

A STUDY OF BIBLICAL BASIS OF SPIRIT- BAPTISM AND SPIRIT-FULLNESS

A Critique on the Pentecostal Position and a Constructive Proposal

Herrick P. Liu

Introduction

In the search for spiritual renewal in contemporary Christianity, the doctrine of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness is of central importance. As stated by A.A. Hoekema, "the central doctrine of Neo-Pentecostalism is its teaching on the baptism in the Holy Spirit. So basic is this teaching to the Neo-Pentecostal movement that if you take this doctrine away from it, what you have left is no longer Neo-Pentecostalism" (Hoekema 1981, II: 10). This view is supported by many Pentecostal/Charismatic scholars, such as Ervin (1987, 2), Lederle (1988, xi), Hunter (1983, 2), Hocken (1992, vol 1, ch. O) and Stronstad (1984, 1). On the other hand, while insisting on the distinction between Spirit-Baptism and Spirit-Fullness, evangelicals also agree that the doctrine of Spirit-Fullness is most important for Christian spirituality (e.g., Walwood 1958, 189). In fact, it is offered like an evangelical alternative to the Pentecostal Spirit-Baptism (Dunn 1970, 54; Green 1992, 179ff; Grudem 1994, 763-787; Stott 1975,

47ff). In the Third Wave Movement, while the members support and participate in the charismatic ministries, they expect multiple Spirit-Fillings rather than Pentecostal Spirit-Baptism (Burgess, McGee & Alexander 1989, 844). The trend seems to go from Spirit-Baptism to Spirit-Fullness, despite the variety of interpretations of the latter term.

Many Pentecostal theologians, such as L. Steiner, W. Hollenweger, G. Fee, H. Lederle (Lederle 1988, 30-32; 227), indicate the need to redefine the essence of Pentecostalism and to search for a new theological category to interpret the charismatic experience. Lederle proposes the concept "the charismatic dimension of a normal Christian life"—experience and expectation of the empowerment of the Spirit in ordinary and extraordinary gifts—as a reinterpretation of Pentecostal Spirit-Baptism (Lederle 1988, 227; 229). In his study, he attempts to incorporate these distinctive elements of the Charismatic Movement into ecumenical Christianity (Lederle 1988: 215). In other words, he first presupposes the validity of those extraordinary charismatic experiences (Lederle 1988, 66) and then searches for a reinterpretation that is acceptable for all sections of Christianity. From an evangelical perspective, this is an approach starting from below, i.e., from experience.

In contrast, we attempt to approach from above, i.e., the Bible. Without any presupposition on the validity (or invalidity) of the Charismatic experiences, we study the biblical basis of Spirit-Baptism and Spirit-Fullness. In other words, our primary intention is not to evaluate the empirical validity of the Charismatic experiences, but rather to determine the appropriateness of interpreting certain ideal types of Spiritual experiences by these two biblical concepts. We contend that first, Spirit-Fullness is a more appropriate concept to interpret these experiences; second, while the Pentecostal/Charismatic understanding of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness is subject to further modifications, it does shed some light to help evangelicals to reconsider Luke's distinctive elements in the formulation of the doctrine of Spirit-Fullness. This will broaden the evangelicals' understanding of Spirit-Fullness as the goal of spiritual pursuit.

While recognizing there are some variations of interpretation on Spirit-Baptism or Spirit-Fullness within the Pentecostal/Charismatic circle, we choose the Neo-Pentecostal perspective presented by Lederle as the representative Pentecostal position (Lederle 1988, 55-57). Since

these two terms appears only in Lukan and Pauline writings in New Testament, these related passages become the core material in this study. It is hoped that this study is not only critical in nature, but also constructive that it may lead to a more biblical approach for spiritual pursuit.

Pentecostal Hermeneutics

As stated by Stronstad, the heart of the controversy on the doctrine of Holy Spirit between Pentecostalism and Evangelicalism is the fundamental issue of hermeneutics, especially the methodological difference in interpretation of Lukan writings (Stronstad 1984, 2). In short, Pentecostals affirm that the pattern of Charismatic manifestations in Acts is normative, and there is no essential difference between Spirit-Baptism and Spirit-Fullness (Horton 1994, 423ff). The arguments for this affirmation can be analyzed as follows:

Luke Had a Theological Purpose in His Historical Writings

Acts is a historical record, but it contains more than brute facts. Luke had a theological intent in his writings (Hunter 1984, 69; Stronstad 1992, 2). M. Hengel points out a close connection between Luke and Jewish intertestamental historians and concludes that Luke "did have a theological interest which was at the same time a historical one" (Stronstad 1984, 7). I. H. Marshall affirms the close relationship between Luke and Old Testament historians, and suggests that Luke "may even be held to have regarded his work as depicting the continuation of history recorded in Old Testament" (Marshall 1971, 56). He concludes, "Modern research has emphasized that he [Luke] was a theologian.... His view of theology led him to write history" (Marshall 1971, 52). In Stronstad's word, Luke's history is an "interpreted narration" (Stronstad 1984, 8).

Luke Intended to Set Theological Norms from Historical Precedent

In addition, Pentecostals argue for the biblical precedent as based on historical precedent (Stronstad 1984, 1). First, Paul cited the Exodus history for instructive purposes in 1 Cor 10. His view of history reflected the Jewish understanding of Old Testament historiography. In 1 Cor 10: 11 he stated that "these things happened to them as examples and were written down as warnings for us, on whom the fulfillment of the ages has come."

Second, Luke, as Paul's close co-worker, also expressed the same view of history in his writings. In Lk 4:16ff, Jesus used a historical precedent to justify His action; namely, leaving His townsmen to minister to others. In Lk 6:1-11, Jesus used another historical precedent to defend His disciples against the charge of violating the Sabbath day. So standing on the same Jewish understanding of historiography, Luke knew well that his historical writings would have the same value.

Furthermore, Stronstad argues against the applicability of Longenecker's position to the interpretation of Acts (Stronstad 1984, 1). Longenecker proposes that NT exegesis of the OT is unique and not normative for our exegesis of OT because of its revelatory character. However, Pentecostals claim that when they appeal to historical precedents in Acts, they are not interpreting OT after the way of NT authors. Rather, as Christians they are "interpreting certain texts about Christian experiences by reproducing practices by which the early church itself on occasion established theological norms" (Stronstad 1992, 16). Stronstad provides an example of these practices from Acts 15 that "the historical precedent of Peter's prior ministry to Gentiles establishes the norm that Gentiles can be saved apart from the necessity of being circumcised according to the custom of Moses" (Stronstad 1992, 14). In other words, since the early church used historical precedents to establish theological norms, today Christians can use historical precedents in Acts to establish theological norms (Stronstad 1992, 15).

Luke's Theology Has Independent Value

Pentecostals not only argue for the theological character of Lukan writings, but they argue further for its independence (Stronstad 1984, 9; Hunter 1983, 68). While evangelicals put more emphasis on the narrative character of Luke, they tend to use Pauline didactic passages to override Lukan writings in formulating the doctrine of Holy Spirit (e.g. Ladd 1991, 347; Guthrie 1981, 535). In response to J. Stott's statement, Stronstad makes clear that Luke's didactic purpose is apparent within itself and it does not need interpretive help from elsewhere in Scripture (Stronstad 1992, 3). So even if Luke's perspective is charismatic and thus different from Paul's, his writings are still a legitimate database for formulating the doctrine of Holy Spirit (Stronstad 1984, 11). Recognizing the fact that Luke has the majority use of both terms, "Spirit-Baptism" (3x in Luke: 1x in Paul) and "Spirit-Filling" (9x in Luke: 1x in Paul),

Pentecostals seek to elevate his role in formulating the doctrine over against the traditional evangelical position. They hold that the charismatic emphasis of Lukan writings cannot be explained away by the ethical emphasis in Pauline passages.

Built upon the above arguments, the Pentecostals conclude that Acts, especially the five key passages (2:1-13; 8:14-19; 9:17-18; 10:44-46; 19:1-7), becomes the biblical precedent of Spirit-Baptism. "The events that occurred on the day of Pentecost are held to be the pattern for centuries to come," and "what was true at the Day of Pentecost, and on subsequent occasions in Scripture, must continue to be true throughout the ages" (Stronstad 1984, 5).

Luke Emphasized a Theological Continuity between Early Church and Our Age

While recognizing various aspects of the Spirit's ministry in believers, Pentecostals stress that the primary nature of the Lukan Pentecost is empowerment for ministry rather than sanctification (Menzies & Horton 1993, 123; Ervin 1987, 24-25; Stronstad 1984, 62).

