

God, in which I give an entire chapter to the Acts of the Apostles and discuss all of the passages in the Bible on the Holy Spirit. So I have written a book on that subject too. Now that is my commercial, so I will single out some things that I think we should deal with in greatest detail.

*"In the Name"*

First of all, had Peter said simply, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the forgiveness of sins" he would have been repeating the preaching of John the Baptist. That much would not be unique; for as you remember in the Gospel of Mark [and then it is repeated, of course, in Matthew and Luke], this was the preaching of John the Baptist. It was a repentance baptism for the forgiveness of sins so that they would repent in order that their sins would be removed. This would not be anything new at all; but a very distinctive thing appears in the statement, "Repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." This is not seen in John's preaching and this formula appears four times in the Acts of the Apostles; twice it is in the name of Jesus Christ and twice it is in the name of the Lord Jesus. To be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ is a more Hebrew way of saying it, for it means to be baptized in the name of Jesus who is believed to be the Messiah. To say that one is baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus would be a more Gentile way of saying it because "Jesus as Lord" is more of a Gentile formulation; however, the meaning is the same and the most important thing is that baptism is "in the name." Now, we studied last evening this point in connection with the dispute which was going on about what person the Corinthian Christians belong to; some said, I belong to Paul, some said I belong to Apollos, some said I belong to Cephas and some to Christ. We pointed out that in this discussion we see the meaning of baptism "in the name" when Paul asked the question: "Were you baptized in my name?"

meaning, of course, if you were not, you don't belong to me. So, we use the psychological term, identification, to summarize the meaning of this baptismal formula. Being baptized in the name means that you belong to the one in whose name you have been baptized. You have identified yourself with him so, therefore, you do not belong to Paul because you have not been baptized in Paul's name. Now this is the distinctive view of the Acts of the Apostles. In other words, the over-arching idea is that baptism is identification, not only with the Lord Jesus, but with the community of faith which is created by the Lord Jesus. I want to single out against this background the two themes that I think are most important in the Acts of the Apostles, and we can deal in later questions with details that I may bypass. They're not bypassed with any feeling that they're not important but simply because of the pressure of time.

*Baptism and the Holy Spirit*

I want to approach it under two headings: first of all, Baptism and the Holy Spirit. And then, after we have looked at that topic, we will talk about Baptism and the Household. I think these are the two major things that we find in the Acts of the Apostles; all of them are held together by this idea of being baptized in the name. Baptism is identification with Christ, with the Messiah and with the Messianic Community. Now it has often been said that the Acts of the Apostles are written to bring together Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, and I think that is perhaps correct. An old classic in English by Rackham talks about the Acts of Peter and the Acts of Paul--the first twelve chapters being the acts of Peter and from chapter thirteen on, the Acts of Paul. He takes the view, which was rather popular here in Tuebingen at one time, that there was a Peter-Paul polarity in the early church. Now this view has sometimes been thrown out. I remember

when I was growing up that this was credited to a man named Ferdinand Christian Bauer, and the saying was that it was more Ferdinand than Christian. But I think it had more truth to it than many people recognized. We recognize now that there was a real conflict in the early church and that this Jewish-Gentile Christianity was one of the major things in the formulation of the New Testament literature. I accept that myself. Now you also know that in the Acts of Apostles you have three books about Peter and three books about Paul. I'm sure you're familiar with the fact that in Acts three times in the first twelve chapters, you have such things as "the Word of God increased and multiplied," etc. But the formula starts with 6:7; 9:31; 12:24, and these are sometimes called the three books of this first half. You have the same thing repeated in the second half at 16:5; 19:21, and then at the end of the book you find this formula -- "the Word of God increased and multiplied" -- or something similar to that. Now in the teachings about the Holy Spirit, you find that in each one of these books in the first half there is a great section about the Spirit in relationship to baptism -- in Book I, Book II and Book III. And I want to concentrate on those and then come to the fourth one which is found in connection with Paul. These have sometimes been called the four Pentecosts of the Acts of the Apostles: the Jewish Pentecost, the Samaritan Pentecost, the Gentile Pentecost, and then the Baptist Pentecost. Let us look at them -- and that is not just a popular way to remember them -- it does pretty well focus on the main question.

