerusalem (2:1-7:60), (3) the church scattered by persecution (8:1-12:24), (4) Paul's missionary journeys (12:25-21:16) and (5) Paul's imprisonment and journey to Rome (21:17-28:31).

<sup>215</sup> Turner, *Power from on High*, 391-397.

<sup>216</sup> Robert Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 220.

One and rebaptized them. Rather, he would just pray for the Spirit. But, it is not the case in this narrative. Menzies' conclusion is greatly constructed upon the portrayal of Apollos rather than the Ephesians' conversation with Paul. He seems to ignore some important factors about the Ephesians disciples – their lack of knowledge about the Spirit and baptism in the name of Jesus that are very crucial for being a Christian.

Despite the one ambiguous factor that Apollos knew only the baptism of John, Luke portrays him as well-versed in the Scripture, as one who has been instructed in the Way of the Lord, 'fervent in Spirit', and taught accurately about Jesus (Acts 18:24-25). He just needs to be updated about Jesus as Priscilla and Aquila correct him secretly. Compared to the Ephesians disciples, there is only one common factor which is the knowledge about the baptism of John. In contrast to Apollos, the Ephesian disciples do not know about the Coming One, Jesus. They had not been baptized in the name of Jesus and had not received the Spirit. There is no reason to regard them as Christians at least for Paul. Although they are mentioned as *τίνας μαθηταί* or *μαθηταί*, this is not sufficient enough to say that they are Christians as the term can refer to both the disciples of Jesus as well as the disciples of John. Although Paul asks them that whether they received the Spirit when they "believed", the word "believe" does not signify that they believe in the right way.

Laying on of hands and receiving of the Spirit does not necessarily indicate the Spirit as an empowerment for mission. There are only two pericopes which mention laying on of hands in connection with the receiving of the Spirit (Acts 10:17 and 19:6). In both events, the receiving of the Spirit is entwined with conversion. In this pericope of the Ephesians' conversion, the receiving of the Spirit with the sign of speaking in tongues and prophecy affirms that they are now Christians. Besides, it affirms to Paul that his coming to Ephesus is in accord with the will of God. The receiving of the Spirit can be seen as an affirmation of Paul's mission in Ephesus.

## CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION

Classical Pentecostal understanding of the Holy Spirit in Acts is that the receiving of the Spirit is ‘distinct from and subsequent to’ conversion; it is exclusively for the empowerment of mission and the glossolalia is the ‘initial physical evidence’ of this experience. The disciples’ receiving of the Spirit (Acts 2:1-4) is regarded as *donum supperadditum*, receiving of the Spirit as the second grace and for the empowerment for mission. However, this study shows that the Classical Pentecostal understanding of the Holy Spirit is not convincing and that it gives an incomplete picture of Luke’s portrayal of the Spirit. Concerning Luke’s portrayal of the Spirit in the narrative of Acts, I would like to make five concluding remarks:

(1) The receiving of the Spirit in the Pentecost event is the fulfillment of the promise of Jesus and the prophecy of John the Baptist. The disciples, who have experienced the taste of salvation during the ministry of Jesus, received the Holy Spirit as a fully realization of salvation. The presence of the Spirit manifests that their salvation is fully realized.

Luke’s portrayal of the Pentecost event in Acts 2:1-4 has linguistically parallels with the Sinai event. It provides that the Pentecost was celebrated as a commemoration of the Sinai event. The disciples’ receiving of the Spirit on Pentecost can be seen as renewal of a new covenant by granting the Spirit to the believers. In other words, the Pentecostal Spirit is the power of Israel’s covenant renewal and the fulfillment of the Baptist’s promise of the messianic cleansing and restoration of Israel. When Luke mentions the disciples’ receiving of the Spirit, he uses the term πλήρης to denote the permanent receiving of the Spirit. The disciples’ receiving of the Spirit is permanent and it is not just an inspiration for a short period of time. The Spirit endowed throughout the whole Christian life. The presence of the Spirit signifies the believers’ lives as Christians. Luke presents the Spirit as the source of Christian existence or the *sine qua non* for Christian existence.

In Acts 4, the Spirit came upon a whole group in one house giving them ‘courage’ to proclaim the good news boldly. However, it is not the initial reception of the Holy Spirit. It indicates that those who had already received the Spirit can be refilled by the Spirit. Similar refilling of the Spirit can also be found in the event of Paul and Silas during their missionary journey. The refilling of the Spirit for the mission is possible in believers’ lives. However, it should not be assumed that the initial receiving of the Spirit must be an empowerment for mission.



(2) The disciples' receiving of the Spirit at Pentecost is different from the believers' receiving of the Spirit after Pentecost. After the Pentecost, Luke presents the receiving of the Spirit in the context of conversion event regarding Acts 2:38-39 as the norm and assuming that the receiving of the Spirit is related to the task of salvation or restoration of Israel. The receiving of the Spirit relates to the event when people have faith in Jesus and are baptized. Luke immediately mentions how the new converts received the Spirit after they believed and were baptized. Repentance, baptism and receiving of the Spirit are regarded as a single 'conversion-initiation' event (although the order may vary). In Acts 8, although the Samaritans believed and were baptized as they heard the preaching of Philip, they received the Spirit by the apostles' (Peter's and John's) laying on of hands. The time gap between 'faith and baptism' and 'receiving of Holy Spirit' does not mean that the two episodes should be considered as two separate phenomena. On the contrary, Luke considers the receiving of the Spirit as part of the conversion event. In the event of the twelve Ephesians disciples, they received the Spirit as Paul laid his hands on them after their baptism. Without having received the Spirit, Luke would not have regarded them as Christians. Since Acts 2:38-39 represents a norm in which the gift of the Spirit is expected to be granted along with conversion and baptism, it suggests that the 'Spirit of prophecy' was not just an empowerment for mission, but a more wide-ranging gift for Christian existence and the experience of God's salvation in the church.<sup>217</sup>