First, Luke wrote that Jesus promised the Pentecostal Spirit in terms of His empowerment (Lk 24:29; Ac 1:5, 8). Second, Luke, through Peter's speech, interpreted the meaning of Pentecost in terms of Joel rather than Isaiah and Ezekiel. While the latter emphasized the inward renewal of the Spirit on an individual and national level (Isa 63:7f; Eze 37:1-14), Joel promised charismatic and prophetic manifestations for the last days (Stronstad 1988, 56-57). The Lukan use of Joel indicates that Luke's understanding of the Pentecost event was a continuation of the charismatic empowerment theology of both OT prophets and Lukan Jesus. In the new age, the believers would enjoy an anointing even more intensive than the disciples' during the earthly ministry of Jesus (Arrington 1988, 7). Third, this coming of the Spirit is for all believers. In Ac 1:8, Jesus promised this empowerment of Spirit for witness to the end of the earth until its completion. In Ac 2:39 Peter announced that this promise was made to all believers anywhere and in every generation. Lastly, Ervin points out that Luke used the term "gift of the Holy Spirit" in Ac 2:38 to describe the repeated charismatic event in Samaria (Ac 8:20) and in the house of Cornelius (Ac 10:45; 11:17). It thus indicates the same nature of empowerment experiences. So the Pentecostal empowerment is not a

once-and-for-all event in the church history, but a realization of the promise which is still in effect for the successive generations (Ervin 1984, 27).

In sum, for Pentecostals, the nature of the Pentecost is basically the empowerment for ministry. It was the beginning of the fulfillment of Jesus' promise based on His own charismatic ministry, as well as on Joel's prophecy which was anchored in the charismatic ministry of the OT prophets. It is the normative characteristics of the last days rather than just of the beginning phrase of the last days.

Comment on Pentecostal Hermeneutics

Basically, evangelicals find no problem in accepting that the historical writings of Luke had a didactic purpose. Different commentaries proposed different theological themes. In fact the controversial issue here is particularly related to the doctrine of Holy Spirit and the narrative nature of Lukan writings—*did Luke intend to present some patterns in his descriptive passages, specifically the five key episodes of Spirit-Baptism, to establish some normative teachings on the work of Holy Spirit?* Some evangelical scholars seem to give a rather negative response to this question. D. Guthrie states that "the theological exposition of the doctrine of the spirit did not fit into Luke's purpose in Acts, but comes to fuller expression in the epistles (Guthrie 1981, 548; similar views see also Ladd 1981, 347; Walwood & Zuck 1983, 409). However, as clarified by J. Stott, this does not imply that there is no normative teaching about the Spirit in Lukan writings. Rather the evangelicals' concern is the issue of narrative interpretation. The narrative portion usually contains few clues for self-interpreting, thus making it difficult to establish normative teaching on its own. Interpretive helps from didactic portions outside the narrative portion, such as sermons and teaching *within* Lukan writings, are crucial for the task (Stott 1990, 11-12; Stott 1975, 15). So the evangelical position is that normative teaching can hardly be found in the narrative portion of Lukan writings *alone*; and it is not a total denial of any normative teaching in *Lukan writings as a whole* (contra Horton's understanding, cf. Horton 1994, 233-237).

However, this position still has some conflicts with the Pentecostal assertion of the pattern value in interpretation of Lukan writings.

Patterns in Lukan Writings

As mentioned above in section 2, Pentecostals take the five key passages (2:1-13; 8:14-19; 9:17-18; 10:44-46; 19:1-7) as patterns of Spirit-Baptism for the church. However, if we examine these passages, we will wonder if there is really any *intended* descriptive pattern in them.

Fig. 1. Lukan descriptions in the five key passages in Acts

Relationship with the coming of spirit (CHS)	Day of Pentecost (2:1-13)	Samaria (8:14-19)	Paul (9:17-18)	Cornelius (10:44-46)	John the Baptist's disciples (19:1-7)
1. precondition for CHS	Waiting (prayer)	No (at conversion)	No (at conversion)	No (at conversion)	No (at conversion)
2. supernatural event beforehand	Jesus' promise and ascension	No	Paul's encounter with Christ, Ananias' vision	Peter's vision	No
3. preaching	after CHS	before CHS	No	CHS during preaching	before CHS
4. water baptism	not mentioned	days before CHS	after CHS	after CHS	during/immediately after CHS
5. laying on hands	No	Yes (with a special prayer beforehand)	Yes	No	Yes
6. supernatural scenario during CHS	sound & supernatural phenomenon of fire	No	No	No	No
7. initial evidence	Xenolalia & praise	(?)	No mention	Xenolalia & praise	tongues (Xenolalia?) & prophecies
8. empowerment for ministry	boldness to witness	No	boldness in witness	No	No

From Figure 1 it is not difficult to understand why some scholars ironically state that "the pattern of Acts is that it has no pattern" (Lederle 1988, 25). Luke *did not intend* to present any consistent pattern of theological relationship between the coming of the Spirit and its preconditions, means, manifestations or even consequences. The details of each event did not correspond. For preconditions, active waiting in community prayer was the case for the day of Pentecost, but in other cases the Spirit was an unexpected gift. The coming of Spirit could happen before, during or after the preaching or water baptism. Laying on hands was not necessary in cases of Pentecost and Cornelius. The supernatural phenomenon of sound and fire in Pentecost did not repeat again anywhere. Only the Apostles and Paul, after receiving the Spirit, were empowered to witness in boldness, but not in other cases. There are no apparently corresponding elements in Luke's presentation of these five cases. We conclude that Luke had *no intention here to present any consistent pattern* in order to establish normative teaching about the coming of the Spirit.

As mentioned above in section 2.2, R. Stronstad makes a case to argue for the biblical precedents of historical precedents (= patterns). Here again the key issue is about hermeneutics: whether Luke really used historical narratives *on its own* to establish normative teachings?

First, in Paul's case (1 Cor 10:1-13), Paul cited five episodes of Israelite experience in the wilderness which "were written down for our instruction" (1 Cor 1:11). Yet when we examine these OT passages we find that the five episodes are composed of narrative (descriptive) as well as didactic (interpretive) elements (e.g. speeches, sermons). Paul did not indicate that the narrative portions alone could be self-interpreted. How did Paul know the normative teaching about God's judgment? The answer lies within the didactic (explicative) portion of these episodes such as speeches by God or certain roles. The first incident is in Num 11:4-34 and the issue is about waiting and rejecting the Lord, indicated in Num 11:18-20, rather than anything wrong about eating meat itself! The second incident (Ex 32:1-6) is about turning away from the first Commandment by idolatry, Ex 32:7-8. The third incident (Num 25:1-2) is about sexual immorality that leads to idolatry, as explained in Num 25:5. The fourth incident (Num 21:4-6) and fifth incident (Num 16:41-49) are explained respectively in Num 21:7 and 16:28-30, 40. Hence, Paul's citation of historical precedents does not imply a conviction of

the self-interpretation power of the narratives. The episodes are self-explanatory because of the didactic elements in those speeches.

Second, in Jesus' cases, Jesus seemed to use historical precedents to justify His or His disciples' actions (Lk 4:16ff; 6:1ff). Here again we do not find that Jesus established norms from these precedents. Jesus did not henceforth regularly turn to gentiles because of constant Jewish opposition; or in the second case, His followers were not taught to regularly eat the show-bread or to pluck grain on the Sabbath day to show that the Sabbath was made for man. Rather, as stated by G. Fee, the precedent illustrates an assumed principle with regard to the precedents and the related principle had a source outside the illustration (Fee 1991, 95). In the first case, possible sources of the principle might be Gen 12:1-4, Isa 2:1-4 or Isa 61:5-6, indicating that gentiles were not totally excluded from God's blessings. In the second case, one possible source was Mt 12:7 (citing Hos 6:6), indicating that mercy was more holy than external formality (cf. Deu 23:25). Of course, as the ultimate revelation from God, Jesus possessed the total authority to re-interpret the OT passages. The precedents were used as illustrations rather than as a basis to deduce norms.

Lastly, the argument that the early church used historical precedents to establish theological norms is also not convincing. Of the four prohibitions which were decided in the Jerusalem council (Ac 15:29), at least one (probably three except the one about sexual immorality), namely abstaining from food sacrificed to idols, is evidently not to be taken as normative in later Church history (1 Cor 10:25 and Col 2:16). Rather, the church decision was incidental according to their progressive understanding of God's revelation and their progress in evangelism. Furthermore, the church's decision to accept gentiles without circumcision into the believing community was not purely a deduction from Peter's experience. Rather, Peter's experience (Ac 15:14) is an illustration to confirm the biblical teaching that gentile salvation apart from the Law does not contradict the OT prophets (Ac 15:15-18) (Walwood & Zuck 1988, 394). In addition, we should remember that the early church was clear that the salvation came not from the Law but from faith and grace (Ac 2:38; Ac 15:1). The church's decision was an application of this truth to gentiles after they had confirmed God's gracious work in them through Peter's, Paul's, and Barnaba's experiences. Again, it is not a formulation of norms from historical precedents alone.