Now we already mentioned the Jewish Pentecost in which Peter is giving what I believe to be one of the most important perspectives in the understanding of the Christian faith. Therefore may I quickly summarize what C. H. Dodd called many years ago the Kerygma of the New Testament. He said that the early preachers fed their flocks

with a three-pronged fork. Every sermon has three points: the Old Testament is fulfilled, the story of Jesus, and the call to repentance. And, of course, we have already quoted the call to repentance; "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins." But it is very significant as just a summary of the Gospel. It is true that the sermons in the Acts of the Apostles all follow this pattern of having three points; and Dodd's little classic called The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development, is certainly a great insight into the understanding of the New Testament. The other thing, though, that I think is becoming more and more important, particularly here in Germany, is the idea of the resurrection. I find myself in great sympathy with the young German theologian, Wolfhard Pannenberg, who wants to lay down two great pillars of the faith: Christ's resurrection and our resurrection. I realize that The Theology of Hope by Jürgen Moltmann is based very much on this also, although if I may express a criticism, Moltmann never tells me exactly what he means by the resurrection. Maybe he does in his classes, but I find it difficult to know in what sense he believes in the resurrection of Christ and in what sense he believes in our resurrection. I would say very specifically that his book, The Theology of Hope, seems to me to have a very glaring weakness at one point, and that is its neglect of the Holy Spirit. For if I understand the New Testament correctly, the real connecting link with that end of the bridge, Christ's resurrection, and the other end of the bridge, our resurrection, is the Holy Spirit.

### *Resurrection and the Spirit*

If I understand what Peter is saying on the Day of Pentecost, we know that the end has begun -- that this is the beginning of the end -- that we have entered into the New Age. Why? Not just be-

cause God raised Jesus from the dead, but because He has poured out the Spirit. I put it something like this --- put the question to you. Do you believe in the resurrection, an actual historical resurrection of Jesus? Well, I think that this is what the whole New Testament is built upon. I just finished a Commentary on Romans, and the thing that came home to me over and over was this - that you find a creed repeated at least seven times in the Epistle to the Romans - first time in 4:25--- that He was delivered up for our trespasses, He was raised up for our justification. The death and resurrection of Christ is what makes the New Testament; what makes the Christian Faith. Without that, I would have to be a religious philosopher, not a Christian. That may sound dogmatic, but I think we ought to be that straight thinking. If God did not raise Jesus from the dead, then we will have to find our religious fulfillment in some kind of religious philosophy because the New Testament is based upon that fact, if I understand it at all. Now I sounded very dogmatic to you. Do you believe in the historicity of the resurrection? And if so, why? Well if we go through the New Testament, I think you'll find the development something like this. You could first of all say, "Because the tomb was empty." But that didn't even convince the first disciples. I think the tomb was empty, but it didn't convince the first disciples. They still did not believe, did they? You could say, "The appearance stories." I think C. H. Dodd in a brilliant work several years ago certainly did point out that if you study the appearances carefully, they certainly bear the marks of historicity. Of course, that has been done recently by Hugh Anderson in Scotland, in great detail. His work, I think, deserves a lot of attention. I don't know whether you know, Jesus and Christian Origins by Hugh Anderson of Edinburgh, but with typical Scottish thoroughness he has examined the resurrection narratives in a way which, to me, is very commendable and very valuable. I

think he has shown in great detail the fact that the resurrection is not a myth,--not just a pious myth -- but that the appearances bear the marks of historicity. But even though I can affirm the empty tomb myself which sounds rather conservative to a lot of people today -- I can affirm the appearances in my own faith -- I don't think we've gone far enough in saying that we believe in the resurrection until we go to what to me is the climactic reason for the early church believing in the resurrection; namely, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. If the second chapter of Acts means anything, that's what it's saying. We now know all that is true: that He not only lived and died, but that God has given us the Holy Spirit; and this is the assurance that He has been exalted. It seems to me that that runs through the Acts of the Apostles. So, therefore, when we talk about baptism - just repent and your sins will be forgiven - we're not going as far as John the Baptist went because even John the Baptist was preaching a promise: "I will baptize you in water, but He will baptize you with the Spirit." So the very distinctive thing about baptism in the Acts of the Apostles is the gift of the Spirit. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and then you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." So starting with this which is perhaps the most basic meaning of baptism in the New Testament [namely, repentance baptism for the forgiveness of sins], I will say quickly that this is the starting point of New Testament doctrine of baptism. Yet, we must remember that in the first church after the resurrection there was this fulfillment of the promise, "Baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence." So, that is the part that I want to advance first and I wish that we could stay and go into the second chapter of Acts in great detail, but we would not be able to say some of these other things. So we are pressed to summarize rather than to go into detail. But as I said, I

have tried to analyze the second chapter of Acts-- I hope in a way which is historically and theologically sound. I am just giving you the gist of it now.

