

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Divinity Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

2-26-1975

The Relationship Between the Holy Spirit and Baptism in the New Testament

Paul Peckman

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, peckmfwi@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peckman, Paul, "The Relationship Between the Holy Spirit and Baptism in the New Testament" (1975). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 128.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/128>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
THE HOLY SPIRIT
AND
BAPTISM
IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

Paul Henry Peckman

RESEARCH ELECTIVE

Prof. Arthur Graudin

February 26, 1975

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HOLY SPIRIT AND BAPTISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Many commentators and exegetes have analyzed the material in the New Testament and come up with an array of varying viewpoints on the relationship between the Holy Spirit and Baptism. A sampling of scholarly opinion shows a wide divergence in opinion. J. K. Parratt remarks that "it seems nearer the truth to say that there is hardly any relationship between the two [the Holy Spirit and Baptism]." ¹ S. I. Buse basically concurs with that opinion, stating, "Such an assertion [that Baptism is normally accompanied by the gift of the Holy Spirit] goes far beyond the evidence..." ² Not too dissimilar from this position is the view of J. H. E. Hull who says, "Nowhere is it claimed (in Acts) that baptism of itself . . . confers or can confer the Spirit." ³ He goes on to qualify his statement "of itself" by explaining, "If there is any *sine qua non* . . . that is to be found in repentance and faith (trust) in Christ. For these two factors there is no substitute at all." ⁴

A more mediating view is taken by G. R. Beasley-Murray when he states that " . . . while baptism and the Holy Spirit are closely related, allowance must always be made for the freedom of God in bestowing the Spirit. This finds negative expression in the well-known saying that God is not bound to his sacraments." ⁵ Another more positive statement is given by Warren Carr [but must be understood with his Baptist presuppositions in order not to misrepresent him]: In the conversion of the individual, the one certain place of the meeting of the person and the Spirit is in baptism . . . " ⁶

Edmund Schlunk offers a Lutheran viewpoint that would appear to be at the opposite pole of Parratt and Buse. Referring specifically to the evidence in Acts, he says: "Even though the act of Baptism and the gift of the Spirit do not always coincide in time, . . . they are so intimately related that the baptized cannot remain further without the effects of the Spirit and the one filled with the Spirit cannot remain without Baptism. Even though the Spirit is not in every case given to the believer through Baptism, He is nevertheless given in a necessary association with Baptism."⁷

Oscar Cullmann comes to much the same conclusion when he states: "There is no Christian Baptism without imparting of the Spirit . . ."⁸

The most serious and compelling critique against this viewpoint has come from the study by Dunn (Baptism in the Holy Spirit), which provides careful and scholarly exegesis of the breadth of New Testament evidence. Dunn's thesis is that "baptism ~~of~~ water" and "baptism in Spirit" are two entirely separate entities, though often closely connected. He believes that "the confusion of water-baptism with Spirit-baptism inevitably involves the confusion of water with Spirit, so that the administration of water becomes nothing other than the bestowal of the Spirit."⁹ Here Dunn betrays the influence of C.F.D. Moule, under whom he studied, and who stated twenty years ago: ". . . I am increasingly inclined to believe that the writers of the New Testament regarded the *reception of the Spirit*--not water-baptism-- as *the* distinctive and essential badge of Christianity."¹⁰

Dunn's conclusion, then, is that "The ~~sacrament~~ and the heavenly gift must certainly not be identified. As water-baptism does not convey forgiveness, so it does not convey the Spirit. There is absolutely no ground for saying that the Holy Spirit is given by or through water-baptism. . ."¹¹ One could not ask for a more firm and self-assured statement than that.

A position which agrees that there are two distinct elements, but which does not separate them so decidedly, is found in Bailey, who writes: "Christian initiation . . . is ordinarily understood as a single event, a new birth of 'water and the Spirit.' This event involves two distinct but nevertheless indissolubly connected features, a water-baptism and a Spirit-baptism or outpouring of the Holy Ghost, generally by direct descent, sometimes through imposition of hands."¹²

Although a thorough critique of Dunn's position cannot be attempted here, this paper will attempt to defend the opposite contention, namely that the Holy Spirit and Baptism are uniquely, indissolubly, and necessarily connected in the New Testament. Lampe's comments in regard to the Pauline evidence is cogent at this point: "Pauline thought affords no ground whatever for the modern theories which seek to effect a separation in the one action and to distinguish a 'Spirit-Baptism' and a 'water-Baptism,' not as the inward and outward parts of one sacrament, but as independent entities."¹³

We must now turn to the specific evidence in the New Testament to determine what kind of a picture can be drawn from it.

The Gospels

Right at the beginning of the Gospels the exegete is confronted with seemingly conflicting--at any rate, puzzling--evidence which links the Holy Spirit and Baptism. The context is the ministry of John the Baptist, whose own baptism prepares the way for one who will come after him and will baptize with "the Holy Spirit and with fire." The problem is that the wording differs among the Gospels. Matthew and Luke include both elements, Spirit and fire (Matt. 3:11=Luke 3:16), while Mark and John omit any reference to "fire." What is also puzzling is that Luke also omits "fire" in a similar verse found in Acts, which comes directly from Jesus' own mouth (Acts 1:5).

The question is raised; "To what does this baptism of Holy Spirit and fire refer?" A variety of suggestions have been offered. Some try to place the matter within the following context, which also mentions the word "fire": "His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather his wheat into the granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire" (Matt. 3:12=Lk. 3:17). This continues the thought found in the preceding verses, whereby the trees which do not bear good fruit will be "cut down and thrown into the fire" (Matt. 3:10=Lk. 3:9).

One interpretation is to say that instead of the meaning "spirit" for Πνεῦμα, it should have read "wind". As Best points out, "the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents *ruach* and *rucha* have also this double meaning."¹⁴ According to this view, then, ". . . John's original statement with its double reference to wind-baptism and fire-baptism originally concerned eschatological judgement in which the wind would separate the chaff from the grain and the chaff would be burned with fire. Coming into Christian hands new depth was seen in the *rucha/pneuma* concept and this was given its alternative meaning 'spirit', thus changing the meaning from one of judgement to one of redemption."¹⁵

Beasley-Murray also attributes John's words to an eschatological judgment, but makes the connection via the Old Testament, particularly Malachi. The Messiah was depicted in terms which are not far removed from the words of John the Baptist. Malachi 3:2 says: "He is like a refiner's fire and like fullers' soap; he will sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he will purify the sons of Levi and refine them like gold and silver . . ." Similarly, Malachi 4:1 states: "For behold, the day comes, burning like an oven, when all the arrogant and all evildoers will be stubble; the day

that comes shall burn them up, says the Lord of hosts, so that it will leave them neither root nor branch." The similarities of Malachi's message and John the Baptist's is striking (cf. Matt. 3:10=Lk. 3:9). Thus Beasley-Murray concludes: "This two-fold use of fire for refinement and consuming judgment suggests that John the Baptist also could have had both aspects in mind. The Messiah's baptism with Spirit and fire will be applied to all . . . for the people of God it will be their refinement for the Kingdom, . . . for the wicked it will be with consuming power. . . ."16

This might explain the reference to "fire," but it does not completely explain its connection with "Spirit." In the Old Testament the Spirit is not viewed as a destructive element. Isaiah 44:3 offers the comfort that God "will pour [His] Spirit upon [Jacob's] descendants, and my blessing on your offspring." The same idea is conveyed in Ezekiel 39:29 where God says, "I will not hide my face any more from [the house of Israel], when I pour out my Spirit upon [them]."

This leaves open the definite possibility that the baptism "with the Holy Spirit and fire" contains an element of blessing in it. Dunn cites two other factors for retaining such an emphasis. First, "the Baptist was not simply a prophet of wrath. . . . Second, and more important, is the fact that the Qumran sect talked freely of a, or God's holy spirit . . . as a cleansing, purifying power . . ."17 Dunn's conclusion, then, is that the "most probable interpretation is that Spirit-and-fire together describe the one purgative act of messianic judgment which both repentant and unrepentant would experience, the former as a blessing, the latter as destruction."18

Those who generally follow this line of argumentation end up with a separation of the Spirit-baptism (with fire) and water-baptism. For example,

Scobie concludes that "there is little reason to doubt that John did speak of a Messiah who would baptize, not with water as John himself did, but with both fire and holy spirit. Upon the wicked, the Coming One will pour out a river of fire to punish and destroy them; but on God's people the Coming One will pour out God's spirit and all the blessings which that entails."¹⁹

Such a conclusion only comes when the rest of the Scriptural evidence is ignored, particularly Jesus' own use of the phrase in Acts 1:8. As J.A.T. Robinson has pointed out: "The promise that Jesus would baptize his people in Holy Spirit (and fire) stood in the Synoptic tradition from the beginning . . . Neither there nor when it is quoted in Acts (1:5; 11:16), is there any suggestion that, whereas John baptized with water, Christians would not. In fact on each occasion when this prophecy is regarded as fulfilled, the Church at once proceeds to water-baptism (Acts 2:38; 10:47f.). It is difficult to see why this saying should have been regarded as confusing the evidence for primitive Christian initiation. For its reference is not to Church baptism at all, but to Christ's once and for all baptism of the Church, from which sacramental water-baptism followed without dispute."²⁰ Here Robinson seems to make a valid point: although this prediction of a future baptism of "Spirit and fire" is not a direct prediction of Christian baptism (e.g., Matt. 28:19), it does have reference to the Pentecostal baptism of the Church, from which Christian baptism followed. The difference is mainly in chronological sequence, not in essence.

Most commentators do not attempt to connect the baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire with the events of Pentecost. Lampe believes that "it is on the whole unlikely that the reference in John's preaching to 'fire-baptism' represents a reading back into the Baptist's time of ideas of

fire and Spirit suggested by the events of Pentecost, for it is an aspect of John's teaching which disappears from view in the later writings of the New Testament and seems to rest on early and good tradition."²¹ What Lampe says is basically correct, but he approaches the problem from the wrong end. John was a prophet and, therefore, it should not be surprising that he would foretell something which was to take place in the future. It would not be a "reading back" of an event, but a "reading forward."