Finally, it is invalid to assume that there is a precedent value in every descriptive portion of Lukan writing. In Acts 21:4-5 and 21:10-15 Luke mentioned two cases in which Paul acted against the two warnings, clearly came from the Holy Spirit (Ac 21:4b; 21:11c), about the danger of returning to Jerusalem. Luke did not bother to give the explanation. What we can conclude is that Luke's purpose here was not for setting precedents. Most likely, he just gave an episode which was a necessary part of the grand story plot (cf. Fee 1991, 91).

Therefore we can conclude that, first, there is no biblical precedent that historical precedent alone can establish norms; second, Luke did not take purely narrative portions as self-explanatory and he *did not intend* to set norms from them without interpretive clues from other didactic portions. This conclusion implies that even if we, by inference under certain assumptions, find some common elements (e.g. separability of Spirit-Baptism and regeneration, or tongue-speaking as a concurrent manifestation of Spirit-Baptism) in the five key passages, we still *have to rely on didactic portions* to establish a theological norm. Common elements in descriptive passages might just reflect some historical-cultural coincidences. All believers wore sandals when the Spirit came in Pentecost, but this does not necessarily imply any norms!

Lastly, rejection of the pattern value of the precedents does not imply that they are not valid *examples* of the embodiment of certain norms within a particular culture and time, which is of great value for reference in our Christian life. Foot-Washing (Jn 13) is a good example. Yet we cannot ascertain what the exact lesson is (brotherly love? humility? service?) until we can confirm it in certain didactic passage (e.g. Jn 13: 34-35).

These hermeneutical conclusions guide the exposition of biblical passages in this paper.

The Significance of Pentecost

As mentioned above in 2.4, Pentecostals also use didactic materials (e.g. promises and speeches) in Lukan writings to interpret the significance of Pentecost and related comings of the Spirit. The day of Pentecost was basically a fulfillment of God's promise of empowerment for ministry and it would occur repeatedly in this new Messianic age.

The issue here was: *did Luke interpret Pentecost as a new age of Spirit-empowerment, or as a new age of Holy Spirit in all aspects of His ministry?*

As stated by F. F. Bruce, "Luke is a biblical theologian" (Bruce 1990, 63). His understanding of what happened in Luke-Acts can be summed up in the term "salvation history." It was the fulfillment of God's self-revelation recorded in the Hebrew Scriptures. God revealed His salvation through His covenant with Abraham (Ac 3:25; Lk 1:55); it was further displayed through Davidic Kingship (Ac 13:22) and all the prophets (Ac 10:43; Lk 1:69-70) since Moses (Ac 3:22-24). The angel's citation of Malachi prophecy (Lk 1:16-17), Zechariah's prophecy (Lk 1:69-70) and Jesus' citation of Isa 61:1-2a (Lk 4:18-19) all constituted the Lukan understanding of the new Messianic age. In other words, the Lukan understanding of significance of Jesus' life and the Pentecost was anchored in the whole prophetic tradition in OT rather than just in "charismatic theology of OT" (contra Stronstad 1984, 75f).

One aspect of Lukan understanding of the Pentecost was from the prophecy of John the Baptist (Lk 3:16-17; cf. Ac 11:16)—"He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ, Lk 3:16). First, the ἐν embraced both elements. There were not two baptisms by Jesus, but one in Spirit-and-fire (Dunn 1970, 11). Second, the term "fire" in v.17 refers to judgment, which is parallel with John the Baptist's usage of it in his preaching (Lk 3:9; Mt 3:7). So this baptism could not be solely gracious. It was one purgative act of Messianic judgment which meant destruction for the unrepentant, and purification and blessing for the repentant. In other words, it was not primarily for empowerment. The Pentecost inaugurated the age of the Holy Spirit who applies the salvation and sharply differentiates between the repentant and unrepentant. Empowerment is just one aspect of the total blessing for the repentant who is initiated into the new age by the Spirit.

Lk 24:49 and Ac 1:5, 8 are often cited by Pentecostals to support the empowerment nature of the Pentecost. However, the context of the new Messianic age for these verses cannot be undermined. First, the Holy Spirit was "what my Father promised (ἡ ἐπαγγελία, Ac 1:4; 2:33, 38f)." This word was used by Luke to describe the covenant promise of God to His people (Ac 2:39; 7:17; 13:22, 32; 26:6). The promise was

identified with the gift of the Spirit in Ac 2:38-39. In other words, the coming of the Spirit in Pentecost was the new covenant fulfillment of an ancient covenant promise. The Spirit is the means whereby people henceforth enter into a new covenant (Dunn 1970, 47). The theme of fulfillment in Lk 24:44 and the theme of the kingdom of God in Ac 1:3 support this perspective. So the nature of Pentecost is *the commencement of the total new covenant ministry of the Holy Spirit*, mentioned in Eze 36:27 and Jer 37:33. This is the framework for us to understand the empowerment emphasized in Lk 24:49 and Ac 1:5, 8.

Two factors can help us understand Luke's emphasis on the empowerment aspect of the Spirit. First, the disciples were already regenerated (Lk 10:20); and second, the overall theme in Lukan writings is mission (Fee 1991, 91; Marshall 1981, 25). For Luke, the Spirit was the crucial factor for the expansion of the early church. The purification and renewal ministry of the Spirit to the end of the earth was fulfilled, at least partially, through His empowerment of the early church, which herself was a community purified and renewed by Him. Empowerment was only regarded as one aspect of the total ministry of the Holy Spirit in the new age. In other words, in Lukan theology, regeneration is the Spirit's purification *in* the church and empowerment is the Spirit's purification in the world *through* the church.

For the same reason, Lukan citation of Joel's prophecy (Ac 2:16-21) did not indicate that his understanding of Pentecost was limited to the empowerment aspect (contra Stronstad 1984, 50-52). First, Peter used "this," the phenomenon that his hearers witnessed was "what was spoken by the prophet Joel," indicating the fulfillment theme. Peter changed Joel's "afterwards" to "in the last days" to emphasize that with the Spirit's coming, the last days have come. The term "the last days" belongs to the *common* prophetic tradition (e.g. Isa 2:2-4; Hos 3:5) with regard to the end-time of the Messianic era (Ladd 1991, 344). However, Peter separated the last days from "the Day of the Lord" (Ac 2:20) and placed them in history. In other words, the Day of the Lord remains an object of hope, but the last days of the Messianic salvation have been realized. It is noteworthy that Peter understood the outpouring of Holy Spirit at Pentecost as a final act of Jesus after His death, resurrection and exaltation before His second coming (Ac 2:33). In this sense the Pentecost event is historical, once-for-all and thus not repetitive (Stott 1990, 60). Second, Joel's prophecy, in contrast with Isaiah and Ezekiel, emphasizes the

prophetic gifts of prophecy, visions and dreams as the evidence of the new age of Holy Spirit (Walwood & Zuck 1988, 1420). It is also noteworthy that the revival of these gifts was symbolically fulfilled in the Xenolalia phenomenon (Ac 2:4), a necessary communicative ability to reach all nations. Xenolalia is thus only symbolic of all aspects of empowerment that are needed for the universal prophetic ministry (cf. Ac 1:8). Recognizing the repetitive occurrence of visions (Ac 9:10, 12; 10:3, 17, 19; 11:5; 12:9; 16:9; 18:9; 26:19), prophecy (Ac 19:6; 21:9), miracles (Ac 2:43; 4:16, 30; 5:12; 6:8; 8:6, 13; 14:13; 15:12; 19:11), and other more "natural" means of empowerment (e.g., obedience 2:42; unity 2:45, 4:32; sacrifice 2:45, 4:34; boldness in witness 4:8f, 31) with their important roles in the realization of the great commission, we suggest that the tongue-speaking at Pentecost, was thus *not only* a once-for-all evidence for coming of the new age, but also a starting point of the revival of spiritual gifts and empowerment for the universal prophetic ministry (Ac 1:8). Furthermore, the consequences of this empowered ministry are described as deep conviction of sin (Ac 2:37), mass conversions (Ac 2:41) and widespread sense of awe, joy, fellowship and worship (Ac 2:43)—all were "normative" signs of the promised new age mentioned in books of Ezekiel (36:27) and Jeremiah's (31:33). In this sense, the empowerment and revivals are repetitive and normative (cf. Stott 1990, 61; Dunn 1870, 53; Lederle 1988, 72).

