

SPIRIT- BAPTISM

YESTERDAY, TODAY

AND FOREVER

PREFACE

There was a great king whose kingdom was above all other kingdoms. The king desired to give as inheritance the kingdom which he reigned over. He thought,

I cannot simply give the kingdom to the ones I love for they would not know how to rule it being unlearned. This is what I shall do. I shall send my messengers with silver coins each having the inscription of my son--for truly the kingdom belongs to him. They shall distribute the coins to all whom I love. The ones whom I love must learn that alone they cannot possess the kingdom, but if they will all come together and spend their coins in unity, they shall possess the kingdom and my son shall reign over them and they shall all be one.

In this writing I would like to throw my silver coin into the box signifying that I believe in the “unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” I intend to invest the earnest of my inheritance that, with others, I might truly possess the kingdom and that the Son might reign over me totally.

His unsearchable riches are for the Christian; charismatic and non-charismatic alike. I am moved inwardly that there might be peace between the charismatic and uncharismatic Christian and that God might be glorified wholly by both. Still, in this writing I humbly seek not only to make peace, but to inspire. I seek to persuade all to come, take of the water of life freely and drink.

**SPIRIT-BAPTISM --
YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND FOREVER**

A study by Min. Mark C. Robison

THESIS: There has been much division among Christians concerning Spirit-baptism with “the initial physical evidence” of speaking in other tongues and also other manifestations of the Spirit. In this study, I stress the need for love and acceptance of all Christians, non-charismatic, Pentecostal and charismatic while enjoining the full acceptance of the Holy Spirit and His manifestations.

We as Christians must agree on essential doctrine, have liberty on nonessential doctrine and have charity in all things.

To speak in tongues is considered here very significant, but non-essential. To confess Jesus Christ as Lord by the Holy Spirit believing that God has raised Him from the dead and to depart from iniquity is considered essential to the Christian life. Further, I consider it essential to accept one another as Christian if we meet this test.

All Christians have the Holy Spirit, but the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” with “the initial physical evidence” of speaking in other tongues is much to be desired and is not known to all Christians.

V. SUBSEQUENCE

A. A SUBSEQUENT EXPERIENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

The question has risen concerning the possibility of “the baptism in the Holy Spirit” as an experience subsequent to salvation. Grudem notes that traditional Pentecostals and charismatics have held to this possibility.⁶² That is, that one may receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit at a time subsequent to conversion. Grudem has argued against a second experience.⁶³

I would set forth a position which testifies that the baptism of the Holy Spirit may be an experience subsequent to the conversion experience. Conversion and Spirit-baptism may occur at the same time as in Acts 10:44-48 or Spirit-baptism may be subsequent by moments as in Acts 19:4-6 or a longer period as in Acts 8:12, 15-17. (If we consider that the Ephesians were regenerate when Paul met them, this would also indicate a longer period of time from regeneration before Spirit-baptism. I have held that the Ephesians were not Christians until after Paul had preached to them, baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, and laid his hands upon them that they might receive the baptism in the Holy Spirit.)

B. JOHN STOTT AND WAYNE GRUDEM

Grudem writes concerning the conversion of Samaria (Acts 8:4-40). The Samaritans received the word of the Lord and were baptized, but had not received the Holy Spirit. When the apostles heard that they had received the Word of the Lord, they sent Peter and John to them who “placed their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Spirit” (Acts 8:17b [NIV]). (Grudem helps the reader to understand the fallacy in rejecting the Samaritans’ experience prior to the apostles coming as not being genuine faith [8:12].)⁶⁴ Grudem, following John Stott’s discussion which Grudem terms “careful” then addresses the situation concerning the apostles’ ministry to the Samaritans as follows,

A better understanding of this event would be that God, in his providence, sovereignly waited to give the new covenant empowering of the Holy Spirit to the Samaritans directly through the hands of the apostles (Acts 8:14-17) so that it might be evident to the highest leadership in the Jerusalem church that the Samaritans were not second-class citizens but full members of the church. This was important because of the historical animosity between Jews and Samaritans (“Jews have no dealings with Samaritans,” John 4:9), and because Jesus had specified that the spread of the gospel to Samaria would be the next major step after it had been preached in Jerusalem and the region of Judea that surrounded Jerusalem: “You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth” (Acts 1:8) (Grudem, 1994, 774)

I would note that this does have a somewhat similar rationale shown in the words of James and the elders to Paul in Jerusalem with the purpose of convincing the believing Jews of Paul’s lawful ways.