It is also very possible that John did not fully understand the magnitude and ramifications of his prophecy, and therefore the details would not be on a *quid pro quo* level. The account of John's disciples questioning Jesus whether he truly was the expected Messiah, adds credence to such an understanding (Luke 7:18ff).

Another factor is Luke's own interchangeable use of the phrase "baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire" (Lk. 3:16) and "baptism with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 1:8). Luke gives no evidence of regarding the two as contradictory.

The details of Pentecost are definitely regarded as connected with what precedes, namely Jesus' statement in Acts 1:6-8. Both "fire" and the "Holy Spirit" play an integral role (Acts 2:3-4).

How does one, then, explain the absence of the one element, "fire" in Mark, John, and Acts? The simplest explanation would be that by the time the Gospels and Acts were written, the Pentecostal experience could be signified without any confusion by either of its ~~elements~~ elements. The reason why "Holy Spirit" became the primary identifying point was because it was the one aspect which continued on (through the Church's baptism), the "fire" being only a temporary phenomenon. ~~It would also be possible~~ It would also be possible to say that the symbolism of the "fire" at Pentecost carried with it the same signifi-

cance as previously traced (pp. 4-5). This might also provide the explanation of the puzzling passage "I came to cast fire upon the earth" which should then be interpreted in the light of Matt. 3:11 and Lk. 3:16. As Robinson concludes: "The purpose of Jesus' coming is to loose upon the world the pentecostal fire of the Spirit, which must in the first instance be a fire of judgment."²²

The connection between the Holy Spirit and Baptism in connection with this problem would appear to be a close one. In view of the fact that Acts 2:38 follows directly upon the Pentecostal "baptism" of the disciples with the Holy Spirit (it is interesting to note that the term "baptism" does not occur within the immediate context of the Pentecostal story, nor does Peter point back to John's words as now being fulfilled, but rather he refers to Joel's prophecy--a problem which cannot be solved here), it would seem that a connection between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism is indicated.²³ There is also a striking similarity between the description of Jesus' own baptism (anointing) in Acts 10:38 and Jesus' words to his disciples in Acts 1:8. Both places emphasize the words "power" and "Holy Spirit." If it can be shown that there is a direct connection between Jesus' own baptism and Christian Baptism, then another link would have been added to the evidence. We will now turn to this question.

John's baptism was a "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins" (Lk. 3:3). What the origins of his baptism are is not within the purview of this paper, nor is the question why Jesus, the sin-less One, even came to be baptized by John here considered. Even without the addition of the Spirit's descent, it is evident that Jesus's baptism is considered special. Luke makes this clear when he emphasizes "Now when

all the people *were baptized*, and when Jesus *also* had been baptized . . ." (Lk. 3:21). The implication which follows is that there is a direct connection between the water-baptism which Jesus received and the Holy Spirit.

Beasley-Murray simply states that "the most striking parallel between Jesus' baptism and ours is the descent of the Spirit on Him and our reception of the Spirit in like circumstances."²⁴ Similarly, R.E.O. White affirms that ". . . our Lord's experience in baptism transformed the rite by linking with it the reception of the Holy Spirit; the prophets association of water and the spirit is here translated into reality and becomes normative for the Church--baptism becomes the 'sacrament for the transmission of the Spirit.'"²⁵

However, not all scholars concur with that view. Parratt believes that "it is significant that this analogy [between the baptism of Jesus and Christian Baptism] is nowhere made in the New Testament itself . . . [which] suggests it is precarious to attempt to attribute to the Christian sacrament all that Christ's baptism involved."²⁶ Dunn offers a similar objection: "It must be stated emphatically that the baptism of Jesus and the descent of the Spirit are two distinct events--closely related, but distinct."²⁷

Several objections to any direct connection between the two events have been offered. Parratt argues that "the descent of the Spirit took place only after the immersion and emergence from the waters were complete."²⁸ Dunn links the descent of the Spirit with the praying of Jesus, not the baptism "which had already been completed."²⁹

These arguments do not seem to hold much conviction. The separation of the two events is more apparent than real. Lampe's simple comment that ". . . the dove could not be seen to alight on Jesus while he was submerged in the water"³⁰ seems *à propos*. Moreover, Luke's inclusion of the detail

that Jesus was "praying" merely indicates one of his special emphases, found throughout his Gospel and in Acts.

When Dunn makes the statement that "in Luke it is quite evident that the supreme experience for Jesus was the descent of the Spirit, not the water-rite"³¹, he is making an unnecessary dichotomy of two things that belong together. His appeal to a distinction in Acts 10:38 does not appear firmly established.³² The passage reads as follows: "[You know the word which was proclaimed throughout all Judea], beginning from Galilee after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power..." There seems to be a close connection between the "baptism" and the "anointing." Elsewhere in the New Testament (II Cor. 1:22) there seems to be a connection between the Greek word *χρυσμός* and baptism. Moreover, the linking of the words "Holy Spirit" and "power" are closely reminiscent of Acts 1:8, where Jesus tells his disciples that they will "receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you . . ."

It must also be remembered that the coming of the Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism was his anointing for his ministry which had yet to be completed. The fact that Jesus can elsewhere use the metaphor of "baptism" for his death should point us to this fact. The transforming of Jesus' baptism with the Spirit and Christian baptism with the Spirit required the completion of His work on earth. As Beasley-Murray has pointed out: "The conjunction of baptism in water with baptism in Spirit awaited the crucial event wherein the Son of Man should be lifted up and exalted to the right hand of the Father (Jn. 16.7, 20, 22)."³³

Lampe finds further confirmation of this connection in the use of the word "ascend" which, when spoken of in connection with coming out of the water (Mk. 1:10), could also point to Jesus' "ascension" to the right

hand of God, "when the Spirit bestowed by anticipation upon the Servant-Messiah at the Jordan was received by Him from the father so as to be poured out on all those who should henceforth be baptized in his name."³⁴ However, caution should be taken in accepting such an explanation without further substantiation.

A closer parallel between Jesus' own baptism with the Spirit and our own Baptism would seem to come in the declaration that Jesus was God's "Son" ("This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased." Matt. 3:17=Lk. 3:22). As Robinson has pointed out: "The association at the baptism of Jesus of the gift of the Spirit with the declaration of Sonship is the ground of the connection between Christian baptism, the Spirit and our adoption as sons (Gal. 3:26-4:7; cf. Rom. 8:14-16)."³⁵ It is also interesting to note in Eph. 1:5-6, where the idea of being God's "sons" is mentioned, the title of Jesus as "the Beloved" is mentioned.

As in the case of the "Coming One's" baptism, the evidence which connects the Holy Spirit with Baptism must be viewed cumulatively. But the over-all impression remains that the Holy Spirit and Baptism are integral components of the one Sacrament.

The only other source in the Gospels which might offer some insight into our discussion is found in John 3:3ff where Jesus, in a conversation with Nicodemus, declares to him that "unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

An immediate question which one raises is "To what is Jesus referring?" Dunn answers by saying "the author intended his readers to understand the water initially in terms of John's baptism, since in other relevant passages of the first three chapters the water spoke directly of the old dispensation's rite of purification, particularly John's baptism $\epsilon\nu \upsilon\delta\omega\tau\iota$."³⁶ Dunn separates the two elements mentioned by speaking of two separate events:

"water-baptism" (John's) and "Spirit-baptism." Brown suggests that the original meaning of the passage referred to the eschatological pouring out of God's spirit. "The picture of God's Spirit being poured out in the final times, which is a frequent one in the Old Testament, lay in the possible range of Nicodemus' understanding, whereas he could scarcely have been expected to understand the theme of Christian baptism."³⁷ It could also be conceivable that the reference points forward to the baptism mentioned in John 3:22 and 4:2, although the nature of this baptism (whether Jesus himself took part) is unclear.

Many scholars have realized the peculiar nature of the Gospel of John, which, unlike the Synoptics, contains no direct reference to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Despite this fact, ". . . it is universally acknowledged to contain sacramental teaching of deepest significance."³⁸ (A thorough, scholarly study of this problem can be found in Raymond Brown's New Testament Essays, notably the chapters entitled "The Johannine Sacramentary" and "The Eucharist and Baptism in John." Although it is given from a Roman Catholic bias, many of the insights are valuable.)

From this viewpoint, it becomes more readily apparent that the words can have (at least an implied) reference to the Sacrament of Baptism. "It seems less forced to take the references as being to baptism, especially if we may stress the fact that *entrance* into the kingdom is mentioned in the context . . . it is difficult to envisage any Christian writer of the late first century, or the early second century, using such an expression without having in mind the sacrament of initiation into the Christian community."³⁹

In support of this view is the fact that the phrase "water and the Spirit" is governed by the same preposition, *ἐν*. This would imply that a single action, with two elements, is involved. This, of course, fits the

description of Christian Baptism perfectly. Another argument that only one operation is referred to in this phrase is its connection with the preceding verse which speaks of being born "again" (or "from above"). As Bruner points out, it says "again", not "again and again."⁴⁰

Within its original setting one would have to allow the possibility that Jesus' words might not have referred to Christian baptism (Post-Pentecost), but that possibility is certainly not eliminated. That Jesus could be speaking proleptically is well within the realm of the possible.

However, our concern is what this section tells us about the Holy Spirit and Baptism. If the phrase "born of water and the Spirit" refer to Baptism--and I believe they do--, then the implication is there that "the very form of the construction suggests their indissoluble connection."⁴¹ That the two items were susceptible to separation is evident from later practice (and even modern exegesis). "Contrary to an evident tendency in the early church to separate Baptism by the Spirit from water altogether, it is here emphasized that in the Baptism of the Christian community the two belong together: water and Spirit."⁴²

Although the Gospels provide scant resource for the subject at hand (mainly because the majority of references to Baptism must wait for its inception at Pentecost), the passages here reviewed indicate no discontinuity between the Holy Spirit and Baptism as it is presented.

We must now turn our attention to the major source of our study, the book of Acts.

ACTS

A study of the evidence in the book of Acts presents its own unique brand of difficulties. On the surface it would appear that Acts has no set understanding of how the Holy Spirit and Baptism relate.