Therefore we conclude that, firstly, Luke's understanding of the Pentecost is the coming of the Holy Spirit in His *total* ministry as promised in *all* OT prophets; secondly, the theme of mission leads him to put more emphasis on the Spirit's empowerment aspect; thirdly, Pentecost was a final act of Jesus' earthly ministry after exaltation and it is historical and once-for-all. However, the effect of the Pentecost event, the new covenant ministry of the spirit including the empowerment aspect in its various modes, is repetitive until the completion of the great commission.¹

¹ The question whether miracles were restricted to the Apostles was out of the scope of this paper. For a most recent position of affirmation of miracles in modern world by an evangelical theologian, please refer to Grudem 1994, 361ff.

The Nature of Spirit-Baptism

The Pentecostal Position

As argued above, the spirit empowerment is repetitive in nature. Pentecostals interpret this experience as Spirit-Baptism. According to the Assemblies of God,

All believers are entitled to and should ardently expect and earnestly seek the promise of the Father, the baptism in the Holy Ghost and fire, according to the command of our Lord Jesus Christ. This was the normal experience of all in the early Christian Church. With it comes the endowment of power for life and service, the bestowment of the gifts and their uses in the work of the ministry (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4, 8; I Corinthians 12:1-3). This experience is distinct from and subsequent to the experience of the new birth (Acts 8:12-17; 10:44-46; 11:14-16; 15:7-9). (Article 7, "Statement of Fundamental Truths")

In other words, while recognizing the indwelling of the Spirit in every Christian, Pentecostals generally insist that Spirit-Baptism is a subsequent experience after regeneration. It is not necessarily a chronologically separate experience (Cornelius' case in Ac 10:44); rather it is a logical subsequence, i.e., that even it occurs at the same moment of conversion-initiation, salvation (conversion and regeneration) precedes Spirit-Baptism (Burgess, McGee & Alexander 1988, 43; Horton 1994, 433). In Wyckoff's terminology, this refers to separability (the dissimilarity in nature or identity) and distinctiveness (being discrete in character and purpose) (Horton 1988, 431). The significance of this doctrine is to affirm that one may be saved but not yet have received the gift of Spirit-Baptism. Believers are thus encouraged to attend to the conditions for the reception of the Spirit-Baptism and seek for it (Burgess, McGee & Alexander 1988, 47-48).

Again the major support of this doctrine comes from the five key passages in Acts (Horton 1988, 428; Burgess, McGee & Alexander 1988, 42-43). The 120 at the Pentecost were believers (Lk 10:20; Jn 15:3; 17:14; 20:22) before the coming of the Spirit. The Samaritans came to faith and were baptized before they received the Spirit through the Apostles. Paul had converted to Christ on the Damascus road and received the Spirit three days later. The Ephesian "disciples" had either received salvation before Paul arrived, or at least regenerated immediately before the coming of the Spirit. The most difficult case of Cornelius, in whom the Spirit-Baptism and conversion-initiation occurred at the same

moment, did not rule out the Pentecostal position of logical subsequence and separability.

Therefore, Pentecostals conclude that Spirit-Baptism "is clearly [chronologically] subsequent in three cases [Pentecost, Samaria, and Paul] and logically separable in the remaining two cases [Cornelius and the Ephesians]" (Horton 1994, 430).

Comment on the Pentecostal Position

As discussed above, Luke did not intend to present any apparently consistent pattern of the coming of the Spirit. The exceptional case of Cornelius again confirmed this observation. Hence, what the Pentecostal can assert is that there are *some* incidents in Acts, rather than a consistent pattern, indicating that it is possible to have a time gap between one's salvation and one's Spirit-Baptism. *The issue is whether these cases imply a necessary doctrine of separability and distinctiveness.*

This paper argues that while Spirit-Baptism may be a separate and distinct element in the order of salvation,² it is normative for it to occur at conversion-initiation. The so-called time gap in some cases only indicates a prolonged conversion-initiation experience. The only exceptional case of Samaria is to be explained on theological grounds.

1. Spirit-Baptism is not Spirit-Filling

In the five key passages, Luke used seven different verb-phrases to describe the same coming of the Spirit (Dunn 1970, 70).³

Figure 2. Lukan phrases describing the coming of the Spirit

- a) "to baptize with" βαπτίζεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ 1:5; 11:16
- b) "to come on" (ἐπ) ἔρχεσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον 1:8; 19:6
- c) "to pour out" ἐκχέειν ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος 2:17,18, 33; 10:45
(ἐκκέχυται)
- d) "to receive" λαμβάνειν πνεῦμα ἅγιον 2:38; 8:15, 17, 19; 10:47; 19:2

² Whether it is a distinct element in the "order of salvation" or not, please see Hunter 1979, 302-325 and Grudem 1994, 773, n.21.

³ Most of the statistics in this section come from Dunn 1970, 70-72.

- e) "to give" δίδοναι πνεῦμα ἅγιον 5:32; 8:18 (δίδοσθαι); 11:17; 15:8
 f) "to come upon" ἐπιπίπτειν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον 8:16; 10:44; 11:15
 g) "to fill with" πλησθῆναι πνεύματος ἁγίου 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9, 52 (ἐπληροῦντο)

Figure 3. Usage of the seven phrases in the five key passages in Acts

	Pentecost	Samaria	Paul	Cornelius	Ephesus
a) to baptize with	1:5			11:16	
b) to come on	1:8				19:6
c) to pour out	2:17			10:45	
d) to receive	10:47	8:15		10:47	19:2
e) to give	11:17	8:18		11:17	
f) to come upon	11:15	8:16		11:15/10:44	
g) to fill with	2:4		9:17		

From the two figures above we observe that Luke used all seven phrases for Pentecost, three for Samaria, one for Paul, five for Cornelius and two for Ephesus. The referent behind these phrases is always the same event of the initial coming of the Holy Spirit, and these phrases represent Luke's different ways of describing this powerful phenomenon (Dunn 1970,70).

However, among these seven phrases, the nature of the referent behind the last phrase ("to fill with") is distinct from the others in that it is the only one that is used of the same individual more than once. In Ac 4:31, "all" those of the community which were filled with the Holy Spirit after praying had to include Peter and John, who had previous experience of Spirit-Filling in the Pentecost. In addition, Dunn notes that in the formula "filling with the Holy Spirit" (πλησθεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου εἶπεν), when "filling" (πλησθεῖς) as an aorist participle was used with "said" (εἶπεν), it always denotes an action which takes place "immediately prior to or which leads into" the act of saying (e.g. Ac 1:15, 3:4; 5:19; 6:2; 9:17, 40 etc.; Dunn 1970, 71). So in Ac 4:8 Peter was filled with Holy Spirit again suddenly. This in fact fulfilled Jesus' promise for Spirit empowerment in special occasions (Lk 12:11). Thus this special empowerment will not last beyond the hour of need and is repetitive (contra Ervin 1990, 35). As all the other six phrases were never used to

refer to a repeated experience in Acts, we conclude that conceptually speaking, Spirit-Filling is different from Spirit-Baptism. Although they can happen together in two cases (Ac 2:4; 9:17), they are of different character. Spirit-Filling (Ac 4:31) is an event Christians can pray for its reoccurrence, but Spirit-Baptism is non-repetitive.

2. Spirit-Baptism is unconditional

In Luke's description, except for the Pentecost, the recipients in the other four cases apparently did not expect His powerful coming upon themselves. They were completely passive until someone came and enabled the Spirit-Baptism. Paul was the only one engaged in prayer, but probably a kind of rehabilitation after the shocking Damascus road experience. Luke did not present him in high expectation of the coming of such a wonderful gift from God. For the Pentecost event, the 120 were an exceptional group that actively waited for the coming of the Spirit. They were in the special transitional moment. They were regenerated but were foretold by Jesus to wait for this historical moment. So there is no ground in Lukan writings to support the view that Christian should actively seek for Spirit-Baptism, neither are there certain conditions to have this experience.

3. Spirit-Baptism is bound to conversion-initiation

Luke's didactic passages clearly indicate that Spirit-Baptism is rather a gift for Christian conversion-initiation than a subsequent blessing after earnest prayer. In Ac 2:38, Peter clearly stated that "Repent... and you will receive the gift of Holy Spirit" (μετανοήσατε... ὑμῶν καὶ λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος). "The gift of the Holy Spirit" refers to Spirit-Baptism in Samaria and Cornelius' case (Ac 8:20; 10:45; 11:17; cf. verb form δίδοναι in 5:32; 8:18; 11:17; 15:8). The verb "receive" (λαμβάνω) referred to the Spirit-Baptism in Pentecost (Ac 2:38), in Samaria (8:15, 17, 19), in Cornelius' case (10:47), and in Ephesus (19:2). Its future tense is a gnomic future indicating a timeless truth. So for Luke, the norm is to receive Spirit-Baptism when one repents (see also Ac 5:32 "the Holy Spirit whom God has given to those who obey Him").