### *Belief and Baptism Are Not Enough*

Now the "Second Pentecost" as we said a moment ago -- of course, it was not on Pentecost to be sure, but it was so much like what happened on Pentecost that it's been called Pentecost in quotes -- was the Samaritan Pentecost. Here was a magician, a sorcerer, by the name of Simon. It's interesting to note that this person in Samaria is called by the same name that Artemis of the Ephesians was called by. You remember when Paul preached at the theater. When he appeared in the theater, the people shouted *megálē*, great is Artemis of the Ephesians. Well, here is a man named Simon. He is called by the same title. He is called *hē megálē dúnamis*. We might put it in English, something as, "The Great Power." Here was a personality who saw Philip preaching in Samaria and as he preached this message of repentance and forgiveness, well, he believed, and he was baptized. Simon was a believer and he was baptized. That ought to assure us that belief and baptism are not enough. Let me just say that with many of us in this room, we put great emphasis upon believer's baptism. But believer's baptism is not enough; belief and baptism are not enough. You can have a society of Simon Magus and still have belief and baptism. And so Simon "the great" was baptized, but the Spirit did not fall upon the people. You know the story, but I will just mention the central thing. The apostles came down from Jerusalem, Peter and John, and laid their hands upon them and then they received the Holy Spirit. We're not told whether they spoke in tongues or not in this particular example, but at least there was enough manifestation of the Spirit that Simon said, well, I'll give you money to give

me this power. And, of course, this has given us the word, "simony," in Christianity -- to try to buy religious privileges or religious powers. You remember the stinging message that Peter gave to him that his heart was not right before God.

### *Acts 8 - the "Anglican" Text*

This 8th chapter of Acts has become a very important passage in the development of Christianity. You might call it the Anglican text. I was just dealing with the Disciples of Christ text a while ago, Acts 2:38. Alexander Campbell and the Disciples of Christ who have followed in his tradition -- I suppose they magnified Acts 2:38 more than any other passage in the Bible. Well, in my two years at Oxford University, I discovered that Acts 8 was the Anglican territory. That was the passage they emphasized so much and I suppose of all Christian traditions, Acts 8 has been emphasized most by the Anglicans who put far more emphasis upon confirmation than Roman Catholics or Lutherans or any other group that I know. Let me say just a word about this because historically we do not understand one another unless we look at this. You see, in Latin theology, beginning with Tertullian, forgiveness of sins was attached to immersion and there certain things were assigned to certain acts. You get immersed, your sins are forgiven; hands were laid upon you by the bishop, and you received the Holy Spirit. So the forgiveness of sins was tied up with the immersion and the laying on of hands was tied up with the giving of the Holy Spirit.

In the process of time this made a real problem. This was first felt by a man named Jerome who followed Tertullian rather closely. Jerome, of course, at the time was over near Antioch, where the bishops couldn't get around very often, and this was a real problem for Jerome. Does it mean that if you can't find a bishop to lay his hands

always read at the confirmation service indicates how important they think it is.

I do not think we will understand our Anglican brothers in Christ unless we understand this part of their tradition and why episcopacy is sometimes more important to them than it would be for a Roman Catholic, and why confirmation is far less rigid - let's put it that way - in Roman Catholicism. I think I know Roman Catholics well enough to say this - that the rigidity about the order of baptism and confirmation - and communion - that order - must always be the order in the Anglican Church. But you have communion before confirmation in the Roman Catholic Church. Is this not true? So to Roman Catholics, you see, there might be irregularity. There doesn't have to be baptism, confirmation, and communion. There may be baptism, communion, and later on confirmation. Is this not true? So I point this out; but in Anglicanism, never. It's fighting language to talk about a person receiving communion before he is confirmed. Well, I threw that in to point out that if we are interested in Christian Unity, we have to confront these problems and we have to really understand one another. We can't dodge them because it may not seem to be important to us. If it's important to thousands and millions of Christians, then it's important for the Church. This is the way I look at things. I never consider a thing unimportant for me, if it's important for other Christians. I still must make myself understand why they think this way. So I mentioned that to relate it to what we're saying tonight on contemporary problems of Christian Unity. That is what I would say means most to us in the Samaritan Pentecost.