A number of solutions to this problem have been offered to explain what appears to be unevenness, if not outright contradiction, in the accounts in Acts which speak of Baptism and (not always explicitly) the gift of the Holy Spirit. Hull indicates that the evidence supports the possible assumption that "in its earliest days the Church was not agreed on how the Spirit was imparted or was agreed that the Spirit could come to men in different ways."⁴³

The most widespread opinion of critical scholars is summarized by S.I. Buse: "That [the fact of discrepancies in Acts] seems to involve an assumption either (i) that Luke was working with different sources which he failed to coordinate, or (ii) that he himself thought differently from one of his sources, or (iii) that the record has preserved for us hints of stages of development in baptismal doctrine and practice within the early Church."⁴⁴

This section of this paper will attempt to demonstrate that there is indeed an inseparable and necessary relationship between the Holy Spirit and Baptism in the book of Acts. Moreover, it will attempt to show that the discrepancies can be explained without resorting to the more "critical" assumptions listed above.

This writer will give full credit to the author of Acts as both an historian and theologian. With this in mind, this writer accepts as his presuppositions concerning the book of Acts that (1) it is "essentially a missionary book"⁴⁵, (2) it records incidents which trace the expansion of the early Church at significant, "epoch-making" junctures in its history; "Luke is concerned with special steps in the history of salvation which are of far-reaching significance as a matter of principle, namely, the overcoming of ancient and profound antitheses which opposed the

growth of the church"⁴⁶, and (3) just at these unique junctures, seemingly conflicting and contradictory narratives are given which support the view that "exceptions only serve to prove the rule."

An immediate problem confronts the reader of Acts in relating the Holy Spirit with Baptism, for there is no indication in the Pentecost story of Chapter 2 that the disciples themselves or the 120 who were with them ever received Baptism (themselves). The promise of Jesus recorded in Acts 1:5 - "before many days you shall be baptized with *the Holy Spirit*" - intensifies the problem by seemingly separating water-baptism from Spirit-baptism. This immediate dilemma can perhaps be resolved by pointing out that Jesus was not necessarily stating the situation in an either-or fashion. They were to be baptized (with the stress on the association of ideas connected with a "baptism", e.g. water) with the Spirit. Any reference to a "baptism" would undoubtedly call to mind John's baptism which was with water. It could also be pointed out that in every instance where that phrase of Jesus is used (Acts 1:5 and 11:16), water-baptism is found in the same context. As Schlink points out that "for linguistic and substantive reasons the conclusion is inescapable that a Baptism with water is meant wherever a Baptism in the name of Christ is mentioned. The Greek terms used (βαπτίζω and βάπτισμα) include the use of water."⁴⁷ This would apply even when "the name of Christ" is only implicit. However, this does not solve the question why the disciples were not recorded as having received "Christian" Baptism.

It is usually pointed out that the disciples probably received John's baptism⁴⁸ and therefore "had less need to undergo the outward rite again."⁴⁹ This is further drawn out by Oulton, who states, ". . . the two things [water-baptism and Spirit-baptism] from the nature of the

events were separate in time: they first received the baptism of John--or most of them did--and then at Pentecost received the gift of the Spirit. Or, alternatively, we might suppose that their discipleship with Jesus, particularly with him during the forty days, stood to them in place of baptism."⁵⁰ Hull approaches the question from a different angle: Jesus' own baptism. "The Lucan understanding of the baptism of Jesus, seeing in it an attestation of the prior possession of the Spirit, reveals, then, the possibility, that in Luke's opinion Christ's followers, like their Master, could have received the Spirit before submitting to the actual rite of baptism."⁵¹

Against the viewpoints just offered a number of objections have been raised. First of all, it is only an unproved assumption that many or most of the 120 gathered together at Pentecost were ever previously baptized. Furthermore, by stressing the unique relationship that this group--and particularly the Apostles--had with Jesus, a seemingly major inconsistency would appear, namely, the case of Paul, who likewise experienced a unique relationship with Christ, but who was nevertheless baptized.

These arguments seemingly lead us nowhere. It would seem to this writer that the case of Paul and the original Apostles are by their very nature unique enough to nullify any argument which is based on similarities. The most productive angle of approach, it seems to me, is one which does not look backward to a Johannine baptismal experience, but rather forward to the inauguration of the Church's mission. Thus Beasley-Murray's response is more satisfying, even if not convincing: "In the mission of the Church to the world no group can be compared with the company of witnesses of the Resurrection, gathered in the name of

the Lord on the day of Pentecost in expectation of the fulfillment of the promise . . . Their relationship to Christ was unique and their experience of his Spirit was unique; we cannot leap from them to the motley assembly that witnessed their ecstasy at Pentecost and the world without that was to hear their gospel."⁵² Robinson's conclusion is very similar: "[The reason why the Apostles did not themselves receive water-baptism] is that at Pentecost they partook of the *Heilsgeschichte* itself. They had a direct share in the One Baptism, of which the sacrament was to be the effective representation for every *succeeding* person and generation . . ."⁵³

At any rate, the baptism which immediately follows the Pentecost account, leaves no doubt that the Holy Spirit and Baptism are connected. The question addressed to Peter and the other disciples was "What shall we do?" The answer is to be baptized .

Peter's words to the crowd deserve closer attention. His response was "Repent, and *be baptized* every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; *and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit*" (Acts 2:38). The simplest understanding of these words would indicate a close, if not inseparable, connection between Baptism and the Holy Spirit. Those who disagree must usually resort to tortuous arguments in order to ignore the obvious. Parratt argues that if such a connection were intended, then Luke should have used a final clause instead of the future indicative.⁵⁴ This bit of literary insight is made in connection with a statement contradicting the claim by Beasley-Murray that Acts 2:38 is similar in form to Acts 16:31 ("Believe on the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved.") where the protosis and the apodosis

are more apparently coincident. Parratt regards a change from the future indicative to the aorist subjunctive in the apodosis of the two passages as significant enough a difference as to destroy any correlation. However, this reasoning seems trifling. It can be argued that "the future tense of the reception of the spiritual gift is as future as the baptism with which it is connected."⁵⁵ Parratt's line of arguing also is shown to be inconsequential when he tried to claim that the "gift of the Holy Spirit" in 2:38 refers to charismatic gifts, namely speaking in tongues. How he can make a statement such as "*Supra* can here only bear the meaning it has elsewhere in the Acts, where it certainly implies the charismatic gifts of the Spirit"⁵⁶ is beyond comprehension. This attempt to draw the "logical" conclusion that baptism must convey charismatic gifts is without basis in the subsequent narrative where speaking in tongues is not mentioned, nor can this one-sided view of the meaning of "gift of the Holy Spirit" be claimed for the whole of Acts (see Excursus). The most natural understanding of this text supports the contention that Baptism and the Holy Spirit are inseparably connected (no further conditions are added after the imperative "be baptized").

A more challenging and almost baffling situation confronts the reader of Acts when he arrives at chapter 8 and the "conversion" of the Samaritans by Philip. Here in verse 16 we encounter the puzzling statement that Peter and John came down from Jerusalem and "prayed for the [the Samaritans] that they might receive the Holy Spirit; for it *had not yet fallen on any of them, but they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.*" This deficiency is resolved, then, by the apostolic laying on of hands, whereupon the Samaritans received the Spirit.

A variety of explanations have been offered to "save" Luke from the terrible "blunder" he has committed here. The most obvious is to regard "the Holy Spirit" as referring to the outward manifestations of the Spirit. This view is propounded by Oulton⁵⁷ and Beasley-Murray⁵⁸. In favor of this explanation, which on first sight is very appealing, is the choice of the words "had not yet *fallen*" on them, which strongly suggests an animistic, as opposed to dynamistic concept of the Spirit. Beasley-Murray also appeals to Luke 11:13 (parallel: Matt. 7:11) for an interpretation of "Holy Spirit" in Acts 8:15 which would include a more ambiguous understanding. In the Gospel passages in question, Luke substitutes the words "Holy Spirit" for the phrase "good things" which appears in the Matthean version ("how much more will your Father in Heaven give *good things* to them that ask Him?"). Others would point out that nowhere in Acts (unless we include this one instance cited hypothetically by Beasley-Murray) is the phrase "the Holy Spirit" so understood.

Another approach would be to regard the Samaritans as never really being Christians in the first place. Thus Dunn incorporates part of the above argument and claims that Philip never really completed his goal of conversion. "Certainly Peter and John missed the manifestation, but they concluded that the Samaritans lacked the Spirit, not spiritual gifts. No gifts meant no Spirit."⁵⁹ He concludes that their behavior can best be explained by the religio-cultural situation in which the Samaritans lived. "To the Samaritans Philip's message could only be about the Taheb, and must mean that the long-awaited second Kingdom was about to be ushered in. . . . This does not mean that Philip's preaching was defective, only that his particular emphasis . . . could

well have given the Samaritans a false impression and resulted in a response which was sincere and enthusiastic, but wrongly directed."⁶⁰

Others, like Oulton⁶¹, have accepted the most simple understanding of the words in the narrative and concluded that the Samaritans were indeed Christians. In fact, there are some resemblances between this story and the Pentecost account, as well as others. Luke emphasizes that the Samaritans "with *one accord*" (Acts 1:14; 2:46) "*gave heed*" (16:14) to what was said by Philip (8:6). The result was much "*joy*" (13:52; 15:3) in that city (8:8). We are told that the multitudes, as well as Simon individually, "*believed*" and were subsequently "*baptized*" (8:12, 13). Simon (and we can assume that he is representative of others) also "*continued*" (1:14; 2:42, 46) with Philip (8:13). Taking the words as they stand in verse 14, we must conclude that the report that Samaria "*had received* the word of God" (11:1!; 17:11) was literally true. The similarities are at least verbally striking, but they still do not solve the riddle of a baptism that does not (immediately) impart the Holy Spirit.