17 When we had come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly. 18 On the following day Paul went in with us to James; and all the elders were present. 19 After greeting them, he related one by one the things that God had done among the Gentiles through his ministry. 20 And when they heard it, they glorified God. And they said to him, “You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the law, 21 and they have been told about you that you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs. 22 What then is to be done? They will certainly hear that you have come. 23 Do therefore what we tell you. We have four men who are under a vow; 24 take these men and purify yourself along with them and pay their expenses, so that they may shave their heads. Thus all will know that there is nothing in what they have been told about you but that you yourself live in observance of the law. (Acts 21:17-24 [RSV])

This was the plan of the leaders that the believing Jews who were zealous for the law would be quieted concerning Paul. This is not altogether unlike Stott and Grudem’s proposition that the Jerusalem leadership might be convinced of the full inclusion of the Samaritans into the church. If Stott and Grudem’s consideration is valid, these would both show peacemaking with the Jewish believers concerning how the advancing of the gospel was being conducted. It ought to be noted, however, that in Paul’s case the Jews from Asia instigated violence against Paul. They saw Paul in the temple after nearly seven days and stirred up the people against him (v. 27-31). Scripture

is silent concerning the convincing of the believing Jews concerning Paul's observance of the law, but Paul was seen after nearly seven days. Whatever success this plan may have had, it could not keep the Jews from Asia from instigating violence against Paul. These Jews were probably not believers in Christ.

I would note that Stott and Grudem's teaching show high purposes and very significant to consider. However, there is no hint of the purpose of which Stott and Grudem write in sending the apostles to Samaria. Further, Luke writes, "And so, when they had solemnly testified and spoken the word of the Lord, they started back to Jerusalem, and were preaching the gospel to many villages of the Samaritans" (Ac. 8:25 [NASB]). The text then goes immediately to a testimony concerning Philip and closes the chapter with this testimony. The text does not show the least interest, it seems, for the Jerusalem leadership. Yet, Stott and Grudem hold that this is the very purpose of the apostles being sent. This is an important point which is not in the text!

Beyond this, a problem arises again with Grudem's statement of the first purpose of the apostles coming to Samaria. I would note that the witness of the apostles was not needed to authenticate the experience of the Samaritans as was later shown in the case of Peter preaching to the house of Cornelius. If authentication was needed then that which was needed was the witness of God in giving the believers the Holy Spirit. This is what Peter set forth to the Jewish apostles and elders in the Jerusalem church (the same church whose leaders purportedly needed convincing concerning the Samaritans).

6 And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter. 7 And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe, 8 And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; 9 And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. 10 Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? 11 But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they. (Acts 15:6-11 [KJV]).

Here, though Peter mentioned that the Gentiles heard the word by his mouth, his argument that there was no difference between Jew and Gentile was solely on the basis of the fact that God had given the Gentile believers the Holy Spirit and not on the basis of his apostolic ministry. (The work of the Spirit and the unity which comes to Jew and Gentile by that work were most vital. Unity today is also most vital [Eph. 2:11-22; 4:3-6]). Peter did not say that God bore them witness along with himself, but stated “God who knows the heart bore witness to them” (Acts 15:8a [RSV]). These versions bear this out. (v. 8 [KJV, LB, Phillip’s, RSV, NEB, JB, NIV, TEV, NASB]).

Peter spoke to the Jewish believers who were with him in the house of Cornelius. “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” (Acts 10:47 [KJV]) Peter spoke of the same sole justification for inclusion in the church as he spoke to the Jerusalem leaders, that of the reception of the Holy Spirit.

The Samaritan believers, I would note, were, perhaps, considered outsiders to a lesser extent than the Gentiles. Jesus had preached to the Samaritans (Jn 4:1-42). I would suggest that the Samaritans needed the apostles in that Christ had sent them to Samaria (Acts 1:8; 8:14) as Grudem points out, but that the purpose in this was not authentication of the Samaritans experience to Jerusalem leaders by apostles. The receiving of the Holy Spirit was all the authentication that these leaders were later to need to authenticate the experience of the Gentile believers. What the Samaritans needed was the Holy Spirit baptism for Christian initiation, power, and to be witnesses, along with all of the blessed benefits of Spirit-baptism. I would set forth another possible explanation of the dynamics of the reception of the gospel by the Samaritans including the ministry of Phillip, Peter, and John.

C. THE SAMARITANS, PHILIP, PETER, AND JOHN

Christ has given ministries to the Church. “It was he who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers.” (Eph. 4:11 cf. 12, 13 [NIV]). God has appointed eight ministries. “And in the church God has appointed first of all apostles,

second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, also those having gifts of healing, those able to help others, those with gifts of administration, and those speaking in different kinds of tongues” (1 Cor. 12:28 [NIV]). The manifestation or gifts of the Spirit are distributed “to each one individually just as He (the Spirit) wills” (1 Cor. 12:4, 11 [NASB]). To different individuals the nine-fold manifestation of the Spirit--or gifts of the Spirit--are severally given to profit the body (1 Cor. 12:7-11 [cf. 12:4]). Believers may have more than one gift. Paralytics and cripples were *healed* as Phillip ministered and, also, *miracles* were worked (Acts 8:7, 13). The Church of Jesus Christ has, as it were, specialization of labor in this, with every part of the body of Christ: eye, ear, nose, hand, foot, head having a particular function and particular equipping.