*"The Gentile Pentecost"*

Now the Gentile Pentecost: I don't know whether we could actually say that this is the "happy hunting ground" of any Christian group, but I think that it well might be. The Gentile Pente-

on someone, the person doesn't receive the Holy Spirit? It's interesting to note that Jerome said you don't really have to have a bishop. This is something called Jerome's Presbyterianism. Perhaps you've heard the phrase -- It's Presbyterianism. Well, this caused a great stir, and some anonymous writer who called himself Eusebius of Emesa tried to reply. Scholars now recognize him - he is pretty well identified now; a lot of detective work has been done on Pseudo-Eusebius of Emesa. The historical detectives have pretty well spotted him as a man named Faustus of Riez--in southern France--who in a famous sermon called "On Pentecost" worked out what became a very influential idea all through Latin theology in the Middle Ages and is still continued somewhat in Anglicanism. May I just say briefly what his view was -- by this time the giving of the Holy Spirit was considered the armor of the Christian. You enrolled in the army when you got baptized and you received your armor when you got confirmed. By which, of course, he was illustrating that actually you are baptized into the body of Christ in infancy if you're baptized by infant baptism, but you don't receive your armor until you get confirmed, and all through the Middle Ages you had this very difficult problem. Here is someone enrolled in the army for several years before he gets his armor. This is still continued and one of the great problems of the Anglican Church [and I might say -- in my work on baptism] is that they've had a tremendous controversy on this point because the Anglo-Catholics have held very rigidly to this idea of forgiveness of sins and then later on the gift of the Spirit. And an Anglican fellow by the name of Lampe has torn this apart and caused quite a controversy in the Anglican Church. I won't go into it in detail except to say that when this idea of laying on of hands became, you might say, the sole way for one to receive the Holy Spirit, it did cause a great problem and it's still a problem in the Anglican Church. It may not sound like a problem to some people, but the fact that it's still in their prayer book and it is the one thing that

cost is a section of the Acts of the Apostles which has not yet been given the attention it needs. This is, of course, the story of the conversion of Cornelius. You see, this is the most detailed description we have in the New Testament. Two chapters. It's actually told twice about Cornelius and I think I understand why -- I think I understand why it has never been popular, especially with people who tie the Holy Spirit so closely to baptism and the laying on of hands. Do you know why? Because here is one who received the Holy Spirit before he was baptized or had hands laid on him. And that is why it has never been popular. You see, if we have what I call sacramental slavery, if we tie the Holy Spirit to a sacrament, whether it is baptism or whether it is confirmation, then Cornelius' conversion won't be popular to us. So here was Peter preaching to a Gentile, and this was a great problem for him; and don't forget that this racial issue is one of the central things in the theology of Acts. After all, Peter went through a great turmoil. It took a transcendent vision to get him out of his race prejudice as he stood before Cornelius, the centurian in Caesarea, and preached. The Spirit, as it said, fell on him, and later on he said, "It fell on them as it fell on us at the beginning," which, of course, was Peter's way of saying it happened in Caesarea just like it happened in Jerusalem. "It happened to these Gentiles just like it did to us and that's why I baptized them." You see, that was the problem. Perhaps Peter never would have baptized them. The Apostles never would have come down from Jerusalem to lay their hands on that Roman centurion. But the Spirit fell on him -- so who was I that I should oppose God? If He gave the Holy Spirit to them, I should baptize them. And that was the defense he made. So, this should always be a warning to people who want to tie the Spirit to a sacrament, whichever it is.

The Spirit is free. Now, I think I said enough last night to indicate that I certainly do believe in the sacramental acts. But never must we say: Unless you've gone under the water, you just don't have the Holy Spirit; especially if you don't go under the water. You'd better not say that! But for some in our own group, I sometimes call this "submarine salvation." There are those who think the Holy Spirit can only operate under water. Well, I certainly believe in the water as a sacramental act, but I don't believe you can say you can always tell whether a person has the Spirit or not. I would not say: He went under the water--he came up--therefore, he is bound to have the Spirit. Neither would I turn around and say the other. Personally, I believe in a united church we should restore confirmation. I am in basic agreement with many things in the Anglican theology. I am not opposed to Episcopacy. That may be heresy to some of you. I am not opposed to these things, but I am opposed to a rigidity that assumes that we can just almost dictate what the Holy Spirit is going to do. And just as sure as some bishop who may be an atheist has laid his hands on me, do I receive the Holy Spirit? After all, you had a predicament in Birmingham, England, a few years ago of an atheist being bishop. And here is where Jerome's remark makes sense -- that the Holy Spirit can operate through something besides the bishop's arm. And so this is what has happened, and it has divided the church because here in the institutional church you say that the only way the Holy Spirit can be received is for Bishop Barnes from Birmingham to come down with his atheism and lay his hands on your head.