An ecclesiological argument has been put forward by some, notably those of the Roman Catholic and Anglican faiths, which claims that the baptism was invalid without apostolic administration or that here is the *locus classicus* of the doctrine of confirmation (laying on of hands by those in apostolic succession) which is the real medium of the Holy Spirit. This argument seems to be the weakest of any offered and has received special treatment in G.W.H. Lampe's book, The Seal of the Spirit⁶². Without going into as much detail as this book, the simplest refutations of the ecclesiological interpretation are: (1) there is every indication that Philip's baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch in the

immediately following narrative was valid without apostolic intervention; (2) Paul's baptism by Ananias was valid, though non-apostolic (some try to claim that Ananias was in reality an "apostle" in that he was "sent" by God for this particular task, but we must allow Luke, who doesn't even regard Paul as an "Apostle," to speak for himself); (3) the laying on of hands is specifically mentioned only here and 19:6 in another "unique" situation (it is also mentioned with Paul's baptism, but with more of a healing connotation). To regard these as normative (particularly in view of the fact that there is no mention of laying on of hands at Pentecost where we would expect Luke not to miss a trick in illustrating Church "practice") disregards the context of the stories and the rest of Acts.

The most satisfying explanation of this account is one which takes into account the special missionary aspect of Acts, the progress of the Word from "Jerusalem and in all Judea and *Samaria* . . ." (1:8). A sample of opinions which take this into consideration is profitable: Beasley-Murray states that "the Apostolic integration of the Samaritans into the Church of the Messiah signified an effective healing of an age-long division"⁶³ (Cf. John 4:4-42 and Luke 10:30-37). Similarly, F.F. Bruce comments that "in the present instance, some special evidence may have been necessary to assure these Samaritans, so accustomed to being despised as outsiders by the people of Jerusalem, that they were fully incorporated into the new community of the people of God."⁶⁴ These passages emphasize the religious-social situation of the Samaritans reflecting age-old differences going back to the fall of Samaria in 722 B.C. Ethnically and religiously the Samaritans were "half-breeds." Their canon contained only the Pentateuch, and they worshipped

on Mount Gerazim, rather than at Jerusalem. Whereas the Jews looked for a restoration through the coming Messiah, the Samaritans (as mentioned earlier in Dunn's analysis, p. 19) expected a prophet, the *Tahab*, to usher in the new dispensation according to Deut. 18:18.

Lampe stresses the progression of the Christian mission in the following statement: "The preaching of the Gospel in Samaria represented a crucial moment in the advance of Christianity. Hence, after the baptism of the first Samaritan converts, the leaders of the Church's mission come down from Jerusalem, and by the sign of fellowship and 'contact' incorporate them into the apostolic (i.e., missionary) Church, with the result that there occurs a Samaritan 'Pentecost,' at least to the extent that visible signs are manifested of the outpouring of the Spirit."⁶⁵ In a similar vein, Dunn concludes that "it would only be when Peter and John, as chief representatives of the Jerusalem Church, proffered the right hand of fellowship that this particular stumbling block [having been brought to faith by an evangelist who was a Hellenist and independent of Jerusalem] was removed and they came to fullness of faith in the One who had died and risen again at Jerusalem."⁶⁶ It might be argued that the Apostles themselves, as much as the Samaritans, needed a demonstration of God's acceptance of the Samaritans.

All of these commentators have been working around a concept which finds its fullest expression by Jacob Jervell. (Bruce mentions "the new community of the people of God"; Beasley-Murray speaks of "the Church of the Messiah" and the "Israel of God"; Lampe refers to "the apostolic (i.e., missionary) Church.") Jervell makes more explicit what these writers are saying more implicitly. The clue which solves the mystery of the Samaritan "converts" lies in Luke's understanding

of the relationship among Israel--the Spirit--the Twelve Apostles--Jerusalem. "According to Luke 22:29f. and Acts 1:14f., the Twelve are directly related to Israel; they are the eschatological regents of the people of God."⁶⁷ Jervell applies this point to the case at hand: "It should be evident that the apostles by their visit have sanctioned Samaria as belonging to the restored Israel. The Samaritans, who previously rejected Jesus because he was on his way to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) now bind themselves to Jerusalem by receiving those who come from Jerusalem. As the listing of missionary territories shows, the restored Israel is found in Galilee, Judea and Samaria (1:8; 8:1; 9:31)."⁶⁸

This offers a suitable explanation to the enigma encountered in the narrative, but does not directly answer the point under discussion: how are the Holy Spirit and Baptism related in Acts? This problem, fortunately, is less difficult than the preceding, as there are strong linguistic indications that support the previous contention that Luke intends to show the Holy Spirit and Baptism as inextricably connected.

The focus of attention is brought upon the passage "for (the Holy Spirit) had *not yet* fallen on any of them, but they had *only* been baptized . . ." (8:16). The emphasis is even clearer in the Greek, for the emphatic negative, οὐδέπω, appears at the beginning of the sentence, making it even more emphatic, and μόνον stands at the front of its clause. Taking both of these words seriously, the conclusion arises that "Luke reports that the Samaritan believers had *only* (*monon*) been baptized, indicating that enough had not yet occurred, as indeed it had not. To be baptized and not to have received the Spirit was

an abnormality, in fact, as the passage goes on to teach, an impossible contradiction in Christian realities."⁶⁹ Further corroboration can be seen from the fact that "when Luke wrote that the Samaritan believers had only been baptized but that the Holy Spirit had not *yet* fallen he meant that it is exactly the coming of the Spirit which completed Christian baptism and that the gift of the Spirit *will* therefore be given to that with which it properly belongs--as indeed it very promptly was."⁷⁰ The converse of the principle will shortly be shown to be the case as well when the story of Cornelius is analyzed.

In the story of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch which follows the Samaritan incident, a minor problem is encountered. Baptism is mentioned, but there is not direct mention of any gift of the Holy Spirit. Rather than acting upon the eunuch, the Holy Spirit acts upon Philip, "catching him up" (8:39). That the Holy Spirit is not directly mentioned here need not present any great problem, for "belief in Jesus (or in His Name), baptism, the remission of sins, the laying on of Apostolic hands, and the reception of the Spirit seem to have formed a single complex of associated ideas, any one of which might in any single narrative be either omitted or emphasized."⁷¹ Bruce arrives at the same conclusion: ". . . if we think of the separate elements in Christian initiation--repentance and faith, baptism, laying on of hands, reception of the Spirit--Luke does not seem to regard any one sequence as normative."⁷² It is merely Luke's literary style not to belabor every point which his readers would already realize. The Western text tries to remedy this situation by having the words "the Spirit of the Lord fell upon the eunuch, and the angel of the

Lord snatched Philip away" appear in place of verse 39a. This merely makes explicit what we have regarded as implicit in the text. Further indirect substantiation that the Holy Spirit is intended to be connected with Baptism by Luke is the inclusion of the fact that the eunuch went on his way "*rejoicing*" (8:39b), which is elsewhere mentioned in baptismal contexts in Acts (11:23-24 and 13:52), as well as by Paul as a "fruit" of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22). "We may conclude that when no mention is made of laying on of hands, the gift of the Spirit was by direct descent, as at Pentecost--and that this was perhaps the normal experience, the cases of the Samaritans and the disciples of John being exceptional, and therefore specially mentioned."⁷³

We can now turn our attention to the baptism of Paul and discover what light it sheds on the problem. Without going into extraneous details surrounding the event, I hope to show that this same understanding of a close connection between Spirit and Baptism is likewise present here in Paul's baptism. Ananias announces to Paul that he has been sent by the Lord Jesus "that" (*ὅπως*) (1) Paul regain his sight and (2) he be filled with the Holy Spirit (9:17b). The narrative continues by showing that the first part was fulfilled ("and immediately something like scales fell from his eyes and he regained his sight", v. 18). However, it does not go on to say "and he was filled with the Holy Spirit." Rather, we are told "he rose and *was baptized*" (v. 18b). The most natural understanding of this passage is that "filling with the Spirit" and Baptism are treated as synonymous, which supports ~~and~~ previous premise. Therefore, Dunn's comments that "9.17f. cannot . . . be used as positive

evidence for the relationship either between Spirit-baptism and water-baptism, or between the gift of the Spirit and the laying of hands "74 should be discounted as ignoring the positive evidence.

The story of Cornelius presents us with another situation as unique and perplexing as that previously encountered with the Samaritans. Here the converse occurs: the Holy Spirit comes upon this assembly before they are baptized. However, if we assume, as we did with the Samaritan converts, that Luke is theologizing on an historical situation and emphasizing the progress of the Christian mission, then much of the perplexity can be cleared up. It is evident that Luke himself regards this event as a milestone in the Church's mission, since he records the event in three different places (10:44-48; 11:15-18; 15:7-9).

In the first instance we are told that the Holy Spirit fell upon Cornelius and his company while Peter was preaching the Word. The reaction to this was "amazement" upon the part of the "believers from among the circumcized," because "the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out *even* on the Gentiles" (10:45). The manifestation of the Spirit took the form of speaking in tongues. Peter's own reaction is significant, as he declares, "Can any one *forbid* water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit *just as we have*" (10:47). This last statement by Peter is elucidated in the next chapter when Peter explains that "the Holy Spirit fell on them just as on us *at the beginning*. . . If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we *believed* (aorist) in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God" (11:15, 17). The final account of this event comes at the Apostolic Council and is significant

because there is no direct mention of a baptism taking place! Rather, Peter relates that "God who knows the heart bore witness to them, giving them the Holy Spirit just as he did to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts *by faith*" (15:9). This last version of the affair contains very real problems, which cannot be gone into here. However, without trying to appear too facile, I will only state that the difficulties are not insurmountable, especially if the quotation by Silva New (p. 24) is taken into consideration. Luke merely omits unnecessary detail at times to enhance the literary style. Even though the "cleansing" of their hearts has as its antecedent Peter's vision and the pronouncement that "What God has cleansed, you must not call common" (10:15), it is not too far-fetched to understand by these words a connection to "baptism for the forgiveness of sins." Flemington's conclusion seems justifiable that ". . . in view of the fact that the 'believing' and the 'faith', on which such emphasis/is laid here, were elsewhere in Acts . . . associated in the closest way with the outward rite of baptism, it would seem precarious to press an argument from silence in the passage as though it were equivalent to a positive statement that baptism was non-essential."⁷⁵

The prior accounts are significant because they associate the coming of the Spirit with a single, prior event (implied by the use of the ingressive aorist). The same objections can be raised here as before, namely that the apostles themselves were not baptized (water-baptism) "at the beginning." However, the remarks made previously (pp. 15-17) will have to suffice, admitting that the problem exists.