The Samaritan event and the twelve Ephesian disciples' conversion event suggest that Christ baptism is related to the receiving of the Spirit. Particularly in the Ephesian event, the lack of the Spirit in the disciples led Paul to consider that they are not Christians. Their earlier baptism did not lead them to receive the Spirit. Thus, Paul baptized them and laid his hands on them for the receiving of the Spirit. James Dunn states that faith and baptism which does not lead to the gift of the Spirit was regarded as an anomalous state of affairs to be corrected (8:14-17; 19:1-6).<sup>218</sup>

If receiving of the Spirit is a *donum superadditum*, the receiving of the Spirit should be expected to occur after believing in Jesus and being baptized. However, in Cornelius and his households' conversion event, they received the Spirit before they were baptized. This event suggests that it is unlikely for Luke to regard the receiving of the Spirit as a separate event after conversion.

---

<sup>217</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, p. 398.

<sup>218</sup> James Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, p. 25.

(3) In the narrative of Acts, Luke does not portray the whole church as actively involved in witness or proclaiming the good news. In Jerusalem, the apostles play a significant role in preaching, performing signs and working for the ministry of the word of God. Paul, Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, John Mark, Silas, Timothy and Apollos are designated for the task of evangelism. The receiving of the Spirit by the Samaritans, Cornelius and his households and the Ephesian disciples shows that the receiving of the Spirit is part of their conversion. Besides, Turner points out that in Luke's summary passages in Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37 and 5:12-16, the role of the Spirit is greatly related to various aspects of church life. Witnessing and the sings of the apostles are totally absent.<sup>219</sup> Therefore, Menzies' understanding of the role of the Spirit as exclusively for the empowerment for mission is unconvincing.

(4) Concerning the Classical Pentecostal understanding of glossolalia as an initial physical evidence of receiving the Spirit, the receiving of the Spirit on the Pentecost day is evidenced by utterances which may be seen as xenolalia. Besides, the outbursts of charismatic praise or invasive prophecy in Acts 10:46 and 19:6 provides the alternative attestation to the presence of the Spirit of prophecy. Thus, speaking in tongues as glossolalia is not the only manifestation of the Spirit of prophecy. The narrative of Acts does not provide evidence to conclude that speaking in tongues is a rigid 'rule' or a verdict when one receives the Spirit.

In Acts 19:6, the receiving of the Spirit occurs by means of laying on of hands. However, it should not be concluded that laying on of hands is the only way to convey the Spirit. The receiving of the Spirit on the Pentecost day (and latter refilling of the Spirit in Acts 4), the Samaritan episode, the conversion event of Cornelius and his households connote that the act of laying on of hands is not mandatory for receiving the Spirit.

(5) Luke has ethnical and geographical concerns when he presents the expansion of God's restoration task. He presents a program in Acts 1:8 - from Jerusalem, to Judea, Samaria and till the end of the world. He first presents how the gospel was spreading in Jerusalem and Judea, then among the Samaritans and the Gentiles. The expansion of the good news can also be conceived as the events of breaking the barriers between Jews and Samaritans and the Gentiles. God acts in a new way whenever the gospel reaches to a new people. In the Samaritan event, God upheld the Spirit until the apostles from Jerusalem came in order that there may be no hesitation about the acceptance of the Samaritans into the eschatological

---

<sup>219</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High*, p. 399.

community which initially is composed of the Jewish people. In the conversion of Cornelius' household, God distinctly plays a major role communicating to both Cornelius and Peter before they met. In these conversion events, particularly in the Samaritan event (Acts 8: 17) and the Cornelius event (Acts 10:44), the receiving of the Spirit signifies that salvation is now rendered to non-Jewish people. In other words, the Spirit plays a major role in the extension of God's restoration task from Jews to non-Jewish and then to the Gentiles. God breaks the ethnical barriers and restores the people by rendering the Spirit from Jerusalem, to Judea, Samaria and till the end of the world.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Nestle Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece 27th edition*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1995.
- Barrett, C. K. *The International Critical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles vol. 1*, ed. J. A. Emerton. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Acts: Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids; Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with introduction and commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation of Pentecostalism Today, second edition*. London; SCM Press, 2010.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Haya-Prats, Gonzalo. *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*. Trans. Scott A. Ellington. Ed. Paul Elbert. Eugene: CASCADE Books, 2011.
- Käsemann, E. "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," in *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary vol.1*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Macchia, Frank D. "The Kingdom and the Power: Spirit Baptism in Pentecostal and Ecumenical Perspective" in *The Work of the Spirit: Pneumatology and Pentecostalism*. Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- McDonnell, Kilian and George T. Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. Collegeville; The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Menzies, Robert. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London; T&T Clark International, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: with special reference to Luke-Acts*. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Peterson, David G. *The Pillar New Testament Commentary: The Acts of the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Acts: Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervon, 2012.

- Stronstad, Roger *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1977.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York; The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.
- Turner, Max *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Cambridge; Grove Books Limited, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The ‘Spirit of Prophecy’ as the Power of Israel’s Restoration and Witness” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Eds. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Wenk, Matthias. *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Witherington, Ben. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids; The Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Zerwick S. J, Max. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. Trans. Mary Grosvenor, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.