Of course, this makes problems other ways. You remember, Bishop Pike had a great problem out in San Francisco with this. When Pentecostalism struck the Episcopal Church in San Francisco, he laid his hands on the head of an adult convert and prayed that the Holy Spirit would strengthen him

in the Christian life and the man began to speak in tongues. Bishop Pike was surprised that his prayer was answered and so he went back and dashed off a very interesting pastoral letter that says that henceforth no one shall speak in tongues while the bishop is confirming him. One of my dearest friends in the world is a theological librarian at Oxford University, A. M. Allchin, whose book on monasticism many of you may have seen or read. He was my guest when I told him he could read this pastoral letter because it was in our library. He read the letter in our library at Southern Baptist Seminary. He was sitting all the way across the library when he read it and I saw him come across and the tears were in his eyes, and in his beautiful Oxford accent he said, "Oh, Dr. Moody, this is the most wonderful thing that I have ever read." I said, "What is so wonderful about it?" He said, "It is wonderful when an Episcopal bishop puts out a pastoral letter like this." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "Oh, the wonderful thing about it is that ten years ago we didn't know there was a Holy Spirit." Well, excuse me for putting that down in the light of some people's problems, but it works both ways about this idea of confirmation. Now, as I say, Cornelius is not very popular because the Holy Spirit is given without baptism and without the laying on of hands, although baptism did follow. So, the order cannot be a matter of rigidity as this story would illustrate. However, let us go on to the fourth one.

#### *"The Baptist Pentecost"*

This is what we would call the Baptist Pentecost. Now, I am not trying to tie this on to the modern movement of Baptists, but this is a proper word. The disciples of John the Baptist - what do you call them? You see, the term "baptist" was widely used in early Christianity and, of course, we now know from the Dead Sea Scriptures that

there was a Baptist movement prior to Christianity and there was a Baptist movement even after Jesus that was not Christian. As you read in the early church fathers, there were Baptists who were not yet Christians - even before John the Baptist. We're talking about the 18th and 19th chapters of Acts. And you have to put them together because, unfortunately, we have a chapter division here. You see, you have the story of Apollos of Alexandria at the end of chapter 18, and then you have the story of 12 disciples of John the Baptist at the beginning of chapter 19. Well, it's quite obvious to me that when the Acts were written, these were intended to be twin stories. To illustrate, we have the story about Barnabas, who sold everything he had--that's a good example of generosity, and then the story about Ananias and Sapphira follows immediately. The idea was to put these two stories side by side in order to stress the contrast. And so, when you do not put Apollos along with the 12 disciples of John the Baptist, you do not really see the point. You have to reread both chapters.

Now, what do you know about this Apollos of Alexandria who was a very eloquent man and was mighty in the scriptures? He taught everything concerning Jesus accurately; Aquila and Priscilla took him in and taught him more accurately the things concerning Christ. A very interesting thing is said about him and I think that the thing that is said about him is usually mistranslated. Many years ago, the old 5-volume work on the Acts of the Apostles, edited by Lake and Cadbury, saw the point. Practically all the translations say that Apollos was fervent in the spirit - as if it meant his human spirit. But he was fervent in the Spirit. It's interesting that the phrase used of him is used in Romans 12:11. Romans 12:11 long ago was translated in a classic way by James Moffatt when he talked about maintaining the spiritual flow. But the Revised Standard Version is trans-

lated correctly when it says, "Be aglow with the Spirit," capital "S". Well, the only thing that is different in the statement about Apollos is the word order. When you say *zēōn tō pneūmati* (Acts 18:25) or *tō pneūmati zēōntes* (Romans 12:11), that's the only difference -- just the word order. And so I think when we talk about Apollos, we should say, "He was glowing with the Spirit." Now that is a very important point to remember. The whole point is missed, it seems to me, when they try to make it fervent in the spirit (little "s"), as if he wasn't anything but an enthusiastic human being. No, Apollos was a man who was *zēōn* -- and the word *zēōn* means glowing or boiling over with the Spirit. Now, I try to say in my book on the Spirit that perhaps the man who stirred up all the Pentecostalism in Corinth was Apollos. You see, Paul had started the church and later on he had a great problem. Everybody was prophesying and talking in tongues in the church service. Where did they get this? I think Apollos was the Oral Roberts of Corinth. And that's what made the problem. I think that most of you know what I mean by that metaphor. And that was the problem.

Now then, what did it have to do with baptism? Well, at the beginning of the 19th chapter, after Apollos leaves Ephesus and goes over to Corinth, Paul comes to Ephesus and he finds some disciples of John the Baptist and he says to them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" And they said, "We didn't even know there was a Holy Spirit." Now back where I come from, they say these are Baptists who have not yet become Christians and I'm afraid that parallel is painfully true sometimes. But they said, we didn't know that there was a Spirit. He said, "Well, in whose name were you baptized?" Notice that phrase, "in whose name were you baptized?" And they said, "Well, we have John's baptism." So he baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus, then he laid his hands upon them. They received the Holy Spirit.

it, spoke in tongues and prophesied. Now what does that story say? First of all, it did not say that Apollos was rebaptized. Here is the whole issue of rebaptism.