Philip’s work in Acts 6:1-6 was “functionally equivalent to what Paul covered in the title ‘deacon’ [c.f. 1 Tim. 3:8-13].”⁶⁵ In Acts 8, he did the work of an evangelist and in Acts 21:8 was designated “the evangelist.” I note that Saul was converted in chapter nine (A.D. 34). Near the end of his third missionary journey (A.D. 57) he stayed with Philip who had four daughters who prophesied.^{66 67} It is remarkable that all four daughters prophesied rather than fewer of them. This may imply an involvement with their father in this gifting. This visit in Acts 21 was at least twenty-three years after Philip ministered to the Samaritans and Ethiopian eunuch. The writer considers it likely that Philip did not have the same level of experience and gifting with the Holy Spirit that he later had (ch. 21), though early on it was great as well. This may show an increase in responsibilities, promotion, and maturation in Philip as he progressed. Similarly, Paul urged Timothy to be diligent in order that his “progress” might be seen by everyone (1 Tim. 4:15 [NIV]).

Peter and John were apostles. The apostles had responsibilities and honor greater than that of the seven (Acts 6:3; cf. 21:8). Their work was in the word of God and prayer (Acts 6:2). When the apostles prayed for the Samaritans, it may be noted that they were fulfilling this ministry of prayer (Acts 8:15).

Evangelists may be ones to lay their hands on converts and to pray that the Holy Spirit may come, but this is not necessarily so. When Philip preached to

the Samaritans, they believed and were baptized (Acts 8:12, 13). Similarly, Philip preached to the Ethiopian eunuch by the commandment of an angel of the Lord and that of the Holy Spirit, the eunuch believed, and Philip baptized him. When Philip had baptized him, the eunuch saw him no more for the Spirit of the Lord caught him away. The eunuch went on his way rejoicing (Acts 8:26-40). Philip was found some distance from Samaria at Azotus. Bruner writes of the eunuch's experience with Philip, "The Holy Spirit arranged the meeting (v. 29), concluded it (v. 39a), and was probably the source of the eunuch's joy (*chairon*)."⁶⁸

I would not seek to dispute this except to note that the fact that the eunuch rejoiced does not necessarily indicate that he had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit. I would note that the Samaritans experienced "great joy in that city." (8:8 [KJV]) The Greek for "joy" is (*chara*) a feminine noun.⁶⁹ This word comes from the Intransitive (*chairo*)⁷⁰ which is found in the instance of the Ethiopian eunuch's "rejoicing." [Luke seems to intend for us to understand in the account of Philip's preaching and ministering to the Samaritans of the extending of the gospel from the Jewish people to the Gentile world.⁷¹ Also, Luke may intend we know of the very satisfying, joy-bestowing benefits of the gospel through Phillip, Christ and all who faithfully proclaim it (Is. 52:7; 40:9; Nah. 1:15; Mk. 16:17). Christ speaks of the character of His gospel. "THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD IS UPON ME, BECAUSE HE ANOINTED ME TO PREACH THE GOSPEL TO THE POOR. HE HAS SENT ME TO PROCLAIM RELEASE TO THE CAPTIVES, AND RECOVERY OF SIGHT TO THE BLIND, TO SET FREE THOSE WHO ARE DOWNTRODDEN, TO PROCLAIM THE FAVORABLE YEAR OF THE LORD." (Lk. 4:18, 19 [NASB]) Such a gospel surely brings great joy, though Christ was hated for declaring its fulfillment in Him.

It is of interest to our discussion that the Samaritans who rejoiced in verse eight had not been baptized in the Holy Spirit as of that time. The Ethiopian eunuch went on his way rejoicing after being baptized in water. It is questionable as to whether the Ethiopian eunuch had received the Holy Spirit in His fulness. No mention is made of Spirit-baptism. It would seem

less natural for him to receive Spirit-baptism before water baptism with no mention of it.

D. ORDER IN BAPTISMS

Let us examine the other occurrences in which water baptism and Spirit-baptism occurred together. In the Samaritan Pentecost, water baptism occurred first and Spirit-baptism followed through the laying on of hands (8:12, 17). At the house of Cornelius, Spirit-baptism occurred first, while water baptism followed (10:45-48). It seems plain that this order was shown that justification for adding the Gentiles to the Church in water baptism would be known and understood to be from God (cf. Acts 15:8). I will discuss the case of Saul subsequently. In the instance of the Ephesian number of about twelve receiving water baptism and Spirit-baptism, water baptism again was administered first (19:5, 6).