However, the connection between the Holy Spirit and the single, prior event (baptism) is evident, even if the time sequence is unusual. That this event is to be regarded as "epoch-making" (along the same line as the "Samaritan Pentecost") can be seen in the use of the word καί. The Holy Spirit had been poured out *even* on the Gentiles. The Church was here learning a lesson in the procession of God's mission (a lesson that was not, however, "new" Cf. Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:17, 21; 8:26-40?). The totality of the mission was here made complete, as it incorporated Jews, Samaritans ("half-breeds") and Gentiles. In view of the universal command to baptize *all* nations, found in Matt. 28:19, the question is pertinent, why the early Church did not perceive this outreach as self-understood. The question can only be raised here.

What is more significant to the scope of this paper is that Peter's immediate course of action when he saw the Spirit given was Baptism. This would be further brought out if we were to follow Oscar Cullmann's basic thesis⁷⁶ that "κωλύειν" is a term directly associated with the baptismal rite ("forbid water": ὕδωρ κωλύειν, 10:47, and "withstand God": κωλύει τὸν θεόν, 11:17).

Bultmann connects this event with the preceding Samaritan episode and concludes that "the passages Acts 8:14-17, 10:44-48, in which the receipt of the Spirit and baptism are not contemporaneous are only an apparent exception. In reality, the intent of both passages is to teach precisely the inseparability of baptism and the receipt of the Spirit. A baptism which does not bestow the Spirit is no proper baptism and hence must be supplemented by the receiving of the Spirit (8:14-17). The bestowal of the Spirit by God means that

baptism must be given to the one so favored (10:44-48)."⁷⁷ Bruner, likewise, concurs with this opinion: "It is one of the most interesting features of Acts that it is in precisely the two passages where an historical separation of Christian baptism and the gift of the Spirit is described (Acts 8 and 10) that the theologically purposed and historically accomplished union of the two is most forcefully taught. In these two places Luke records separation only to teach union."⁷⁸

Our attention will finally be drawn to a final "unusual" case study provided in Acts concerning Baptism: the story of Apollos and the Ephesian "disciples" (Acts 18:24-19:7). Here again we are confronted with a perplexing situation. Apollos, a Jew, "fervent in (the?) spirit (Spirit?), and one who "spoke and taught *accurately* the things concerning Jesus" (18:25), knows only the baptism of John. When Aquila and Priscilla learn about this unusual situation, they expound to Apollos "the way of God more accurately" (v. 26). The problem arises because there is no mention that Apollos' deficiency is remedied by *Christian* baptism. In many ways he stands similarly with the 120 at Pentecost. The difficulty is enhanced by the ambiguity of the phrase "ἔωv τῷ πνεύματι" which could be read with small "s" or large "S". It can perhaps be argued that Apollos was actually baptized, even though it is not recorded here (that function not being a part of Aquila and Priscilla's work).

The "things concerning Jesus" which Apollos spoke and taught "accurately" might have been the facts of Jesus' ministry, perhaps up until his death. At that point Apollos might not have learned that Jesus had risen and instructed his disciples to wait in Jerusalem for the Pentecostal experience and the inauguration of *Christian* baptism.

Luke juxtaposes another paradigmatic situation next to the Apollos story. Here is a group of "disciples" from Ephesus (same town where Apollos is now living; did he instruct them?), who likewise received John's baptism, but were without the Holy Spirit. Paul remedies their situation by Christian baptism. Part of the problem would be solved if we knew exactly what Luke meant by referring to these Ephesians as "disciples." Is it that Paul only mistook them as "disciples" of Jesus and was soon enlightened to the truth by their own statement? Or are we to assume that they were true disciples (Luke always uses the term of true believers everywhere else in Acts) with a serious flaw? Or does it only refer to their being "disciples" of John?

Some regard the phrase *τινας μαθητάς* as indicative that they were outside the regular Christian community in Ephesus. It is debated whether these disciples had contact with Apollos himself, who would then be the cause of their predicament. These questions cannot detain us further here. A valuable study is provided by Ernst Käsemann (whose conclusion I do not concur with), "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," in Essays on New Testament Themes (see bibliography), which can better provide the arguments pro and con.

What is significant to the problem at hand is Paul's questions and the responses of the Ephesians. We are not given the background as to what led Paul to doubt the validity of these "disciples" experience. His first question is significant, though: "Did you receive *the Holy Spirit* when you *believed* (aorist)?" (19:2). The ingressive aorist leads us to suspect, at least, that Paul has reference to Baptism. Their reply that they had never even heard of the Holy

Spirit is confusing, for as followers of John the Baptist they should have learned that John baptized with water, but that the one greater than he would come baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with fire (Luke 3:16). Moreover, the concept of "Spirit" was not a *novum* to the people of that day. Therefore, some have understood the phrase "we have never even heard that there is a Holy Spirit" (19:2) to mean that they did not realize that the Age of the Holy Spirit spoken of by John had now been ushered in. This compounds the difficulties in determining their true status as "disciples."

What is more significant is Paul's next response: "Into what then were you *baptized*?" (19:3). The clear implication of this question is, as Flemington points out, "how could they have failed to receive the Spirit if they had been baptized in the normal Christian way?"⁷⁹ When he learns that they have only received the baptism of John, Paul corrects them by demonstrating that true Baptism is in "the name of Jesus," the one whom John had declared was to come--and had. He completes their instruction by baptizing them. The clear implication of the encounter is that the Holy Spirit and Baptism are regarded as inseparable. The fact that the coming of the Holy Spirit is preceded immediately by the laying on of hands and not Baptism need not alter the conclusion. As Dunn argues: "The laying on of hands . . . must therefore be the climax of a single ceremony whose most important element is baptism and whose object is the reception of the Spirit."⁸⁰

That problems such as these would be encountered in the early days of the Christian mission is understandable. "In the period of transition, when the effects of the ministries of John

and Jesus overlapped with that of the Apostles and their contemporaries, borderline cases were sure to occur; but the position of most men was not on the border and it is with the appropriation of salvation by mankind that we are concerned."⁸¹ This does not solve all the difficulties in the text. However, we might be safe in concluding in the case of Apollos and the Ephesian "disciples" that "where submission to the Messiah Jesus is accompanied by the possession of the Spirit, Johannine baptism needs no supplementing; where both are lacking, baptism in the name of Jesus must be administered."⁸²

In covering the incidents of baptism in Acts, only the more unusual examples have been adduced as evidence. It can rightly be argued that this omits a wealth of cases, most of which do not even speak of the Holy Spirit in connection with Baptism. However, I do not feel that this in any way nullifies the conclusions herein drawn. A study of the words which appear in the same context with baptism (e.g., "were added," "believed," "turned from sin," "turned to God," "were joined," etc.) only helps to indicate that Luke is able to use a host of different words, even when he is speaking of the one action--Baptism. Silva New's comment already cited concerning the "complex of associations" is a valid one. Furthermore, if the "exceptions" to the rule can be shown to support the "normal" view, then one would expect that the "normal" situations would likewise fall into line.

Now we must turn our attention to the evidence found in the Pauline literature, which should offer a valuable control to the data. Paul's thought is crucial on this matter, since his letters were the earliest written documents and, therefore, should portray the picture of Baptism in the earliest days of the Church.

THE PAULINE LITERATURE

There is no unanimity among scholars over the relationship between Baptism and the Holy Spirit in the writings of Paul. Marsh, for one, states that "Paul never states or implies that the gift of the Spirit is conditioned by baptism. He has passages in his writings in which its coming is ascribed to the gift of God without any mention of the medium of baptism."⁸³ Marsh is, however, saying that the Holy Spirit can come apart from Baptism, not denying that he ever does come in it.

Dunn's position is more direct. His conclusion is that "[water-baptism] may not be described as the means whereby God accepts [the individual] or conveys to him the Spirit."⁸⁴ For Dunn water-baptism and Spirit-baptism are two distinct acts, though sometimes connected closely chronologically. Schnackenberg, however, holds to an opposite position. He says that ". . . one will seek in vain in the Pauline Letters to discover a peculiar sacrament of the Spirit alongside baptism: the actuality and fulness of the Spirit of God, whose 'outpouring' is most closely connected with baptism, dominates the Apostle's field of vision."⁸⁵

The task is made more difficult when we realize that Paul's letters were generally written for *ad hoc* situations, and only accidentally do they treat a doctrine in a thorough, systematic style. One would wish that Paul had recorded a similar "tradition" concerning Baptism, as he did concerning the Lord's Supper in I Cor. 11:23ff. The plain fact is that Paul does not treat Baptism in any major way (with the possible exception of Rom. 6). Although some would explain this phenomenon by suggesting Paul merely could

assume Baptism as a "given" among his readers (perhaps suggested by Rom. 6:3--"*Do you not know that all of us who have been baptized . . . ?*"), argument from silence is always tenuous, at best. Nevertheless, we will select a few samples from Paul's writings to discover their contribution to the question at hand.

It might seem odd to begin with Rom. 6 as a starting point, because the word "Spirit" does not appear anywhere in the chapter. Yet a connection does seem to be implicit in the account. Paul usually reminds his readers of their Baptism as a means of exhorting them to live a life of sanctification. This element is found most clearly in this chapter in the expression "We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that . . . we too might *walk in newness (καινότης) of life*" (v. 4). This phraseology is found elsewhere in the Pauline epistles, most notably in Gal. 5:25 where Paul says "If we live by the Spirit, let us also *walk by the Spirit.*" The Galatians context has just finished speaking about those who have "crucified the flesh", which parallels the thought in Rom. 6:6 that "our old self was crucified with him." "For Paul, therefore, to 'walk in newness of life' . . . and to 'walk in the Spirit' . . . are synonymous, and the ethical outlook has its basis in the Christian's possession of life or Spirit, In Rom. vi the Apostle speaks of 'life,' instead of 'Spirit,' because it fits more exactly the idea of resurrection (and 'death'), whereas in Gal. v he is concerned to oppose the 'walk in the flesh' by the 'walk in the Spirit.'"⁸⁶ But we need not go any further than the next chapter of Romans to find corroboration for this "identity" of "Spirit" with "life." Rom. 7:6 says that we serve "not under the

old written code but in the *new life of the Spirit*." Here Paul employs the same word (*καλυότης*), as he did in 6:4. Baptism and the Spirit, then, are closely connected here, though precisely how is not spelled out in any comprehensive fashion.