### *Re-baptism?*

Should people ever be rebaptized? You see it in the time of the Reformation -- down in Zurich in 1525 -- a movement began which was known as the Anabaptist Movement -- a rebaptism movement and it is just now that this is being given the attention that it needs in Reformation studies. Personally, I think that one will never understand the Protestant Reformation unless he knows this "left wing" because Luther and Calvin both reacted against it and you cannot understand what they were saying, especially Luther, unless you understand these people. Many times Luther was far more concerned with his controversy with the Anabaptists than he was with his controversy with the Catholic Church. And you have to read George Williams' great book called The Radical Reformation if you want to understand the Protestant Reformation because that is the other side. Do you know this great work, nearly a thousand pages? It puts the Protestant Reformation in a completely new light. Luther and Calvin were reactionaries in many ways. The Reformation was only half completed. And until you had a great scholar like George Williams to bring all of this reason and research together, people had a distorted view of the Protestant Reformation. Now, what I'm saying here is in connection with the whole rebaptism movement, the Anabaptist Movement. Well, they use a text like this to justify it. At least, you do have one text in the New Testament where there was rebaptism. Apollos was not rebaptized because he had received the Spirit. I think that's the whole point. The 12 disciples of John the Baptist were rebaptized because they didn't even know there was a Spirit.



Now I don't know what would happen in contemporary Christianity if we rebaptized everyone who had not received the Spirit. I'm afraid we'd have some pretty big baptismal services. But it does raise the question today. What do we mean when we talk about New Testament Christianity? I just bring this out as a suggestion. I think it's a very significant story. No need for Apollos to be rebaptized. He was boiling with the Spirit: he was overflowing with it. But the 12 disciples of John the Baptist - they also had the baptism of John - but they hadn't even heard there was a Spirit, so they were rebaptized; hands were laid upon them and the sign that they did receive the Spirit was that they spoke in tongues and prophesied. Now then, this is mentioned in at least three of the Pentecosts and perhaps it's implied in the fourth - we've talked about four of them. Certainly on the Day of Pentecost it was because it says that they began to speak in tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance and Peter stood up and gave a great prophecy himself. In the case of Cornelius it says very clearly that they spoke in tongues and prophesied. And I think it's implied even in the Samaritan story, but we're not told specifically. At least, Simon the Great saw something that caused him to want to buy it.

#### *We Need the Holy Spirit*

So a question arises; and it has been raised by none other than the great Anglican Bishop, Lesslie Newbigin, in his book, The Household of God, in which he has said that Pentecostalism is a third force in the church. The trouble with us is today, when we go to talk about the Holy Spirit, we talk about some wild-fired Pentecostalism we've heard of somewhere that's often steeped in superstition and ignorance, and it's good for us to see a great modern churchman like Lesslie Newbigin say that there are three types of churches. He called them the Catholic type, the Protestant type and

the Pentecostal type. Have you read this great little book of his written several years ago, called The Household of God? He points out that in the Protestant type we're interested in sound doctrine, but he says there is a third type that the church today, the Ecumenical Church, must take account of, and he calls it the Pentecostal type. This type is concerned with the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit. Now I perhaps am saying this in such a tone that you realize that I am very sympathetic with that point of view. However, I think that we need them all brought together. We need an ordered church that Catholicism has emphasized. We certainly need clear-cut teachings in Christianity as Protestantism has often emphasized. But we need something more than an ordered church and sound doctrine. We need some power. We need the power that the Acts of the Apostles is talking about.

Now, of course, if we have this, we may end up with this problem that Paul had; and I suppose that is why the ecclesiastical authority is sometimes wary of spiritual activity (and I'm not talking about other denominations than my own - if you want really to get the fire department out just get a spiritual movement started among Southern Baptists). We have a lot of people who want to quench the Spirit. They get afraid of it because, you see, you can't control the Holy Spirit too easily, and so I'm not talking about your group. I'm talking about my own group when I say this. But I think today that we could well study I Corinthians 14. There is nothing in that chapter that I am not willing to accept into my own Christianity; however, I think our friends - our Christian brothers - who are usually spoken of as the Pentecostal groups, need to read closely Paul's regulations. You need to read over the words of Paul, "Let everything be done decently and in order." Some things are not very decent and some things are not very orderly in some of the Pente-

abreast if they want to, with me. But this is what we need today.