It would seem that water baptism preceding Spirit-baptism might well be normative (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 19:5). At any rate, it would seem natural for Luke to have recorded Spirit-baptism for the eunuch if he had received the Spirit prior to water baptism. Further, it also is questionable whether the eunuch received the Holy Spirit after baptism as Philip was abruptly and immediately (“suddenly” *NIV, Phillips*) translated by the Spirit (8:39, 40). This is also in consideration of the fact that much is made of the receiving of the Holy Spirit by the Samaritans under the hands of the apostles both in the experience of the apostles and in Luke’s writing of it, while no mention is made of Spirit-baptism for the Ethiopian eunuch. An account of Spirit-baptism for the eunuch is strikingly absent. [However, Henry records this reading from some textual copies. “And, when they were come up out of the water, the Holy Spirit fell upon the eunuch (without the ceremony of the apostles’ imposition of hands), but the angel of the Lord caught away Philip.”] ⁷²

As we have seen the normal Spirit-baptism included all of the believers (i.e. Pentecost, possibly the Samaritans, the house of Cornelius, probably the Ephesians, and the Corinthians [Acts 2:4; 8:17; 10:44-46; 19:6, 7; 1

Cor. 12:13; Clement, (see note 67)]). As we shall see subsequently, other instances of water baptism without the mention of Spirit-baptism do occur in Acts.

Ananias was sent that Saul (Paul) might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit. Ananias went to Saul. Though the record of Scripture does not state that Saul received the Holy Spirit, I assume that he did as Ananias spoke of this purpose, laid hands on him, scales fell from Saul's eyes and he arose and was baptized (Acts 19:10-20). When Ananias ministered to Saul, it seems that he may have laid hands on him prior to baptism because Saul had been blinded and regaining his sight was the most pressing need. Further, it was preferable that he should be able to see so as to be baptized. In the three instances when hands were laid upon the believers for the purpose of Spirit-baptism, water baptism was first administered except in the case of Saul.

Other pertinent accounts of baptism without Spirit-baptism are Lydia (16:15), the Philippian jailer who also "rejoiced" (*agalliao*) (16:33, 34), and many Corinthians who along with Crispus and his household believed (18:8). It would seem very natural and right for Philip to have laid hands on the Samaritans and on the Ethiopian eunuch after water baptism was administered if they were to receive the Holy Spirit under his hands. He did not do so in the case of the Samaritans and we have no record of his laying on of hands and Spirit-baptism for the eunuch.

E. PHILIP AND SPIRIT-BAPTISM

I CONSIDER IT POSSIBLE, EVEN SOMEWHAT LIKELY, THAT THE GIFT OF LAYING ON OF HANDS AND PRAYING FOR THE HOLY SPIRIT TO FALL WAS NOT GIVEN TO PHILIP DURING THAT PERIOD IN HIS MINISTRY. I note that Paul, though his ministry was so great and far-reaching, was not sent to baptize in water (1 Cor. 1:17). This commandment seems to have been remarkably left out of Paul's commissioning (Acts 26:12-18). This was not God's purpose for Paul. The fact that the Corinthians were

“not lacking in any spiritual gift” (1 Cor. 1:7 [*NASB*]) may not only denote the fulness of the Corinthian church, but may indicate that a lack of spiritual gifts is a possible reality which is to be remedied by the church (or churches) by earnest seeking of the face of the Lord, spiritual worship, sound teaching, sincere faith and love, etc..

God’s way concerning love and gifts is such that we are encouraged, “Follow the way of love and eagerly desire spiritual gifts, especially the gift of prophecy” (1 Cor. 14:1 [*NIV*]). This indicates a flow of gifts from not possessing them to possessing them. Philip was full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom (Acts 6:3), had gifts of evangelism (21:8) deliverance from demons and healing (8:7) and signs and great miracles (8:13), but may not have had the gift of praying for the new believers to receive the Holy Spirit. It should be noted that any Christian may desire and ask for the gift of laying on of hands and praying for believers to receive the Holy Spirit. However, Simon sought to buy this gift through offering money and was sharply rebuked and judged (8:18-25). It is important to our discussion that Simon sought to buy the “gift (*dorea*) of God” saying ‘Give me also this power, that any one on whom I lay my hands may receive the Holy Spirit.’ But Peter said to him, ‘Your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain the gift of God with money!...’” (8:19, 20 [*RSV*]). This “gift” may imply a wider meaning such as the gift or baptism of the Holy Spirit Himself, or may imply ministry itself, but explicitly, Peter relates the request for this power to pray for others to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit to the “gift of God.” I would note that this gift, which may indeed relate to the manifestation of the Spirit of “faith,” (1 Cor. 12:9a) and is to be earnestly desired. Further, one must ask for such a gift humbly and with faith. I thank God for His kindness in granting me this gift when I had begun ministering evangelistically in 1980 or so. Reverently, I would note that I have had great joy in seeing Christ baptize those who were being converted and also those who had previously been converted as I have laid hands upon them and prayed for this blessing. Christ alone baptizes in the Holy Spirit (Mt. 3:11; Mk. 1:8; Lk. 3:16; Jn 1:33).