Rom. 8:9 needs to be understood along with I Cor. 3:16 and Gal. 5:24. The first two passages speak of the Spirit as "dwelling" in the Christian. The last one has already been cited and uses the figure of "living" and "walking" by the Spirit. In none of these cases is Baptism specifically mentioned. Therefore, any claims made must all be conjectural. That Gal. 5:24 might be connected with the thought of Baptism has already been demonstrated above. However, there is evidence that the context of Rom. 8, which speaks of "sonship", also has Baptism in mind. Rom. 8:15ff says: ". . . you have received the spirit of sonship. When we cry, 'Abba! Father!' it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God . . ." "It is clear from Matt. iii. 17; Mark i.11; Luke iii.22 that Christ's baptism was associated with divine sonship. We can therefore be reasonably certain that in the mind of St. Paul and other first-century Christians men could be spoken of as 'becoming sons of God' in Baptism."⁸⁷ It is likewise revealing that a parallel passage to Rom. 8:15ff., namely Gal. 4:6-7 ("Because you are sons, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!"), is preceded by a baptismal context (Gal. 3:27). The distinct impression is left from this "complex of associations" (to steal an earlier phrase) is that Baptism and the Spirit go together. This leads me to discount Parratt's remarks, cited earlier (p. 9), that "it is significant that this analogy [between Christ's

Baptism and Christian Baptism] is nowhere made in the New Testament itself . . ."88 The most natural conclusion would be that this is the origin of the phrase, and that Christians early made it a part of their witness.

Another passage which needs a little "interpreting" is I Cor. 6:11 ("You were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the *Spirit* of our God.").

There are several factors which would lead one to assume Paul has reference to Baptism here. First of all, there is a close similarity between the idea of "washing" with Baptism. The best parallel to this would be Acts 22:16 where Paul repeats Ananias' words: "Rise and be baptized, and *wash away* your sins . . ." Ephesians 5:26 speaks of the Church being cleansed "by *the washing* of water with the word . . ." Titus 3:5 employs similar terminology ("*washing* of regeneration").

Secondly, there is a close connection between Baptism and the "name" of Jesus Christ. Acts 2:38 speaks of being baptized "in the name of Jesus Christ." I Cor. 1:13 carries the same connotation (through negation) when it says, "Were you baptized in the name of Paul?"

Not everyone is convinced by these pieces of evidence. Parratt makes the claim that "while it is no doubt true that the Early Church did administer baptism 'in the Name', it would scarcely be a logical inference from this to claim that the phrase necessarily, or even usually, points to the sacrament. . . Furthermore, baptism is hardly ever connected in the Pauline epistles either with justification or sanctification."89

Parratt's conclusions are hardly tenable, given the data at hand. He does not provide any suitable alternative to Baptism as the action signified. Moreover, his last conclusion falls far short of the truth, if one were to merely compare Eph. 5:26 and Titus 3:5. As the aorists of all three verbs suggest, we must look back to a single action and that action is undoubtedly Baptism. Even Dunn must conclude that ". . . it may be implied that water-baptism was the occasion when this cleansing took place."⁹⁰ Moreover, Brunner states: "The name of Christ is pronounced and the Spirit of God is given not in imperfect or doubtful succession but, as the trebling of aorists in the text declares, in the one initiation act of baptism."⁹¹

The relationship between the Holy Spirit and this Baptism is not expressly elucidated in the passage. However, Brunner is probably very close to the truth when he says that "in baptism the believer is washed, sanctified, and justified by entering the new life of fellowship in the body of Christ in which, by definition, the Holy Spirit dwells [I Cor. 3:16; 6:19; cf. Rom. 8:9; Eph. 2:22]."⁹²

We turn our attention now to I Cor. 12:13 ("For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body--Jews or Greeks, slaves or free--and all were made to drink of one Spirit," which has affinities with Gal. 3:27-28. Although Dunn does not believe this passage refers to water-baptism at all⁹³, the close connection with the Galatians parallel passage makes this conclusion untenable. "The similarity between Gal. 3:27f and I Cor. 12:12-3

is reproduced in Paul's emphasis that baptism to Christ and his Church entails an obliteration of social distinctions. If in Gal. 3 this happy result follows on Christian baptism and in I Cor. 12:13 it follows on baptism in the Spirit, the inference is not unreasonable that the two baptisms are one."⁹⁴

There is some question whether the phrase in v. 13 ("all were made to drink of one Spirit") also has reference to the same action as that described in the first half of the verse. It is possible that the verb "ἐποτίσθημεν" points to the Lord's Supper, thus drawing both sacraments into focus. Parratt believes, however, that Paul "is here using the traditional Old Testament imagery of the Spirit as water (Is. 32:15; 44:3; Ezek. 39:39; Joel 3:1ff.). In Acts this imagery seems to be connected especially with the charismatic gifts (2:16, 33; 10:45), and has no connection with baptism . . ." ⁹⁵

That this is what Paul has in mind here is doubtful. The verb is in the aorist and, therefore, points back to a single event (thus excluding the Lord's Supper, which is to be repeated). Furthermore, charismatic gifts are not in the picture here, for Paul says that we "all were made to drink of one Spirit." Water-baptism is in Paul's view here.

If this is the case, then we can make some important conclusions about the role of the Spirit here. With Bruner, we conclude that ". . . the Spirit not only acts as agent by baptizing all Christians into the one body of Christ, but that as the Spirit baptizes, he gives *himself*, fully, as the gift of Christian initiation! By the graphic picture of 'drinking in' Paul wishes to emphasize that Christians are not only baptized *by* the Spirit (v. 13a), but

they are at the same time filled *with* him."⁹⁶ This close inter-relationship between Baptism and Spirit is echoed by Lampe, who states that ". . . Baptism into Christ is synonymous with reception of/the bestowal of His Spirit, and with entry into the spiritual fellowship of His Body."⁹⁷ The ambiguity in this passage of the Spirit as being both agent and gift is picked up in Cullmann's discussion: ". . .(I)n *the act* of incorporation the Holy Spirit is operative. By reason of his nature the Holy Spirit is not imparted as a static quantity but only as something operating *in actu*."⁹⁸

Paul, then, shows the Spirit and Baptism to be here inseparably united. You cannot find the one without the other. This, however, does not mean the two may be separated later in the life of the individual. The Spirit as "gift" can be rejected. That is precisely the point of the picture painted in I Cor. 10:1ff.. We finish the discussion of this passage by concluding with Lampe that ". . . if Baptism effects union with Christ, as St. Paul certainly claims that it does, then it is baptism which also effects the bestowal of the Spirit."⁹⁹

We now focus our attention on those passages which speak of the Holy Spirit as a "seal" to determine if any light can be shed on the Spirit's relationship to Baptism. II Cor. 1:21-22 ("It is God who establishes us with you in Christ, and has commissioned [*Χρῆστῶς*] us; he has put his seal upon us and given us his Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee.") must be viewed in the light of Eph. 1:13 ("In him you also . . . were sealed with the promised Holy Spirit, which is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it . . ."). In his major study on this subject, The Seal of the Spirit, Lampe comes to the conclusion that ". . . the connection between the 'sealing with the Spirit'. . . and the sacrament of Baptism is so close that the one

can be regarded as the thing signified by the other."¹⁰⁰ The reasons for this can be summarized as follows: (1) the three verbs used in II Cor. 1:21-22 ($\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\chi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, and $\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) are all in the aorist tense and thus look back to a single event in the past; (2) "one of the basic ideas of sealing is the declaration that that which is sealed . . . is the property of him whose seal is affixed to it (or him). In popular usage this is the significance of assigning an object or person in the name of another. . ."¹⁰¹

There are also some exegetical considerations found in parallel passages which point to this conclusion. II Cor. 1:22 speaks of the Spirit as given in "our heart." In a baptismal context (previously discussed, p. 35) Gal. 4:6 speaks of the Spirit as sent into "our hearts." The Ephes 1:14 mentions the "promised Holy Spirit" as the "guarantee of our inheritance." In the parallel baptismal passages (Rom. 8:17 and Gal. 4:7), the concept of "heir" is present. The thought of a "promised" Holy Spirit recalls the prophecy of Joel 2 found in Acts 2:17, as well as the phrase describing Jesus in Acts 2:33.

This view is not held by everyone. Both Dunn and Delling center their argument on the verb " $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ " at the end of verse 21. Dunn remarks that "the anointing of God which made Jesus the Christ is the same anointing of God which makes men Christians. Since the anointing of Jesus is not to be equated with or made a part of Jesus' baptism, it follows that Paul in using $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ thinking of baptism in the Spirit, not water-baptism."¹⁰² Delling comes to much the same conclusion: ". . . aber es besteht kein Anlass, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in 2 Kor. 1, 21 als Bezeichnung der Taufe zu verstehen."¹⁰³ However, they fail to take in the

whole picture, as here delineated. Moreover, an out-right rejection of any relationship between Jesus' own baptism and Christian baptism seems untenable, based on the similarities of Acts 10:38 and 1:6 (see the previous discussion on p. 8).