### Baptism and the Household

Let me now turn to the second part right here. I'm about to use all of my time on this baptism and the Holy Spirit. And I do want to say something about these other texts because they are distinctive and I think people in my own tradition do not pay enough attention to the Household Baptisms. There are five of those, as you know, in the New Testament; and let me just say a few words about them and give some inclinations, some suggestions, about their significance for us today.

The first household baptism, of course, is that of Cornelius and it's a wonderful story to read to find out what a household really was. It was the father and mother and children and even the kinsmen and the close friends in the case of Cornelius. He gathered them all together. Of course, Jeremias has done a lot of writing on what *oikos* and *oikta* mean in the New Testament: household and house. And it can be a very comprehensive term as in the case of Cornelius. You find more about what a household really is by reading the 10th and 11th chapters of Acts because it does describe well those who were in the household of Cornelius. There is no question about it. They believed and they were all baptized.

### *Jewish "Group Baptism"*

Now I believe that this is the place where proselyte baptism in Judaism influenced Christianity because you find in the Talmud that if the head of the household was baptized, the whole household was baptized. And I believe that carried over. Now you do have in the New Testament, though, instances of divided households where the head of the house might be a Christian and some

costalism which I have witnessed. However, I think that's our predicament today--that we are all split up like this. That here we're interested in a structured church which seems to be so clearly the distinctive thing in Catholicism, or in theology which, of course, - well, one only has to look at Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics to find out that Protestants do talk about theology and we do need this. But I think I would be missing the whole point if I came down to talk to you about baptism and you talked about nothing except what baptism means and how you do it, etc. Because the most distinctive thing about the New Testament is not the baptism of water but, rather, that which followed and that is the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "I baptize you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit."

Now we talked about that some last night in I Corinthians 12, but that is the first thing that I think we need to take quite seriously today and I'm just summarizing those five great things. I really wonder how many churches--when I see these great beautiful Gothic churches and nobody loves them more than I do, architecturally, with a little fist full of people inside them--I really wonder what on earth is wrong. I think the thing that is wrong is that we need to rediscover the Holy Spirit. I don't know whether you will agree with this or not, but I don't want to see people leaving the Lutheran Church. I don't want to see people leaving the Catholic Church. I'm never happy when I see priests leaving the Catholic Church or parsons leaving the Protestant Church. What I want to see is all of the different groupings of Christians renewed and revived. And most of all reunited. But I don't think we will ever be reunited until we have reform and renewal. If I might just get a little more practical, what we need is the four "R's" in this order: reform, renewal, reunion and relevance. Now, you don't have to put them in that order necessarily. They can all come four

members of the household were not. Philemon would be a case in point. But, I think that we cannot understand the stories in the Acts of the Apostles about the household baptisms until we see this Jewish background where the household was a very important thing. In Judaism, normally (there were exceptions) when the head of the household was baptized the whole household was baptized. Now those of us who talk about baptism as an individual thing, I think, have difficulty in saying that; but I think we cannot really understand the Acts of the Apostles unless we realize that that's exactly what happened. After all, later on in Christianity, we had even tribal baptisms and they were not always bad. A whole tribe would be baptized when the head of the tribe was baptized. After all, most of Northern Europe was baptized that way. That's the way most of Northern Europe became Christians. So that is not necessarily bad in a primitive society, even a tribal baptism and a household baptism. So we need to shake off some of our Renaissance individualism and realize that maybe in some primitive cultures today, that's the way to reach people: reach the old chief and you'll get the whole tribe. And some of our friends who are missionaries in Africa say that's the way you have to go at it. You can't just win them one by one. You have to win them tribe by tribe. So I'm saying this to emphasize that we need to think more in the sense of the group.

In my own church, I've heard quoted so much the old liberal idea quoted by conservatives--the value of the individual--that I have coined my own phrase - the value of the group. I think it's more distinctive of Christianity to talk about the value of the group than it is to talk about the value of the individual. After all, Paul did not study at the University of Königsberg under Kant--who taught the individualism that we try to emphasize in Protestantism.