A further note concerning Simon and the baptism in the Holy Spirit with tongues speaking is found in Rea's commentary.

A clue in the Greek text that tongues indeed were in evidence at Samaria may be found in v. 21. In rebuking Simon for his wicked thought that he could obtain the gift of God with money, Peter exclaimed, "You have no part or portion in this matter, for your heart is not right before God" (*NASB*). The word for "matter" is Greek, *logos*, "Word," "speaking," or "kind of speaking" as in 1 Cor. 1:5 where Paul says the Corinthians were enriched "in all (manner of) utterance." Simon could have no part in this kind of speaking,... (Rea, 1972, 38)

F. TWO OR THREE WITNESSES

I believe that it is also important to note that with Philip apparently alone in Samaria, there was but a single witness there. An important principle of Scripture is expressed in this, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established" (Mat. 18:16b [*NKJV*]). (cf. Deut. 17:6;19:15; 2 Cor. 13:1; 1 Tim 5:19; Heb 10:28; 1 Cor. 14:27, 29). Jesus sent the twelve and the seventy (or seventy-two) out two by two (Mk. 6:7; Lk. 10:1). Barnabus and Saul (Acts 13:2), Paul and Silas (15:40), and Peter and John (8:14) were sent two by two. The issues of safety, power, and establishing of witness may be found in the word or work of two of three witnesses together (cf. Ecc. 4:9-12). I consider that the gospel was established in Samaria by the testimony of Philip, Peter, and John. (God the Father, Christ, the word of God and the Holy Spirit also may be considered Witnesses.) It is of interest to note that Paul, like Philip in Samaria, was alone without his partners in Athens (Acts 17; 1 Thes. 3:1). Paul was so stirred while in Athens that he reasoned with the Athenians from their own literature and preached. "'For in him we live and move and have our being.' As some of your own poets have said, 'We are his offspring.'" (Acts 17:28 [*NIV*]). There remain three possible sources to Paul's citation: Aeschylus⁷³ Cleanthes,⁷⁴ and Aratus.⁷⁵ This citation of Paul, whether we know the certainty of the references or not, is a testimony to the "witness" of the poets (plural) to which Paul refers. Concerning the rationale of this argument, I would note the words of Jesus, "'It is written in your law that the testimony of two men is true. I am One who bears witness of Myself, and the Father who sent Me bears witness of Me.'" (Jn. 8;17, 18 [*NKJV*]) This unusual testimony and Paul's both show

a great condescension, brilliance, majesty, and establishment of God's truth by two or three witnesses.

G. STOTT AND GRUDEM

Following Stott's careful discussion, Grudem, as above, states, "Because this is a special event in the history of redemption (the Samaritan Pentecost), as the pattern of Acts 1:8 is worked out in the book of Acts, it is not a pattern for us to repeat today. It is simply part of the transition between the old covenant experience of the Holy Spirit and the new covenant experience of the Holy Spirit." ⁷⁶ ("Charles Holman in critiquing this paper noted that this issue of the Samaritan Pentecost not being a pattern for us to repeat today, as Grudem writes following Stott, is something that "could be questioned." ⁷⁷) (I had questioned this vigorously, personally, but did not feel that I ought to bring this question to this paper. However, I do think it appropriate to mention Dr. Holman's note.) Stott does not see the Samaritan Pentecost as a precedent for today. ⁷⁸ Grudem states this and eliminates the Scriptural warrant for a second experience of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. This seems very perplexing and may preempt the baptism of the Holy Spirit by Christ or quench the Spirit. Though expressing this, I would note that I do not seek to condemn Stott and Grudem's writing, but to bring an acceptable, viable, and worthy alternative.

Philip did not have the gift or did not have the liberty to minister Spirit-baptism in Samaria. Peter and John did have the ministry of prayer and faith for Spirit-baptism and represent second and third witnesses to the gospel in Samaria. As I have shown, God's witness was needed for the Jerusalem leadership, but the apostle's was not. If Philip could have ministered Spirit-baptism or if Christ baptized the Samaritans in the Spirit without human agency it would have served equally well. (Note: Paul received the Spirit, we believe, when Ananias entered the room where he was praying [Acts 9:17]. He was thought to be an "enemy" to Ananias and to others [9:13], but God sent Ananias to him and, subsequently, Saul was with the disciples in Damascus [9:19]. These disciples did not need an apostle's witness, but

only the disciple, Ananias. The key was that Ananias was sent by Christ for this work. [9:17])

Let us imitate the gospel record in the Samaritan Pentecost and minister to those who have believed and been baptized in order that they may receive Spirit-baptism with the “initial physical evidence” of speaking in other tongues. Let Christian initiation include hearing the word of God, faith, repentance, confession of Jesus Christ as Lord believing that God has raised Him from the dead in conjunction with water baptism and, further, let Spirit-baptism with “the initial physical evidence” of speaking in tongues be ministered. Is this not Christian initiation?