If we accept these passages as referring to Baptism, then it is evident that Paul also here posits a close connection between the Spirit as "given in our hearts" at Baptism. The fact that the Spirit is the Christian's "down-payment" fits in well with other baptismal theology. "The outpouring of the Spirit is the beginning for a life in expectation of further activity of the Spirit. . . With the outpouring of the Holy Spirit the guarantee has been given for further gifts of the Spirit, gifts which the baptized is permitted to pray for and receive for his service in the church and to the world."¹⁰⁴

The last evidence from Paul that we will look at is Titus 3:5 (" . . . he saved us, not because of deeds done by us in righteousness, but in virtue of his own mercy, by the *washing of regeneration and renewal in (ἐν) the Holy Spirit.*"). Some, notably Pentecostals, have seen in this verse reference to two different actions--water-baptism ("washing of regeneration") and Spirit-baptism ("renewal in the Holy Spirit"). However, this position does not have any strong support. As Lampe points out, the ". . . two genitives are coordinate and alike dependent on λουτροῦ . . ."¹⁰⁵, and Brunner states that ". . . the single preposition in the single phrase again seals the single occasion."¹⁰⁶ Both prepositions, moreover, refer to the one act of being "saved" (aorist).

How does this relate to Baptism and its connection with the Spirit? Dunn tries to maintain that "it does not follow . . . that we can

speak of baptism here as effecting regeneration or conveying the Holy Spirit--the genitive Πνεύματος ^{ἁγίου} indicates not dependence on λουτροῦ but the agency which effects the πλῆθυνεσθαι καὶ ἀνακαινώσεις and the Spirit is poured out not διὰ λουτροῦ but διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.¹⁰⁷

This argument seems tortuous, trying to make a distinction without making a difference. It is more natural to conclude with Beasley-Murray that ". . . the Holy Spirit is the Agent of the action denoted by both words: the regeneration and renewal are alike wrought by the Spirit."¹⁰⁸ Thus Paul again shows that one cannot speak about Baptism without at the same time speaking about the work of the Holy Spirit, who is "poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior" (v. 6). This "pouring out" again calls to mind the prophecy in Joel 2, recorded in Acts 1:17, and Peter's words in Acts 2:33.

We can conclude this discussion of the Pauline evidence by again noting that Paul does not always refer to the Spirit when he speaks about Baptism. This, however, does not void the connection between the two, for we have seen how Paul also employs a wide variety of words in describing Baptism. Paul can describe it as "being buried with Christ" (Rom. 6:4), "putting on Christ" (Gal. 3:27), "sealing" (II Cor. 1:22), a "washing" (I Cor. 6:11; Titus 3:5), a "renewal" (Titus 3:5), and so forth. Despite this variety it has been shown that Paul almost always mentions the Holy Spirit, either implicitly or explicitly, somewhere in the context or in a parallel passage.

One point of difference seems to appear between our study of the material in Acts and the evidence in Paul. Acts places much

greater stress on the spectacular, outward manifestations of the Spirit, whereas Paul, on the other hand, "regularly uses language which implies that all Christians *ipso facto* have the Spirit . . ."109 The reason for this is probably in the difference in purpose between Paul's writing to Christians with individual questions and concerns and Luke's interest in tracing the significant movement outward of the Gospel from Jerusalem.

However, it is significant that there is no discontinuity between the witness of Paul, who wrote in the 50's and 60's of the First Century, and Luke, who may have written his work sometime between 80-90 A.D.

Our conclusion has been that the New Testament gives a unified witness to the inseparability between Baptism and the Holy Spirit. This conclusion has no little significance for today, as the Church is confronted by the growth of the Charismatic Movement, which attempts to posit the "gift of the Holy Spirit" at some later "experience" other than water-baptism. Because the Charismatic Movement also professes a strong commitment to the Word of God, it will be necessary to counteract any claims which find a separation between Baptism and the Spirit by sound exegesis of the Scriptures. This study has attempted to be a step in that direction.

EXCURSUS: "HOLY SPIRIT" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

A concordance survey of the concept of the "Holy Spirit" indicates a latitude in emphases throughout the New Testament. Sometimes the Holy Spirit is spoken of as "the promise" or "the gift," and is often associated with outward manifestations, such as speaking in tongues and prophesying. In other places, the Holy Spirit becomes a special quality dwelling within the individual Christian. Rudolph Bultmann has provided a valuable summary of the term, which has proved useful for this study. In his New Testament Theology he comments: "The Spirit can be conceived *as the power which seizes a man, or is given to him, for a specific situation or moment*, causing in him a temporary condition or eliciting specific deeds for that sole time. Or it can be conceived *as a power permanently allotted to him, resting in him, so to say*, which of course goes into effect on special occasions, but which also gives his whole mode of life a special character, imparting a supernatural quality to his nature."

The former view is usually spoken of as "animistic" and generally follows the Old Testament conception of Spirit as an *afflatus*. The latter view is usually termed "dynamistic" and more closely relates to the Pauline conception of Spirit as immanent power. I would include a third category in which the particular emphasis is personal. At times it is difficult to put any of the references to the Holy Spirit into a neat category, because it is not always the case of either-or, but both-and. Throughout this paper no attempt has been made to determine which concept is predominating at any particular time. Such an effort, while informative and worthwhile,

is not essential to the conclusion drawn. Further study of the subject can be found in IDB ("Holy Spirit," G. W. H. Lampe, Vol. II, pp. 626-639, especially pp. 633-636) and IDNT ("Πνεῦμα," Eduard Schweizer, Vol. VI, pp. 389-455, especially pp. 404-415). I have included here a brief review of some of the uses in the New Testament, attempting to place them into the three categories mentioned above. It will become readily apparent that clear-cut listing is a hazardous practice, at best.

I. Spirit as Personal

Jesus is "led up" by the Spirit into the wilderness (Matt. 4:1=Mk. 1:12=Lk. 4:2); the Spirit can be "blasphemed against" (Matt. 12:31=Mk. 3:29=Lk. 12:10); the disciples are instructed to baptize in the name (singular) of the Father, Son, and "Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19); at the baptism of Jesus the Spirit "descended as a dove" (Mk. 1:10=Lk. 3:22, cf. Jn. 1:32); Simeon in the temple received a revelation by the Holy Spirit (Lk. 2:26); the Holy Spirit will "teach" what a Christian should say (Lk. 12:12); the Holy Spirit will "teach you all things" (Jn. 14:26), "bear witness" (Jn. 15:26), "guide into all truth" (Jn. 16:13); the Spirit "leads" (Rom. 8:14), "helps us in our weaknesses" and "intercedes" (Rom. 8:26); he "searches" everything (I Cor. 2:10); the Spirit can be "grieved" (Eph. 4:30); he "says" (Heb. 3:7), "indicates" (Heb. 9:8), and "bears witness" (Heb. 10:15).

II. Spirit as *Afflatus*

Jesus casts out demons "by the Spirit" (Matt. 12:28); David was "inspired by the Spirit" to write (Matt. 21:43=Mk. 12:36); John the Baptist will be "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Lk. 1:15); Elizabeth was "filled with the Holy Spirit" and "exclaimed" (Lk. 1:41), while Zechariah was "filled with the Holy Spirit" and "prophesied" (Lk. 1:67); Simeon came to the temple "inspired by the Spirit" (Lk. 1:27); Jesus was "full of the Holy

Spirit" (Lk. 4:1); there are a variety of "manifestations of the Spirit" (I Cor. 14:12), and one who speaks in tongues "utters mysteries in the Spirit" (I Cor. 14:2); holy men of God spoke as they were "moved by the Holy Spirit" (II Peter 1:21).

III. Spirit as Immanent Power

The Holy Spirit was "upon" Simeon (Lk. 2:25); Jesus "rejoiced in the Spirit" (Lk. 10:21); the Father will give "the Holy Spirit to those who ask" (Lk. 11:13); the Spirit had "not yet been given" (Jn. 7:39); the "Spirit of truth dwells with you and will be in you" (Jn. 14:17); similarly, the Spirit "dwells" in you (Rom. 8:9, cf. I Cor. 3:16); the Christian should "be aglow with the Spirit" (Rom 12:11); the Spirit is "in our hearts" (II Cor. 1:22); the Holy Spirit is "given" by God (I Thess. 4:8).

In this paper it has been demonstrated that there is a close and necessary connection between the Holy Spirit and the sacrament of Baptism. However, no attempt has been made to more closely identify what is meant by the "Holy Spirit" as it affects the Christian who has been baptized. Although that was not part of the scope of the study, the following quotation from Brunner comes closest to summarizing and combining the two elements in a meaningful:

[The Spirit is understood in the New Testament] (a) as agent the Spirit baptizes into Christ, and it is by virtue of being baptized into Christ that the believer may derivatively be said to be baptized into the Spirit, for Christ and the Spirit are not divided; (b) as gift, in corollary, the Spirit in the New Testament comes in and through the name Christ Jesus and never in or through a discrete experience with himself as a separate gift which initiation into Christ was unable to convey, as though the Spirit were not fully given to Christ and in and through Christ to us; (c) for as the rich gift of salvation in Christ the Spirit's wealth consists in his pointing not to a better, higher, or richer experience in himself, but to an accomplished justification in Christ (Titus 3:6-7).

N O T E S

¹J.K. Parratt, "The Holy Spirit and Baptism, Part I: The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles," Expository Times, LXXII (1970-71), p. 235.

²S.I. Buse, "Baptism in the Acts of the Apostles," in Christian Baptism, ed. by Alec Gilmore (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), p. 117.

³J.H.E. Hull, The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles (London: Lutterworth, 1967), p. 91.

⁴Ibid., p. 91.

⁵G.R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism Today and Tomorrow (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966), p. 58.

⁶Warren Carr, Baptism: Conscience and Clue for the Church (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 190.

⁷Edmund Schlink, The Doctrine of Baptism, trans. by Herbert J.A. Bouman (St. Louis: Concordia, 1972), p. 65.

⁸Oscar Cullman, Baptism in the New Testament, trans. by J.K.S. Reid (London: SCM Press, 1950), p. 41.

⁹James D. Dunn, Baptism in the Spirit (London: SCM Press, 1970), pp. 5-6.

¹⁰C.F.D. Moule, "Baptism with Water and with the Holy Ghost," Theology, XLVIII (1945), p. 246.

¹¹Dunn, Baptism, p. 99.

¹²S. Bailey, "Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament," Theology, XLIX (1946), p. 14.

¹³G.W.H. Lampe, The Seal of the Spirit (London: Longmans, Green, 1951), p. 57.