### Proselytes and "God-fearers"

Now then, the second household was Lydia. Here is a wonderful picture of early Christian baptism in which she is called a "God-fearer." You understand, you read Acts of the Apostles and you know how the synagogue was made up. Every time Paul preached, he usually confronted three groups of people in the synagogue: the Jew, the proselytes, and the God-fearers. You know who they were: the Jews--they were born Jews. But who were the proselytes? Why, the proselytes were Gentiles who had "come forward": *prosēlytoi*. The proselyte came and worshipped the one God, lived according to the law of Moses; but one day he said, I want to become a member of the synagogue. I want to become a Jew. Remember that last night I mentioned the real problem of the roles in Judaism. How does a Gentile become a Jew? And that seems to be the origin of baptism. They put him in 40 "seahs" (Hebrew measure) of water, according to the Talmud. He stood in the water up to his neck, promised to worship one God, live according to the law of Moses, and submerged himself in the water; and, as the Talmud says, when he came up, "he was in every sense a Jew," and could offer a sacrifice. That's where I think baptism really started - pre-Christian. And so the proselytes were baptized Gentiles who had been accepted in the synagogue. The men had been circumcised before they were baptized, but women were not.

Now, Lydia is called a God-fearer. She had not yet joined the synagogue. She was not a proselyte. So, therefore, because she was not a proselyte, she and her household were all baptized in Acts, chapter 16--Lydia. We had a very wonderful visit to Lydia's River the other day. I have a picture of Mrs. Moody standing on the banks of Lydia's River. (That's the only way I can bet sure---that is, to shoot my own.) But this is the first European woman to become a Christian. It was

a household baptism.

Now in the same chapter of Acts, 16, there is another household baptism. He is not a proselyte; not only that, he is not a God-fearer; he is just a jailer. But you know the story of the Philippian jailer and his household; they believed and they were baptized. So in this chapter you see two stories side by side again -- one was a God-fearer who was leading a place of prayer--a *proseuchē*. You could not have a synagogue unless you had 12 men, so they had a little *proseuchē*, a place of prayer, down by the river and the leader was this woman, Lydia. But she was only a God-fearer. When she believed, the whole household was baptized with her. And then, as I say, the parallel of that story, which is another of these famous doubts, or twin stories, that you find in the Acts of the Apostles is about a jailer. As far as we know, he wasn't "anything" before he believed with all his household and his household was baptized.

#### *Only Crispus Was Baptized*

It's interesting to notice the fourth household that is mentioned in Acts and that is the household of Crispus whom we mentioned last night. Crispus was a Jew. As a matter of fact, he was the ruler of the synagogue. This caused a great furor in Corinth because the ruler of the synagogue was converted, and it says he believed and so did his household. But it's interesting (and Jeremias seems to have overlooked this in his writing) that it never said that Crispus' household was baptized with him. Jeremias says so in his book, but Luke doesn't say so in his book. It says that Crispus and his household believed, but that's all it says. And when we turn over to I Corinthians where we were last night, he says, I baptized Crispus and Gaius; I also baptized the household of Stephanus. I just throw this out because I think it has been overlooked. It's quite significant because Cris-

pus was a Jew; and therefore, household baptisms were practiced only when Gentiles were converted. I think this argument will hold. In this case it's exactly like proselyte baptism. So, I think proselyte baptism did influence the early church. For the Jews baptized Gentile households, but not Jewish households. It's interesting that Crispus and his household believed, but it does not say that his whole household was baptized. That may be pushing it too far, but at least that silence is a very interesting thing inasmuch as he is the only Jew in the bunch out of five. The fifth, of course, is Stephanus. The household of Stephanus we mentioned last night who was, of course, obviously a Gentile.

#### Conclusion

So what we are trying to say here tonight (to bring it down to a very practical conclusion) is very simple. This is what I've been trying to say, in case you are raising that question. I think today that we need to focus attention and interest upon these two points: namely, the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit and the value of group life -- the value of the group. That is what I've been trying to say. And in the Acts of the Apostles, the teaching on baptism brings these forward in a very powerful way. We can talk all we want to about baptism and confirmation without the gift of the Holy Spirit. We'll still have a dead institution. We can talk about what God and Christ mean to each one of us as individuals, but until we learn that Christianity is a way we live together as a group and that the great thing about Christianity is that we are members of the Body and the great unit is not the individual, but the great unit is the group, we will not get back to New Testament Christianity. Now when I say this, I am challenging two of the sacred things in our Western Christianity: institutionalism and individualism. But I believe they both need renovat-

ing. Institutionalism, alone, (we have to have institutions; I'm not against institutions at all)--but institutions, alone, and individuals, alone, will never be Christianity. The institution must be a fellowship and the individual must lose his individualism by being related to a group. We, as we said last night, are members of one another and that's not individualism. Now I know I'm attacking almost objects of worship to say that two of our biggest problems are these two things: institutionalism and individualism, and neither one is really Christianity. So we'll put the fellowship above the institution -- we'll have Christianity. We'll put the group above the individual--we'll have Christianity. Now I think I'm subject to being chewed on, but that is where I want to stop.