I consider that it is somewhat likely that Philip could not minister Spirit-baptism at that time in his ministry. Further, I believe that the gospel was established in Samaria by Philip, Peter, and John. I do not consider Peter and John to have been sent to Samaria in order to convince the Jerusalem leadership of the Samaritans full inclusion in the body of Christ. I believe that God’s witness in giving the Samaritans the gift of the Holy Spirit was necessary and sufficient.

I believe that we may imitate the faith of Philip, Peter, and John in bringing Spirit-baptism as an experience subsequent to conversion to those who are willing to ask, today.

Williams writes, “Samaria was about a two days’ journey from Jerusalem. By the time word about the Samaritans’ faith had reached Jerusalem, and Peter and John had traveled to Samaria for ministry, at least four days, possibly even a week, would have elapsed. The exact numbered days, of course, is not important: clearly there was an intervening time, however.”⁷⁹ Further, he writes,

The Samaritan story likewise has numerous parallels with the contemporary scene. Many after coming to faith in Jesus Christ, have later had hands laid on them and have experienced the fullness of the Holy Spirit. As with the Samaritans, earnest prayer has often been the immediate background. Frequently, too, one person has been the evangelist

(like Philip) to bring people to a commitment to Christ, and others have been used by the Lord in ministering the Holy Spirit. Thus the two experiences have occurred over a period of time--from initial faith to the reception of the Holy Spirit. (Williams, RT2, 1990, 275)

Grudem explains the situation in Ephesus in Acts 19:1-7 in a paragraph as well.⁸⁰ He states, “these disciples at Ephesus are certainly not a pattern for us today either, for we do not first have faith in Messiah that we are waiting for, and then later learn that Jesus has come and lived and died and risen again. We come into an understanding of the gospel of Christ immediately, and we, like the Corinthians, enter immediately into the new covenant experience of the power of the Holy Spirit.”⁸¹

The passage reads as follows,

While Apollos was at Corinth, Paul passed through the upper country and came to Ephesus. There he found some disciples. 2 And he said to them, “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?” And they said, “No, we have never even heard that there is a Holy Spirit.” 3 And he said, “Into what then were you baptized?” They said, “Into John’s baptism.” 4 And Paul said, “John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus.” 5 On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. 6 And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied. 7 There were about twelve of them in all” (Acts 19:1-7 [RSV]).

The situation is as Grudem describes. The Ephesians did not have saving knowledge of Jesus Christ when Paul met them. However, it may be noted that the Ephesians were “disciples” who knew valid teaching in knowing John’s teaching, but that they had a lack of knowledge of the gospel of Christ. Grudem seems to note that the Ephesians did not have the essential Christian doctrine of salvation through Christ alone and, therefore, are not a pattern for us who have this essential doctrine. That is to note that he believes they are not a pattern to imitate in ministering a subsequent experience termed by traditional Pentecostals or charismatics “the baptism in the Holy Spirit”^{82 83}

H. MY VIEW CONCERNING SUBSEQUENCE

Surely, there is an aspect of subsequence in the case of the Ephesian disciples. They were baptized with a baptism of repentance (Mk. 1:4). The Christian conversion comes upon repentance and baptism (and other aspects of initiation). Grudem questions the legitimacy of imitating the Ephesian example in subsequence. It ought not be considered precisely the same as subsequence for a Christian convert.

I note that a general principle may be seen. Though the exact situation cannot be duplicated we may still imitate the Ephesian “disciples” in the following way. The Ephesian were “disciples,” but had a lack of knowledge. They received essential instruction from Paul, subsequently. If we, as those converted to Christ, have a lack of knowledge as concerns “the baptism in the Holy Spirit” we may follow the Ephesian example by asking for and receiving this blessed experience, even “the baptism in the Holy Spirit.” While Grudem would be willing to designate this a subsequent “infilling of the Holy Spirit,”⁸⁴ he would not term it the “baptism in the Holy Spirit.” The baptism in the Holy Spirit, he maintains, is known upon conversion.⁸⁵

As I have stated in accordance with Williams, Dunn, and Flower and the traditional Pentecostal understanding since the Azusa Street Revival in 1901, this baptism in the Holy Spirit is accompanied with “the initial physical evidence” of speaking in other tongues. As such, this occurs once in a Pentecostal /charismatic believer’s life as a beginning point.

(Similarly, those who have not been adequately instructed concerning water baptism may receive water baptism subsequent to receiving and confessing Christ as Lord through the faithful ministry of the local church. This water baptism, as is the “baptism in the Holy Spirit,” is a once for all event.)⁸⁶

Ervin writes with detailed grammatical study that the baptism in the Holy Spirit is “the baptism in/filling with the Holy Spirit.”⁸⁷ He does not support

any “refilling” of the believers, but testifies that the believers experience “One Baptism, One Filling”⁸⁸ and that Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 6:3, 5; 7:55; 11:24; 13:52; and Eph. 5:18 refer to this one baptism, one infilling or refer back to the one baptism, one infilling.