¹⁴Ernest Best, "Spirit-Baptism," Novum Testamentum, IV (1960), p. 240.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶G.R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament (London: MacMillan, 1963), p. 38.

¹⁷Dunn, Baptism, p. 9.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁹Charles H.H. Scobie, John the Baptist (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 73.

²⁰John A.T. Robinson, "The One Baptism," in Twelve New Testament Studies (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, 1962), pp. 166-67.

²¹Lampe, Seal, p. 27.

²²Robinson, Studies, p. 161.

²³Scobie, John, p. 71.

²⁴Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 66.

²⁵R.E.O. White, "The Baptism of Jesus," in Christian Baptism, ed. by Alec Gilmore (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), p. 97.

²⁶J.K. Parratt, Expository Times, LXXII, p. 232.

²⁷Dunn, Baptism, p. 35.

²⁸Parratt, Expository Times, LXXII, p. 232.

²⁹Dunn, Baptism, p. 33.

³⁰Lampe, Seal, p. 42.

³¹Dunn, Baptism, p. 33.

³²Ibid.

³³Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 66.

³⁴Lampe, Seal, p. 43.

³⁵Robinson, Studies, p. 35.

³⁶Dunn, Baptism, p. 36. Cf. Oscar Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, trans. by A.S. Todd and J.B. Torrance (London: SCM Press, 1953), p. 76: "Contrary to an evident tendency in the early Church to separate Baptism by the Spirit from water altogether, it is here emphasized that in the Baptism of the Christian community the two belong together: water and Spirit. The writer may be thinking again of Jesus' own Baptism at the hand of John, where indeed the linking of water and Spirit was effected." Also Parratt, p. 233.

³⁷Raymond E. Brown, "The Eucharist and Baptism in John," in New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing, 1965), p. 93.

³⁸Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 216.

³⁹D.R. Griffiths, "Baptism in the Fourth Gospel," in Christian Baptism, ed. by Alec Gilmore (Chicago: Judson Press, 1959), p. 156.

⁴⁰Frederick Dale Bruner, A Theology of the Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 258.

⁴¹Griffiths, Christian Baptism, p. 158.

⁴²Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 76.

⁴³Hull, Holy Spirit in the Acts, p. 90.

⁴⁴S.I. Buse, Christian Baptism, p. 121.

⁴⁵J.E.L. Oulton, "The Holy Spirit, Baptism and Laying on of Hands in Acts," Expository Times, LXVI (1954-55), p. 237.

⁴⁶Schlink, Doctrine, p. 67.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 26. Cf. Marsh, p. 166: "With his knowledge of the message of John it seems scarcely credible that Jesus should use the figure of baptism concerning His own gift of the Spirit if he meant to reject the symbol entirely. It was called a 'baptism' and under that term it is most natural to include the material symbol as well as the spiritual experience. If Jesus had meant to reject John's water rite we should have expected more definite language. We cannot conceive that such was used by Him and suppressed by a ritualistic band of followers. Nor, if it is merely a case of misinterpretation, can we know whether modern criticism is better able to gauge the mind of Christ in this than the men who passed on His message."

⁴⁸W.F. Flemington, The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism (London: S.P.C.K., 1957), p. 42.

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Oulton, Expository Times, LXVI, p. 237. Cf. F.F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, "The New International Commentary on the New Testament" (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 386: ". . . probably their Pentecost endowment with the Spirit transformed the preparatory significance of the baptism which they had already received into the consummative significance of Christian baptism."

⁵¹Hull, Holy Spirit in the Acts, p. 95.

⁵²Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 97.

⁵³Robinson, Studies, p. 167.

⁵⁴Parratt, Expository Times, LXXII, p. 235.

⁵⁵Bruner, Theology, p. 168.

⁵⁶Parratt, Expository Times, LXXII, p. 235.

⁵⁷Oulton, Expository Times, LXVI, p. 238.

⁵⁸Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 119.

- ⁵⁹Dunn, Baptism, p. 56.
- ⁶⁰Ibid., p. 64.
- ⁶¹Oulton, Expository Times, LXVI, p. 238.
- ⁶²Lampe, Seal.
- ⁶³Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 118.
- ⁶⁴Bruce, Commentary on Acts, p. 182.
- ⁶⁵Lampe, Seal, p. 72.
- ⁶⁶Dunn, Baptism, p. 67.
- ⁶⁷Jacob Jervell, Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), p. 126.
- ⁶⁸Ibid.
- ⁶⁹Bruner, Theology, p. 177.
- ⁷⁰Ibid., p. 178.
- ⁷¹Silva New, "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands," in Beginnings of Christianity, ed. by F.J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (Part I: The Acts of the Apostles; London: MacMillan, 1933), V, p. 134.
- ⁷²F.F. Bruce, "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," Interpretation, XXVII (1973), p. 176.
- ⁷³Bailey, Theology, XLIX, p. 13.
- ⁷⁴Dunn, Baptism, p. 78, note 15.
- ⁷⁵Flemington, Doctrine, pp. 48-49.
- ⁷⁶Cullmann, Baptism, pp. 71ff.
- ⁷⁷Rudolph Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, trans. by Kendrick Grobel, I (New York: Scribner's, 1951), p. 139.
- ⁷⁸Bruner, Theology, p. 194, note 40.
- ⁷⁹Flemington, Doctrine, p. 47.
- ⁸⁰Dunn, Baptism, p. 87.
- ⁸¹Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 97.
- ⁸²Ibid., p. 112.

- ⁸³Herbert G. Marsh, The Origen and Significance of the New Testament Baptism (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1941), pp. 137-38.
- ⁸⁴Dunn, Baptism, p. 172.
- ⁸⁵Rudolph Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, trans. by G.R. Beasley-Murray (New York: Herder & Herder, 1964), p. 91.
- ⁸⁶Ibid., p. 164.
- ⁸⁷D.E.H. Whitely, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 170.
- ⁸⁸Parratt, Expository Times, LXXXII, p. 232.
- ⁸⁹Ibid.
- ⁹⁰Dunn, Baptism, p. 121.
- ⁹¹Bruner, Theology, p. 256.
- ⁹²Ibid.
- ⁹³Dunn, Baptism, p. 129.
- ⁹⁴Beasley-Murray, Baptism in New Testament, p. 169.
- ⁹⁵Parratt, Expository Times, LXXXII, note 9, p. 270.
- ⁹⁶Bruner, Theology, p. 294.
- ⁹⁷Lampe, Seal, pp. 56-57.
- ⁹⁸Cullmann, Baptism, p. 40.
- ⁹⁹Lampe, Seal, p. 62.
- ¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 5.
- ¹⁰¹Beasley-Murray, p. 173.
- ¹⁰²Dunn, p. 133.
- ¹⁰³Gerhard Delling, Die Taufe im Neuen Testament (Berlin: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 1963), p. 107.
- ¹⁰⁴Schlink, p. 63.
- ¹⁰⁵Lampe, p. 59.
- ¹⁰⁶Bruner, p. 259.
- ¹⁰⁷Dunn, p. 169.

¹⁰⁸Beasley-Murray, p. 211.

¹⁰⁹Bruce, Interpretation, p. 178.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Bailey, Sherwin. "Baptism and the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament." Theology, XLIX (1946), pp.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. Baptism in the New Testament. London: MacMillan, 1963.
- . Baptism Today and Tomorrow. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.
- Best, Ernest. "Spirit-Baptism." Novum Testamentum, IV (1960), pp. 236-243.
- Brown, Raymond. New Testament Essays. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing, 1965.
- Bruce, F.F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. "The New International Commentary on the New Testament." Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1954.
- . "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles." Interpretation, XXVII (1973), pp. 166-183.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Scribner's, 1951.
- Buse, S.I. "Baptism in the Acts of the Apostles." Christian Baptism. Edited by Alec Gilmore. Chicago: Judson Press, 1959.
- Carr, Warren. Baptism: Conscience and Clue for the Church. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. Translated by J.K.S. Reid. "Studies in Biblical Theology." London: SCM Press, 1961.
- . Early Christian Worship. Translated by A.S. Todd and J.B. Torrance. "Studies in Biblical Theology." London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Dunn, James D. Baptism in the Spirit. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Flemington, W.F. The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.
- Griffiths, D.R. "Baptism in the Fourth Gospel." Christian Baptism. Edited by Alec Gilmore. Chicago: Judson Press, 1959.
- Hull, J.H.E. The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles. London: Lutterworth, 1967.

- Jervell, Jacob. Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus." Essays on New Testament Themes. London: SCM Press, 1964.
- Lampe, G.W.H. "Holy Spirit." Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Vol. II. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
- . The Seal of the Spirit. London: Longmans, Green, 1951.
- Marsh, Herbert G. The Origen and Significance of the New Testament Baptism. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1941.
- Moule, C.F.D. "Baptism with Water and with the Holy Ghost." Theology, XLVIII (1945), pp. 246-249.
- New, Silva. "The Name, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands." The Beginnings of Christianity. Edited by F.F. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. V. London: MacMillan, 1933.
- Oulton, J.E.L. "The Holy Spirit, Baptism and Laying on of Hands in Acts." Expository Times, LXVI (1954-1955), pp. 236-240.
- Parratt, J.K. "The Holy Spirit and Baptism, Part I: The Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles." Expository Times, LXXXII (May, 1971), pp. 231-235.
- . "Part II: The Pauline Evidence." Expository Times, LXXXII (June, 1971), pp. 266-271.
- . "The Rebaptism of the Ephesian Disciples." Expository Times, LXXIX (March, 1968), pp. 182-183.
- Reiling, J. "The Holy Spirit in Baptism." Baptist Quarterly, XIX (October, 1962), pp. 339-351.
- Robinson, John A.T. Twelve New Testament Studies. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, 1962.
- Schlink, Edmund. The Doctrine of Baptism. Translated by Herbert J.A. Bouman. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. New York: Herder & Herder, 1964.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Τὸ Βάπτισμα" Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. VI. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Scobie, Charles H.H. John the Baptist. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- White, R.E.O. "The Baptism of Jesus." Christian Baptism. Edited by Alec Gilmore. Chicago: Judson Press, 1959.
- Whitely, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.