Moreover, Luke's narratives of the five key cases confirm his own theology of Spirit-Baptism. As Luke mentioned nothing of an earlier coming of the Spirit, all the recipients—the 120 and the new converts in

the other four cases—apparently received their first experience of the Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, while the Samaritan case is the only exception that required a theological explanation, all the other three post-Pentecost cases indicate that the Spirit-Baptism occurs at the conversion-initiation event.

In Paul's case, the issue is whether his conversion was a process that lasted for three days, or occurred instantly in the Damascus road experience. First, in Luke's description, he was totally passive in the whole incident. From a literary point of view, the shock effect of the dramatic experience was not resolved until the reception of the Holy Spirit (Ac 9:3-18). In other words, for Paul, the whole incident with its aftershocks that led to his conversion of faith did not complete until three days later. His blindness, his neither eating nor drinking during the next three days clearly indicate his psychologically, theologically, as well as spiritually chaotic state (9:9). This transitional state was not completed until the reception of the Spirit (9:17 "see again"; 9:18 "eat again"). If saving knowledge, agreement and decision to trust Christ personally are three essential components in a conversion (Grudem 1994, 709-713), Paul was not ready psychologically, theologically, and spiritually to convert until then. If we agree that it is the Damascus road incident that leads to Paul's conversion, we must allow that the three days were necessary for Paul to integrate its total meaning and to effect the ultimate conversion (cf. Dunn 1971, 76). Since conversion is basically a subjective decision and response, there is no such description throughout the passage that can hint that the decision was made before the Spirit-Baptism. When Paul responded with "Lord" he did not even know who the Lord was (9:5). Ananias' addressing "brother" to Paul (9:17) was probably a hailing to one's fellow Jew (see 13:38). If it is the case, Ananias' addressing as a Jewish casual greeting should not be taken as an expression of a well thought theological assessment of Paul's salvation status. Moreover, we know well that Ananias was sure in God's will Paul would become a Christian in a short moment! So we conclude that Paul's conversion was a process lasting for three days. The conversion was completed simultaneously with the Spirit-Baptism.

In the Ephesians' case, the spiritual status of the "disciples" cannot be determined from a testing question with tentative assumptions (Ac 19:2), but by Paul's final appeal to them "to believe in the one coming

after him (John the Baptist), that is, in Jesus" (εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτὸν ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Ac 19:4b). F.F. Bruce notes that when ἵνα is joined immediately to the verb instead of coming at the beginning of the clause, it "throws εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτὸν into prominence, thus stressing the preparatory character of John's ministry" (Bruce 1990, 407). In other words, the "disciples" were not sure who was the coming one and Paul convinced them that it was Jesus ("that is, in Jesus"). These disciples were John's disciples and converted to Christ only after hearing Paul's message. Moreover, J. Dunn supplies additional linguistic data that Luke used only μαθηταί here (19:1) rather than οἱ μαθηταί, which is confined to reference to Christian communities. This loose term may reflect Luke's awareness of their imperfect spiritual status (Dunn 1970, 85). Lastly, the laying on of hands in Ac 19:6 did not indicate a separate moment other than the baptism ceremony, as this was the ultimate goal Paul's whole ministry to them (19:2). If we do not insist to conjecture too much on the scientific timing issue from a literary presentation, we can at least conclude that in Paul's case, *the Spirit-Baptism occurred within the conversion-initiation event.*

The Samaritan case is the only exception that for special historical reasons, God allowed the separation between the conversion with the Spirit-Baptism (Stott 1990, 151ff; Green 1975, 168; Fee 1991, 110; contra Dunn 1970, 55ff). First, Luke did not even hint about the inadequacy of Samaritans' faith. The descriptions about their faith (πιστεύω + dative) are typically Lukan language for Christian conversion (16:34; 18:8) (Marshall 1980, 156; see also 8:14 "Samaria had accepted the word of God"). Second, Philip approved their faith by granting the baptism. Nothing in Lukan passage suggests his inadequacy as an evangelist. Third, it was not that the apostles thought the Samaritan's faith was defective that they immediately prayed for their Spirit-Baptism (Stott 1990, 155). Fourth, all of the Lukan descriptions of this coming of Holy Spirit ("receive" v. 15, v. 17; "come upon" v. 16; "give" v. 18, v. 20) point to the first reception of the Spirit (see discussion above; cf. Ac 2:38). There is a real time gap between their conversion and Spirit-Baptism.

Several reasons are suggested for the necessity of this exceptional arrangement of God. The background was that the Jerusalem Church was not yet ready to accept non-Jewish believers. First, this mission was resulted from a persecution scattering and was thus not a planned ministry. Second, leaders' testimonies were the crucial factor for a unified decision

of acceptance of non-Jewish believers (Acts 11 Peter's testimony; Acts 15 Peter's testimony and James's speech). Although Jesus had commanded a universal commission (Ac 1:8), the Jerusalem Church was still so unprepared psychologically, culturally, and theologically to accept non-Jewish believers. It took a lengthy road for the church (Ac Ch.8-15) to integrate the implications of this great commission. Here, we learn that the Spirit not only led the church to grow dramatically, but also to grow in a unified manner.

It is significant here to note Luke's attitude towards this exceptional case. Lukan theology indicated that the norm is that conversion and Spirit-Baptism are bound together (Ac 2:38). All other post-Pentecost cases followed this normative pattern with this single exception. Moreover, Luke's usage of "simply" in 8:16 (RSV) might indicate a note of surprise as this case seemed atypical (Stott 1990, 156). Therefore we conclude that *Luke did not intend to present this exceptional case as normative.*

Here we can summarize our findings about Luke's teaching on the nature of Spirit-Baptism:

- a) It is experiential by the recipient.
- b) It is unconditional for all repentants.
- c) It is bound to conversion-initiation.
- d) It is non-repetitive in the believer's life.
- e) It has effect on the repentant's life, ministry and role in church.

4. Comparison with Pauline Spirit-Baptism

Paul mentioned about Spirit-Baptism only once in 1 Cor 12:13 (καὶ γὰρ ἓν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δούλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.). First, it was baptized in one Spirit, not by one Spirit (contra Ervin 1984, 99). When the ἓν is used with the passive of βαπτίζω, it is locative rather than an agent, just as in 1 Cor 10:2. The usage of ἓν in 12:9 with δίδωμι is thus irrelevant. So the Pauline usage is same with the Lukan phrase (Fee 1994, 181, n. 378). Second, the context is about the double concern of Paul, namely, although there is diversity among members, they are one body (12:12a), and although they are one body, there is a need for diversity (12:12b). The diversity

refers to different gifts mentioned in 12:4-11. Structurally, the two "for indeed" (καὶ γάρ) at the beginning of vv. 13 and 14 mark the connection of these two verses with the major argument. Specifically speaking, 12:13 explains 12:12b and 12:14ff explains 12:12a (Fee 1994, 176). In other words, the Spirit-Baptism in 12:13 is an explanation that although they have different gifts, they constitute one body because they all have the common experience of Spirit-Baptism. The "all" restricts the referred experience to the initial reception of the Spirit at the beginning of the Christian life.

Third, the metaphors of immersion (baptism) and drinking imply a lavish experience (Fee 1994, 181; cf. Gal 3:2-5). Paul appeal to their common experience of the same Spirit that was the source of their diversity of gifts (cf. 12:4). Thus the purpose of diversity was for unity. Here we can sum up the Pauline concept of Spirit-Baptism:

- a) It is experiential.
- b) It is the initial reception of the Holy Spirit, thus is bound to conversion-initiation (Rm 8:9).
- c) It has effect on the recipient's life, ministry (gifts) and role in Church (body).

Therefore we conclude that the Pauline and Lukan concept of Spirit-Baptism is basically agreeable in these major features. The relevance to our discussion is that they both affirmed that Spirit-Baptism is bound to conversion-initiation.