Grudem believes that “the baptism in the Holy Spirit”⁸⁹ occurs at conversion and that subsequent experiences might be called “being filled with the Holy Spirit.”⁹⁰ He also examines verses in Acts and Ephesians. He believes that there are repeated infillings of the Holy Spirit discussed in Acts 4:8; 6:3; 7:55; 11:55; and Eph. 5:18. He compares these repeated infillings to filling up a balloon with air. When the balloon has just a little air in it it is full, but when more air is put within the balloon it may be “more full.”⁹¹

To state my position, I would note that the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” ought to imply the initial baptism in and infilling with the Holy Spirit with “the initial physical evidence” of speaking in other tongues as in Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6 and, in all likelihood, 8:17-19. (Also, God intended Paul to receive the Holy Spirit [9:17] and the Pisidia Antioch disciples may have received the initial baptism in and infilling with the Holy Spirit [13:52]. Ervin holds that the Pisidia Antioch disciples may have received Spirit-baptism in his explanation of the iterative use of the imperfect tense of the word translated “were filled”.⁹²) Some passages speak of infilling with the Holy Spirit in which tongues speaking is not explicitly involved. Concerning these, some may imply an effusion of the Holy Spirit and speaking boldly on a special occasion. These include: Elizabeth (Luke 1:41), Zachariah (Luke 1:67), Peter (Acts 4:8), “friends” (*Phillip’s, RSV, NEB*)⁹³ (4:23, 31), Stephan, (7:55, 56), and Saul (13:9-11). All of these show God’s intention of witness and ministry associated with the infilling of the Holy Spirit (1:8). Every other expression of the fulness of the Holy Spirit seems to pertain to empowerment for ministry as well (and martyrdom in Stephen’s case) (Lk. 1:15; 4:1; Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55, 56; 11:24; Eph. 5:18-20).

ONE OUGHT TO RECEIVE THE BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT
INITIALLY, BE CONTINUALLY FILLED WITH THE SPIRIT

THEREAFTER (Eph. 5:18) AND EXPERIENCE SPECIAL OCCASIONS OF AN EFFUSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT; AN INCREASED FULLNESS, THOUGH NOT A REPEATED INFILLING, REBAPTIZING, OR REINFILLING.

Grudem's illustration of a balloon which may be "more full" through receiving more air in it showing that one may be filled and yet receive more fullness seems a very helpful one. Roger White spoke, similarly, of air pressure.⁹⁴

I. DISCUSSION

Wayne Grudem does not believe in a subsequent experience of the Holy Spirit. He believes that the conversion experience is that in which one is baptized in the Holy Spirit. I believe that there may be a second experience with the Holy Spirit which is rightly called "the baptism in the Holy Spirit." Grudem in following John Stott brings the theory that the apostles, Peter and John, were sent to Samaria in order to convince the Jerusalem leadership of the full inclusion of the Samaritans into the body of believers. Grudem states that this was important because of a historical animosity between Jews and Samaritans and because Jesus had commanded the word to be preached in Samaria (Acts 1:8).

This is possible. Stott and Grudem's thinking is highly developed. They are great gifts to the church. Still, I would note that they remind me of two surgeons who care deeply for their patient, the body (of Christ). They believe that the issue at stake is a heart issue; viz. how can Jews and Samaritans be reconciled in one body. As they perceive it to be a heart issue, they operate accordingly, ascribing the work of the apostles, Peter and John, to be a reconciling one.

This may have had a reconciling effect, but I think the actual need of the Samaritans and of the body of Christ today is to receive the baptism in the

Holy Spirit. He will bring the unity Himself (1 Cor. 12:13) for it is the “unity of the Spirit” (Eph. 4:3). (This is not to note that the Christian is not involved in the promoting of this unity.) The body had and has the deep need of an operation on the belly (*koila*) rather. The body has the deep need of receiving the promise of the Father. This gift is towards “one body” and is closely connected to this unity as we have seen. I offer an alternative view to Stott and Grudem as we shall see in this section.

In the writing, I hold that Philip (as Timothy, also) “progressed” in the gifts and graces of the Spirit. It is certainly astounding how Philip was “a vessel of honor, sanctified, useful to the Master, prepared for every good work.” (2 Tim. 2:21 [*NASB*]). One wonders that raising of the dead was not shown in Philip’s ministry in Samaria. But, perhaps this was not yet to be done by Philip.

It seems that God deals with men in seasons often times. Seasons of growth and development in gifts, graces, abilities, willingness to labor, and in many things can be a blessed easy yoke and light burden. I remember that Paul thanked God that he spoke in tongues more than all the Corinthians (1 Cor. 14:18). I should be a little embarrassed of my zeal, but I imitated Paul seeking to pray constantly in the Spirit. To God be glory that such an activity may broaden a person’s spirit to receive much more from God in the Spirit. May all grow in this grace, in all grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ!

I must note that I cannot testify unequivocally that Philip did not have faith or the gift to lay hands upon the Samaritans or the Ethiopian eunuch. Nevertheless, I set this forth as a possible explanation concerning Philip’s great, but not comprehensive ministry to these ones.

Consider creation, how God created the heavens and the earth in a way that progressed from the first day to the sixth. Consider the human body, how it grows and develops. Even though the body begins to grow old, the inner person, the person of character, continues to grow and develop and be renewed.

In the Spirit, we grow whether charismatic, Pentecostal, or non-charismatic. Yet, in the gifts or manifestations of the Spirit, the Spirit-baptized may grow in things miraculous in a way which others cannot. “Ho! Every one who thirsts, come to the waters’ and you who have no money come, buy and eat. Come, buy wine and milk without money and without cost” (Isa. 55:1 [NASB]). I pray that all who are charismatic may show gentleness, kindness, patience and love to the one whom God is calling to this astounding way of the Spirit.

I also discussed the issue of two or three witnesses being needed in Samaria. Christ showed that his words and his works were both witnesses to Him (Jn. 5:36) as well as His Father being a Witness to Him (8:18). He took three witnesses with Him on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt. 17:1, 2). He said that two of us might “agree on earth as touching any thing” that we may ask and it shall be done for us (Mt. 18:19[KJV]). His adversaries could not judge him for their witnesses did not agree (Mk. 14:59). In countless ways, two or three witnesses are shown to establish truth or to convict.

The fisherman hooked the steelhead and pulled it in. His companion took note of the catch. The fish was taken to the fisherman’s wife. She prepared it and fed the children. Meanwhile, the two companions were outside and it seemed an argument was erupting. The fisherman assured his friend that the fish was 20” long. The other man said that by no means was it so long. The wife said that it went from one end of the pan to the other and that the pan was 14”. The men considered for a moment and then looked at the wirehaired terrier. The dog had such a chagrined look on his face that the fisherman conceded. There had not been enough fish for the children and the dog. The wirehaired’s chagrined countenance was the third witness. People do respond when convinced by two or three witnesses.

Grudem’s following of Stott’s doctrine which we have discussed above proved to be a great sticking point for my writing. I went over these points of doctrine with prayer for many hours. Grudem is inspiring, compelling, scientific, and profound in his writing. Nevertheless, I have questioned

that which he seems clearly to pre-suppose. That is, that the traditional Pentecostal/charismatic doctrine concerning the baptism in the Holy Spirit to be wrong. I have not in this writing viewed Pentecostal/charismatic positions traditionally held to be necessarily mistaken or wrong. On the contrary, I have had the presupposition that much of what the Pentecostal/charismatic Christian has done has been right. The fruit of the Pentecostal/charismatic believers has proved to be good in tremendous ways, though not without problems. All churches are in process.

I cite writers such as J. Rodman Williams and Howard M. Ervin who write powerfully, with great skill and acuity about Pentecostal/charismatic theology. Still, I have admonished the Pentecostal/charismatic to fully accept the non-charismatic believer and have sought to make some determinations concerning the Holy Spirit and all believers which may be acceptable to both.

Oh, Lord, I have heard it said that Job asked “Why?” and received no answer. Job 1:1-2: shows the cosmic confrontation between God and Satan , but it doesn’t note why God should be moved against Job by evil in the first place. God did assure Job with many rebukes that He knew what He was doing, though Job did not know what He was doing (Job 38:1-42:17).

Stott and Grudem have sought to discover the “Why?” of sending the apostles. I, in my feeble way, have sought to discuss a possible alternative. I think both discussions have good fruit in view. Let the reader consider and find good fruit in his or her decision about this.

I have sought to show that the experience of receiving the Holy Spirit for the Samaritans was a subsequent experience. Rae and Williams write about this. I believe that this is an experience which we can imitate today, though Grudem does not.

I believe that, with some technical differences, the Ephesian disciples indicate a subsequent experience which can be imitated approximately.

I have ministered to a significant number of people, asking them to ask God for the Holy Spirit and the manifestation of the Holy Spirit of speaking in other tongues; “the initial physical evidence.” I have believed that it is honest to ask God for the gift of the Holy Spirit as though one had never received it in the past. However, I confess that the believer in Jesus Christ, (whether he has received the “baptism in the Holy Spirit” or not) does have the Holy Spirit in or with him as we shall discuss below. The “baptism in the Holy Spirit” is discussed throughout this writing and is much to be desired, but is not essential to Christian faith or to salvation. Receiving Christ and salvation in Him is essential to all who would make heaven their home. When one confesses Christ one has done so by the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 1:3).

I realize that there is much hard work involved in receiving this book. I pray that all who do read it will know times of refreshing and blessing through the Holy Spirit. Let Christ be the center of all of our religion and of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit whom He pours out to us!