The Nature of Spirit-Fullness

Luke's teaching on Spirit-Fullness

As discussed above, Spirit-Filling is different from Spirit-Baptism in that it is the only Lukan phrases to describe the repetitive experience in post-Pentecost Christian. Moreover in NT, Christians are commanded to seek for Spirit-Fullness but not for Spirit-Baptism. In the following study we will focus mainly on the post-Pentecost cases of Spirit-Filling and the exposition of Eph 5:18. Of course, as the first Spirit-Filled person

in the last days, Jesus is our supreme exemplar of a perfect life of Spirit-Fullness.⁴

1. Spirit-Fullness can be manifested in various ways

Although some Charismatics do not find the evidence of tongues to be conclusive, most Pentecostals still insist glossolalia as *the* initial (immediate) evidence of Spirit-Filling (Burgess, McGee & Alexander 1988, 45; Horton 1994, 442). This position stated in Article 8 of Fundamental Truths of the Assemblies of God: "The Baptism of believers in the Holy Ghost is witnessed by the initial physical sign of speaking with tongues as the Spirit of God gives them utterance." Furthermore, many Pentecostals hold that character qualities are not continuing evidences of Spirit-Filling. Rather, various charismatic manifestations are the required evidences (Horton 1994, 443). In sum, only charismatic manifestations are considered as valid evidence of Spirit-Filling.

The major support of this position comes from the five cases in Acts (Horton 1994, 440). As we have discussed above, Luke did not intend to present any pattern for establishment of norms. So the weakness in this argument is not only on their suspicious inference on Paul's case (e.g. 1 Cor 14:18) from such indirect evidences, but rather their arbitrary restrictions on the database from which they make their induction. There are totally 14 Spirit-Filling cases in NT,⁵ 13 of them are found in Luke-Acts. All of them are valid for our induction for initial or continuing evidences of Spirit-Filling. Since we will exegete Eph 5:18 later, we first analyze the 13 Lukan passages here.⁶

⁴ A list of relevant biblical passages about Spirit-Fullness: Ex 31:3, 35:31; Deut 34:9; Mic 3:8; Lk 1:15, 1:41, 67, 2:40, 4:1, 10:21; Ac 2:4, 4:8, 31, 6:3, 5, 8, 7:55, 9:17, 11:24, 13:9, 52; Rm 15:13, 5:18.

⁵ Lk 4:1, 10:21; Ac 2:4, 4:8, 31, 6:3, 5, 8, 7:55, 9:17, 11:24, 13:9, 52; Eph 5:18.

⁶ Since detailed exegesis of these passages is out of the scope of this paper, please refer to the footnote in each evidence for further exegetical support.

Figure 4. Charismatic evidences of Spirit-Filling

	as initial evidences	as continuing evidences
a. Xenolalia	Ac 2:4	x
b. boldness in witness	Ac 4:31	Ac 9:20-22; 11:24
c. meeting place shaken	Ac 4:31	x
d. miraculous power	Ac 13:9	Ac 4:33, 6:8
e. wisdom ⁷	x	Ac 6:13
f. vision ⁸	Ac 7:55	x
g. restoration of sight ⁹	Ac 9:17-18	x
h. led by Spirit	Lk 4:1	x

Figure 5. Character qualities as evidences of Spirit-Filling

	as initial evidences	as continuing evidences
a. brotherly love & unity	x	Ac 4:32
b. love of enemy	Ac 7:60	x
c. joy ¹⁰	Lk 10:21; Ac 13:52	x

From the two figures above we can make some observations. First, both the initial and continuing evidences of Spirit-Filling are of great varieties, not one. They include both Charismatic and ethical dimension. The fruit of the Spirit (brotherly love and unity, love of enemy and joy) are valid evidences (cf. Rm 15:13). As the main emphasis in Lukan writing is about the expansion of the church, Luke's selective attention in recording more charismatic evidences cannot be interpreted as the only valid evidences. For Luke, the effect of the Spirit-Filling is not restricted to the ministry dimension, but also include the ethical life of the recipients. Moreover, these evidences can be natural or supernatural, as shown in the following figure:

⁷ Bruce 1990,183; Marshall 1981,126-27.

⁸ Bruce 1990, 210; Marshall 1981,148.

⁹ Ac 9:18 "immediately" (καὶ εὐθέως).

¹⁰ Lk 10:21 "full of joy through the Spirit" (ἠγαλλιάδατο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ).

Figure.6 Evidences of Spirit-Filling in Lukan Writings

Supernatural Evidences	Natural Evidences
a. Xenolalia	a. brotherly love & unity
b. meeting place shaken	b. love of enemy
c. miraculous power	c. joy
d. vision	d. boldness in witness
e. restoration of sight ¹¹	e. wisdom
f. led by the Spirit (?)	

Second, glossolalia is thus not the only valid initial evidence. Its proportion among all other evidences is insignificant even if we include also the other three key Spirit-Baptism cases (Samaria, Cornelius and Ephesus). Furthermore, the glossolalia in Acts is Xenolalia, not angelic language. There are two reasons: first, Luke described the three evidences of glossolalia in similar manner: tongue-speaking with the content of praising God (2:4, 11; 10:46; 19:6). "Prophecy" in 19:6 should be understood as praising God (cf. Lk 1:67, Bruce 1990, 407). For Luke, praise is also the main function of glossolalia (Ac 2:11, 10:46). Second, the term glossolalia (γλώσσαις) is the same in three cases. In Ac 10:46, the glossolalia was understood by Peter and Jewish believers as praising God, indicating that it was probably Xenolalia as what had happened in Pentecost, not an angelic language. Therefore *there is no support from Lukan writings that a glossolalia which is not in the form of Xenolalia can be evidence of Spirit-Filling.*

2. Spirit-Fullness can be a long-term phenomenon

"Full of Holy Spirit" is a distinctive Lukan phrase to denote the general characteristic of a person (Lk 4:1 "Jesus"; Ac 6:3, 5 "the seven apostle-assistants"; Ac 6:8 & 7:55 "Stephen" and Ac 11:24 "Barnabas"). Full (πλήρης) denote a quantity of space completely occupied by something (cf. Ac 13:10, Louw & Nida 1989, 1:5935). When it refers to the Holy Spirit, it can be translated as "whom the Holy Spirit commands, directs or possesses" (Newman & Nida 1972, 135). Hence the person is habitually governed and controlled by Lord the Spirit. The corresponding characteristics of this spiritual state might include: first, leading by the

¹¹ Ac 9:18 "immediately" (καὶ εὐθέως).

Spirit (Lk 4:1); second, full of spiritual wisdom (σοφία, Ac 6:3)—an allusion to Isa 11:2; Ex 28:3; Deut 34:9 (Bruce 1990, 183)—the capacity to understand (God's Will) and, as a result, to act wisely (Louw & Nida 1989, 1:384); third, deeds of wonders and signs in evangelism (Ac 6:8); lastly, fruitful ministry (Ac 11:24). Hence, the manifestations of a constantly Spirit-Filled life are also pluralistic. As Jesus is the supreme exemplar of a constantly Spirit-Filled life of constant Spirit-Fullness, every aspect of his humanity becomes valid manifestations of Spirit-Fullness. *So a life of constant Spirit-Fullness can be characterized by ethical and functional, as well as supernatural and natural manifestations.* Moreover, a Christian life of constant Spirit-Fullness is not only an ideal, but also our norm to pursue.

Another attribute of Spirit-Filling is that it is repetitive, even for a person who is already described as "full of Holy Spirit." Jesus enjoyed a new Spirit-Filled joy for the wonderful spiritual experience of the seventy-two (Lk 10:21). Stephen, in his last moment before death, was enabled to have a heavenly vision by the Spirit. Many scholars would consider this as a new Spirit-Filling (Marshall 1981, 148; Newman & Nida 1972, 167). At least we can be sure that it is a new empowerment experience enabled by the Spirit, resulting in Stephen's vision and his love for those who stoned him. Peter, experiencing the Spirit-Filling in Pentecost (Ac 2:4), was again Spirit-Filled (πλησθεῖς) before the Sanhedrin (Ac 4:8) (contra Ervin 1990, 36). Paul, experiencing his Spirit-Filling in his conversion, was also Spirit-Filled again in a power encounter with Elymas the sorcerer (Ac 13:9). Lastly, there was a mass repeated Spirit-Filling in the prayer meeting after the release of Peter and John (Ac 4:31). It is highly improbable that Peter and John were the only two in this large community who had experienced the Pentecost event. It is also noteworthy that the believers were gathered in their common meeting place (cf. Ac 4:23). It was at least a repeated Spirit-Filling experience for some of the believers.

So we can summarize Luke's teaching on Spirit-Filling as follows. First, although we understand that sin can affect one's spiritual state, Spirit-Fullness can still be a relatively constant spiritual state of a believer; so it is a norm that Christian should pursue for. Second, as Spirit-Filling is a repetitive experience, it can be initiated unconditionally by God to meet the occasional needs of the believer (Stephen, Peter and Paul), or it can be a response by God to one's prayer. Lastly, as in every experience

of Spirit-Filling, a constant life of Spirit-Fullness can be manifested in various ways and dimensions. The normative measure of the "maturity" of a Spirit-Filled life is not in any specific manifestations, but Christ Himself.

Paul's Teaching on Spirit-Fullness

The only Pauline phrase of Spirit-Fullness appears in Eph 5:18b ("Do not get drunk on wine, which leads to debauchery. Instead, be filled with the Spirit" καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἶνω, ἐν ᾧ ἐστὶν ἀσωτία, ἀλλὰ πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι) . "Be filled" (πληροῦσθε, Present Passive Imperative) denotes a command for a habitual and continuing action (Reinecker & Rogers 1980, 538), implying a repetitive action which the reader had some experiences before. With the force of the passive, the phrase can be paraphrased as "allow yourselves continually (or repeatedly) to be filled with the Holy Spirit."

1. The nature and conditions of Spirit-Filling

Structurally speaking, Eph 5:15-21 is the fifth and last Pauline exhortation about the conduct of the church starting from 4:1 ("Therefore and walk/live" [οὖν & περιπατέω] in 4:1, 17,; 5:1-2, 7-8, 15). Furthermore, starting from 4:17, there is a series of contrasts between "before" and "after" of living like Gentiles but now God's people who have "learned Christ" (Fee 1994, 720). Drunkenness belongs to something "before" and Spirit-Filling beyond to something "after," in parallel with the four commands above, namely walking in unity (4:1ff), walking in holiness (4:17ff), walking in love (5:1ff), and now walking in wisdom (5:15ff) (Walwood & Zuck 1988, 632-639). As Spirit-Filling is one aspect of walking in wisdom, other walking of a Christian life no doubt will enhance the fulfillment of this command. In contrast, their counterparts of "before" will affect its realization. In other words, in terms of the Holy Spirit, "grieving the Holy Spirit" (4:30) will prohibit the Spirit-Filling but the sealing of the Spirit which marks the beginning of a Christian life (1:13, 4:30) is the foundation for experiences of Spirit-Filling. Every Christian can have the experience of Spirit-Filling, and their commitment to walking in truth is helpful to have this experience.

In the immediate context of 5:15-18, the theme of wisdom is made up of three main exhortations and its negative counterpart (Lincoln 1990,

347). The first one is to adopt a wise attitude to make most of the opportunities to do good, knowing that the moral climate of the present age is evil. The second is not to be foolish, but to gain practical understanding of what the Lord requires. The third is to be Spirit-Filled in contrast to debauchery, which is implied as a foolish way of living. So walking in wisdom in terms of a watchful attitude to daily life before the Lord is helpful for a Christian to experience Spirit-Filling.

In the parallel passage in Col 3:15-17, wisdom is again an important theme. Since the fulfillment of the command in Col 3:16a (the indwelling of the word of Christ) will lead to a similar consequences of joyful fellowship and worship (Eph 4:19-20// Col 3:16b-17), it is significant to investigate the relationship between it and the Spirit-Filling. First, considering the theme of Christ as the fullness of God in this epistle (Fee 1994, 650), we better take the genitive in "the word of Christ" (ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) as objective, denoting that the content of the word is Christ. Second, the phrase "with all wisdom" is generally agreed as a modifier of "teaching and admonishing" than of "indwelling." Since the "wisdom" in Col 1:9 is that of the Spirit, the exhortation in Col 3:16a is to teach one another the word about the fullness of Christ by spiritual wisdom (Fee 1994, 652). The sense of the greatness and power of Christ, as a result of this teaching, is thus closely related to the experience of Spirit-Filling (cf. Jn 16:14). Mutual learning of God's word in spiritual wisdom is thus a means to participate in this experience.

This Christ-centered view of Spirit-Fullness is further supported by the theme of fullness in Ephesians. If we take the πλήρωμα in its passive sense in Eph 1:23, the church is "the fullness of Him [Christ]" (NIV, Stott 1980, 64-65; Lincoln 1990, 78). Since Christ fills the church just like He fills the Universe, the fullness denotes Christ's presence, power and ruling (Stott 1980, 66; Lincoln 1990, 78). In Eph 2:16-19 the indwelling of this ruling Christ is enhanced through the power of the Spirit, and the ultimate end is to be filled to the measure of "all the fullness of God" (= Christ, Col 2:9). The work of the Spirit is to enhance our growth in submission and Christlikeness (Lincoln 1990, 215, Stott 1980, 139). The Ephesian theme of "fullness" affirms that the Spirit-Filling is to enhance Christ presence and ruling in the believer's life.

Therefore we conclude that Spirit-Filling is Christ-centered and the conditions for this experience is to learn the truth about Him by spiritual wisdom and to commit to living in truth and wisdom.

2. The manifestations of Spirit-Filling

The comparison of Spirit-Filling with getting drunk on wine leads some scholar to propose an initial charismatic manifestation of Spirit-Fullness, just like what happened at Pentecost. As argued above, the primary thrust of Eph 5:15-18 is walking in wisdom in terms of a watchful life before God, the major contrast with drunkenness is a disciplined life (making every opportunity to do good) against debauchery (losing self-control). The emphasis here is not the ecstatic character of the Spirit-Filling, but the fullness of Christ presence and ruling (cf. Fee 1994, 721). However, this does not imply a "cool" type without affections. Of the four consequences indicated in Eph 5:18-21, "singing," "thanking," "speaking" to one another in songs in a worshipping context essentially involve emotions. In contrast, submission (Eph 5:21-6:9) indicates a long-term behavior which demonstrates more the use of one's intellect and will.

The Spirit-Filling can be an individual's experience, but it also has its communal aspect. The community as a whole is commanded to be Spirit-Filled, as the church as a whole is the fullness of Christ (Eph 1:23). The members have to keep the unity of the Spirit (Eph 4:1) and minister to each other by spiritual gifts so as to reach the measure of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4:13). And the manifestations of the Spirit-Fullness are in corporate worship and fellowship (Eph 5:19-20) as well as in interpersonal relationships (Eph 5:21-6:9).

Lastly, there is also a functional aspect of the Spirit-Filling. Eph 6:13 mentions again the evil nature of the last days (cf. 5:16). However, the theme here is about Christian warfare against the power of evil. In this context, the power of the Spirit is extremely important (6:10, 18-20). God's word and prayer are mentioned as two means to draw this power (6:17-18; see Fee 1994, 731 and Lincoln 1990, 349). Since the exhortation to witness, "living as children of light in age of darkness" (Eph 5:8) is parallel with the command to be Spirit-Filled, the close connection of this last section 6:10-20 with Spirit-Filling should not be overlooked. Spirit-Fullness may manifest as an empowerment for ministry.

3. Comparison between Luke's and Paul's teaching on Spirit-Filling

As demonstrated in this paper, Luke's and Paul's teaching on Spirit-Filling is basically agreeable. It is viewed as a repetitive experience for which Christians should seek. The norm of the maturity of a Spirit-Filled life is not a specific kind of manifestations, but Christlikeness. The manifestations of Spirit-Filling are of great varieties, including ethical-spiritual as well as ministry dimension. However, while Paul put the ethical-spiritual aspect in the foreground, Luke put it in the background. For pursuing Spirit-Filling, Luke mentioned about prayer but Paul emphasized more on truth about Christ, both learning and walking by it.

Luke's distinctive teaching on Spirit-Filling is that it is sometimes an unconditional gift from God, especially in times of urgent needs in witnessing. Furthermore, charismatic manifestations are more common in Luke's writings, reminding us that there is a supernatural dimension to the work of the Holy Spirit. However, manifestations of Spirit-Filling are of great varieties in all different aspects, and there is no support from didactic passage that charismatic manifestations constitute a norm. Therefore, we should better take it as a possibility rather than a necessity.

Conclusion

Since the growth of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement is rapid around the world, it is important to re-examine the biblical basis of its central teaching: the doctrine of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness. It is significant especially because the Pentecostals are sometimes criticized to put their experience before their hermeneutics (Fee 1991, 86). This study reflects a conviction that a more solid biblical foundation will guide the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement to a direction more favorable in God's sight, as well as more acceptable by evangelicals as a whole. It is our belief that further cooperation between the two traditions will promote the God's Kingdom to experience a new chapter in the twenty-first century.

This paper first examined the major hermeneutical issue of "patterns" in interpretation of Acts. We argue that Luke did not intend to present patterns for formulating theological norms. The methodology of Pentecostals is thus in fact only a kind of induction from a sample of incidents from Acts. It is arbitrary to restrict this database to the five key

passages. This paper demonstrates that when more incidents are taken into consideration, the conclusion on the nature, conditions and evidences of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness has to be completely different.

Second, it is important for evangelicals to consider more fully the Pentecostal claims on the independent status of Lukan theology on its own. Yet this paper still affirms that the foundation of Lukan theology rests on the didactic portions in his own writings. The interpretations of John the Baptist's prophecy, Jesus' promise and Joel's prophecy are thus crucial in this task. We conclude that the empowerment for ministry, although possible yet not necessary in supernatural mode, is normative for us to pursue. Although Lukan incidents in Acts are not normative, they still have illustrative value. Evangelicals need to be reminded of the charismatic aspect of the Spirit's work today. Although it is not a norm for all cases, it is legitimate and anticipatory for some cases. There is a need to reexamine the teaching that miracles are restricted to the Apostolic age and its implications for a naturalistic world view among contemporary Christians.

Third, Spirit-Baptism is not Spirit-Filling in both Luke's and Paul's teaching. While Spirit-Baptism is given at conversion-initiation once-for-all, Spirit-Filling is repetitive throughout the Christian life. Christians are exhorted to pursuing Spirit-Filling, even a constant state of Spirit-Fullness just like Jesus. Yet there is no command for pursuing Spirit-Baptism. So Spirit-Fullness is a more biblical concept to interpret this subsequent empowerment experience. It is a more biblical approach to spirituality. While sometimes Spirit-Filling is an unconditional gift from God in special occasions, prayer, learning God's truth and living by it will help us in experiencing Spirit-Fullness.

Lastly, both Luke's and Paul's teaching affirm the varieties in manifestations of Spirit-Filling. Glossolalia, in the form of Xenolalia is legitimate but not the necessary evidence of it. Spirit-Fullness can have an effect in the recipient's ethical-spiritual and/or ministerial aspect, in individual and/or communal aspect, in emotional and/or intellectual aspect. It can manifest in the formal worship meeting and/or daily interpersonal life, as well as in natural and/or supernatural dimensions. It is totally the sovereign grace of God. The ultimate measurement of the maturity of our spiritual life is not any specific mode of these manifestations, but the degree of the fullness of Christ in us. Christ's

life, in its totality in both ethical-spiritual and functional dimensions, is our unchangeable goal of spirituality.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arrington, French, L. 1988. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Bratcher, R.G., and & E.A. Nida. 1982. *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians*. New York: United Bible Society.
- Bruce, Frederick F. 1990. *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3rd revised and enlarged ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1974. *The Book of Acts*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Burgess, S.M., G.M. McGee and P.H. Alexander, eds. 1989. *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1970. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Erickson, M.J. 1989. *Christian Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Ervin, Howard M. 1990. *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1987. *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Fee, Gordon D. 1994. *God's Empowering Presence*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1991. *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Green, Michael. 1975. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Grudem, Wayne. 1994. *Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Guthrie, Donald. 1981. *New Testament Theology*. Leicester: IVP.
- Hocken, Peter D. 1992. "Baptism in the Spirit as Prophetic Statement: A Reflection on the New Testament and on the Pentecostal Origins." In *Drinking from Our Own Wells*. vol.1. Ch O. Springfield: Society for Pentecostal Studies Conferences (22nd).
- Hollenweger, Walter, J. 1988. *The Pentecostals*. Peabody: Hendrickson.

- Horton, Stanley M., ed. 1994. *Systematic Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield: Logion Press.
- Hunter, Harold D. 1983. *Spirit-Baptism: A Pentecostal Alternative*. Lanham: University Press of America, Inc.
- Ladd, George E. 1991. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1974, reprint ed.
- Lederle, Henry I. 1988. *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of "Spirit-Baptism" in the Charismatic Renewal Movement*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Lincoln, A.T. 1990. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 42. Dallas: Word Book Publisher.
- Louw, J.P. and E.A. Nida, ed. 1989. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Roggebaai: The Bible Society of South Africa.
- Marshall, I.H. 1981. *The Acts of the Apostles*. TNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1971. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Menzies, William W. & Horton, Stanley M. 1993. *Bible Doctrines: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Springfield: Logion Press.
- Newman, E.M. and E.A. Nida. 1972. *A Translator's Handbook on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: United Bible Society.
- Rienecker, F. and C. Rogers. 1980. *A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Stott, John R.W. 1990. *The Message of Acts*. BST. Leicester: IVP.
- . 1980. *God's New Society: the Message of Ephesians*. BST. Downers Grove: IVP.
- . 1975. *Baptism and Fullness*. Downers Grove: IVP.
- Stronstad, R. 1984. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 1992. The Biblical Precedent for Historical Precedent. In *Drinking from Our Own Wells*. vol.2: Ch U. Springfield: Society for Pentecostal Studies Conferences (22nd).

Walwood, J.F. and R.B. Zuck. 1988. *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: New Testament*. Wheaton: Victor Books.

Walwood, John F. 1958. *The Holy Spirit*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

ABSTRACT

Since the growth of the Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement is rapid around the world, it is important to re-examine the biblical basis of one of its central teaching: the doctrine of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness.

In this paper we argue that Luke did not intend to present patterns in Acts for formulating theological norms. The methodology of Pentecostals is in fact only a kind of induction from a sample of incidents from Acts. It is arbitrary to restrict the database to the so-called "five key passages." We demonstrate that when more incidents are taken into consideration, the conclusion on the nature, conditions and evidences of Spirit-Baptism/Fullness has to be completely different.

Second, it is important for evangelicals to consider more fully the Pentecostal claims on the independent status of Lukan theology on its own. Yet we still affirm that the foundation of Lukan theology rests on its didactic portions. The empowerment for ministry, although possible yet not necessary in supernatural mode, is normative for us to pursue. On the other hand, while Lukan incidents in Acts are not normative for us today, they are legitimate and anticipatory for us in some cases.

Third, Spirit-Baptism is different from Spirit-Filling in both Luke's and Paul's teaching. While Spirit-Baptism is given once-for-all at conversion-initiation, Spirit-Filling can be repetitive throughout the Christian life. The latter is a more biblical concept in interpreting any subsequent empowerment experience. While sometimes Spirit-Filling is an unconditional gift from God in special occasions, prayer, learning God's truth and living by it will help us in experiencing Spirit-Fullness.

Lastly, both Luke's and Paul's teaching affirm the varieties in the manifestations of Spirit-Filling. The ultimate measurement of the maturity of our spiritual life is not on any specific mode of these manifestations, but on the extent of the fullness of Christ in us. Christ's life, in its totality in both ethical-spiritual and functional dimension, is our unchangeable goal of spirituality.

撮 要

因著五旬節及靈恩運動在世界各地迅速的增長，重新檢定它的一項主要教導——聖靈的洗或聖靈充滿——就變得很重要了。

我們在本文論路加在使徒行傳中並沒有刻意表達敘事的典範，或藉此建立神學的規範。五旬節宗人士的論證方法實際上只是從使徒行傳隨意抽取了幾件事實

來作歸納，並且任意地將事例資料限定在所謂「五段關鍵經文」內。我們的論證是：當更多相關事件都放入考慮之列時，我們對聖靈的洗或聖靈充滿的性質、產生條件和證據的結論也必會截然不同。

其次，福音派人士需要更認真考慮五旬節宗所宣稱——路加神學獨立於保羅神學之外自足的地位，但我們仍然肯定路加神學的基礎是在它教導而非敘事性的篇章中。聖靈為事奉者的加能賜力是規範性的，即我們可以並應該追求的事，但這加能賜力卻不一定包括超自然方面的恩賜。另一方面，雖然使徒行傳所記載的事件對我們今天而言已不具規範性指導作用，但它們仍具有合法的可能性。

第三，不論在路加或保羅的教導中，聖靈的洗和聖靈充滿都是有所不同的：前者是在人悔改歸主的時候，神一次便完成 (once-for-all) 的賜予，後者卻可以在基督徒生命中多次重覆出現，因此，就詮釋信主後聖靈為人加能賜力的經驗而言，聖靈充滿比聖靈的洗更合乎聖經的觀念。雖然，聖靈充滿在一些特別的情況下是神無條件的恩賜，但禱告、學習及實踐聖經真理有助信徒進入這經驗之中。

最後，路加和保羅都肯定聖靈充滿後彰顯形式的多元化。靈命成熟的量度指標最終不在於某些特定形式的彰顯（例如方言等），乃在於基督之豐盛內住信徒心中的程度。基督之整全生命——包括祂的屬靈道德和事奉能力兩方面——永遠都是我們屬靈追求上不變的目標。