

The Dunn Debate and Its Inception

INTRODUCTION

THIS BOOK IS WRITTEN primarily for my fellow Pentecostals.¹ It is about that central, treasured doctrine of ours: baptism in the Holy Spirit. My aim is to offer an explanation and defense of the doctrine, before also offering some brief practical applications of it for church life today. My defense of the doctrine, unsurprisingly, will focus on the scriptural foundation on which it has been built. As the subtitle of this book indicates, I will be focusing, as so many Pentecostals have before me, on Luke's Gospel and his other work, the Acts of the Apostles. However, chapter 4 will bring Luke's voice alongside those of other key New Testament authors on the subject. My subtitle also mentions the *Dunn Debate*. While Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals have, generally, disagreed over the meaning of the phrase *baptized in the Holy Spirit* throughout Pentecostalism's history, those familiar with academic writing on this subject will know that the modern phase of the debate dates back to the publication in 1970 of a book by James Dunn titled *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*.² This book vigorously challenged the Pentecostal understanding of the New Testament on this subject. Several Pentecostals in the academic world have responded to Dunn's thesis in writing. A study of their debate with Dunn provides an excellent way of consider-

1. It is an updating, expansion, and significant development of my earlier articles: "Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Luke-Acts*" and "Pentecostal responses to Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Pauline Literature*," both published in *JPT*, and "The Prior Work of the Spirit in Luke's Portrayal," published in *Australasian Pentecostal Studies*.

2. Originally a doctoral dissertation; published in 1970 in London by SCM; subsequently reprinted in 1977 as a Westminster Press "Classic." For a brief survey of the debate, see Mittelstadt, *Reading Luke-Acts*, ch. 2: "The Dunn Factor."

ing the best of current thought from Pentecostals about baptism in the Spirit. As I consider the Pentecostal contributions to the debate, I will weigh the strengths and weaknesses of each contribution. Taking the strongest features of each argument, and adding certain observations of my own, enables a robust defense—and explanation—of Spirit baptism as it is understood by the keenest Pentecostal minds today.

In writing this book, however, I do not primarily seek to persuade non-Pentecostals or ex-Pentecostals to change their views. If the likes of Stronstad and Menzies have not convinced people like Dunn, it is not very likely that my own contribution will achieve this! My aims are somewhat more modest. I hope to show my fellow Pentecostals that there are good reasons, in the face of strong arguments against our views, for continuing to hold them. I aim to indicate that the Pentecostal position is cogent and attractive.

I also have a more general aim. I trust that this book will help to bridge the divide that exists between academic theological study and current Pentecostal church practice and mission. In my own context, this divide is still wide and deep: it needs all the long, strong bridges that can be mustered! I hope to show that academic theological study does have its uses, and that those uses are relevant to Pentecostals who, for whatever reason do not intend to or do not have the opportunity to engage in such study themselves. With this in mind, I try to write in a way that is reasonably accessible for people who may not be used to scholarly language. I keep technical terminology to a minimum, transliterate and translate all the Greek I use, and confine all quotations of non-biblical ancient sources to footnotes.

Pentecostalism and Spirit Baptism

If humanity's history on this earth continues long enough, then perhaps it will look back at the twentieth century and judge that church history's greatest single phenomenon was the extraordinary appearance, rise, growth, and spread of world Pentecostalism. With this growth and spread of Pentecostalism, of course, has come an increase in the extent to which it is known by those outside its ranks. We Pentecostals are known for our worship: its vibrancy, informality, and even excitability. We are known for our eschatological expectancy and for our expectancy in the here and now of miraculous interventions from on high, including those mediated through gifted individuals. We are known for our evangelistic

fervor (though many of us know in ourselves that we are not as fervent as we ought to be). But among these distinctives and characteristics one feature stands out above all others: our belief in and valuing of “the baptism in the Holy Spirit.” Such is our commitment to this doctrine and practice that Frank Macchia can write: “I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that this understanding of Spirit baptism has imprinted itself on the Pentecostal psyche as the crown jewel of Pentecostal distinctives.”³ For many of us, this “crown jewel” is the *sine qua non* of Pentecostalism.⁴

Spirit baptism is not perceived uniformly across the whole of Pentecostalism. Nevertheless, Macchia’s brief characterization of Spirit baptism as “an empowerment for ministry distinct from regeneration or initiation into Christ” is sufficiently central to Pentecostal self-understanding for him to write, “enough have understood Spirit baptism as a postconversion charismatic experience to make this view of the doctrine distinctly Pentecostal.”⁵ Macchia writes here of baptism in the Spirit as “distinct from regeneration” and as “postconversion.” J. Rodman Williams’ analysis combines these thoughts: “Pentecostals often speak of baptism in the Spirit as being distinct from and subsequent to salvation,” but takes care immediately to point out that “this does not necessarily mean a chronologically separate experience.” Rather, “the important point for the Pentecostal is not chronological but logical subsequence.”⁶ This is the definition of baptism in the Holy Spirit that I shall apply throughout this book (while obviously at times referring to other people’s definitions): it is a charismatic empowering for Christian service distinct from and thus, potentially, chronologically subsequent to initial regenerating faith in Christ. I will also call this the Pentecostal doctrine of *subsequence*.

3. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 20. Nevertheless, Vinson Synan is right to observe, “the baptism in the Holy Spirit—with its accompanying gifts and graces—doesn’t belong only to the Pentecostals. It belongs to the whole Body of Christ” (Synan, *An Eyewitness Remembers*, 29).

4. Baptism in the Spirit stands as one of the features in the typical Pentecostal “four-square gospel” of Jesus as “Savior, Healer, Baptizer in the Holy Spirit, and Soon-Coming King,” from which central set of doctrines flow Pentecostals’ enthusiasm for evangelism, miracles, Spirit baptism, and preaching on the second coming of Christ. Dayton opines of Pentecostalism that, “these four themes are well-nigh universal within the movement” (Dayton, *Theological Roots*, 23). In some traditions, the full gospel is fivefold, with Sanctification added.

5. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 20.

6. Williams, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” 43.

This doctrine has not only proved to be characteristic of typical Pentecostalism and one of Pentecostalism's main distinctives; it has also proved to be highly debatable. This book considers the subject by studying a certain aspect of that debate. The aspect in question is the one that comes into focus when baptism in the Spirit is considered through two "lenses." The first of these lenses is the writing on the subject known in scholarly circles as Luke-Acts, and the second lens is the writing on the subject by James Dunn. I will turn to Professor Dunn shortly, but first a word about Luke-Acts.

Spirit Baptism and Luke-Acts

It is perhaps an unfortunate though understandable feature of the standard canonical order of the Gospels and Acts in our New Testaments that Luke and Acts are separated by John. This feature means that some readers of the New Testament may fail to observe that Luke and Acts are two companion volumes by the same author.⁷ However, once this feature is acknowledged, many areas of common ground between the two volumes come to light. One of these is Luke's⁸ particular interest in the Holy Spirit. Another is his interest, evidenced especially but not exclusively in Acts, in the growing mission of the church that spread Jesus' message internationally. These twin interests combine. Luke related the work of the Holy Spirit to the evangelistic mission of Christ's followers, and he did this in a more sustained and focused way than any other New Testament author.⁹

7. This conclusion is almost universally acknowledged by scholars. Ben Witherington III writes of "the considerable linguistic, grammatical, thematic, and theological evidence that these volumes both come from the same hand" (Witherington, *Acts*, 5).

8. The traditional view of the authorship of Luke-Acts is, of course, that it is by Doctor Luke, the sometime travelling companion of the apostle Paul (Col 4:14; Phlm 24). I have no reason to doubt this view, though it does raise some difficult questions that I will address in chapter 4. From the internal evidence of Luke-Acts, Witherington draws the conclusion that its author is a second generation Christian whose mother tongue is Greek and who has received a good Greco-Roman education. While he does not seem to know Aramaic or Hebrew, and is therefore almost certainly not from Israel, he does display a strong familiarity with the Greek Old Testament translation (the Septuagint [LXX]) and so has perhaps been a God-fearer attached to Jewish synagogues for some time before his conversion to Christ. Witherington indulges in the speculation that Luke may have been a convert of Paul, perhaps in Troas or Philippi (Witherington, *Acts*, 52–54, and 53 n. 193).

9. Note the title of Penney's work on the subject: *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*.

As part of his interest in the Holy Spirit, Luke described several occasions when, as he put it, people “received” the Holy Spirit. He used several terms for Spirit reception,¹⁰ one of which, that he repeated, was “being baptized with the Holy Spirit.” Outside Luke-Acts, the phrase only appears in verses parallel and roughly parallel to Luke 3:16 (Matt 3:11; Mark 1:8; John 1:33) and in 1 Corinthians 12:13, the translation of which is disputed, especially by Pentecostals (see chapter 4). Given Luke’s twin interests in the Holy Spirit and in evangelistic witness and his repeated use of the phrase “baptized with the Holy Spirit,” it is hardly surprising that we Pentecostals have turned repeatedly to Luke-Acts for primary biblical data concerning our distinctive doctrine of Spirit baptism.¹¹ This interest in Luke’s works has been so consistent and extensive that Luke-Acts has often been called a “canon-within-the-canon” for Pentecostalism. Such is the volume of Pentecostal writing on Luke-Acts that Mittelstadt’s excellent bibliography of Pentecostal writing on Luke-Acts, published in 2010, extends to 35 pages.¹²

Part of this interest in and reliance on Luke-Acts comes to light when the debate with James Dunn concerning baptism in the Spirit is studied. Dunn himself wrote his famous book *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* as a study of the whole New Testament on the subject. However, when Pentecostals came to respond to his thesis, most of them confined their responses to the study of Luke-Acts. This is not true of them all. Howard Ervin and David Petts, in particular, engage with Dunn’s reading of Paul, and I will refer to their findings briefly in chapter 4. Ervin, in fact, tackles Dunn’s exegesis of the whole New Testament.¹³ However, the bulk of Pentecostal debate with Dunn has been “fought on the battle-ground” of Luke-Acts. With this in mind, I am going to restrict most of this book to Lukan issues. I will stray briefly in chapter 4 to studies of 1 Corinthians

10. Luke used such terms as being “filled with the Spirit,” “receiving the Spirit,” being “baptized with the Spirit,” the Spirit “coming upon,” “falling upon,” being “poured out” upon, and God “giving” the Spirit. He used these, generally, to refer to the same overall experience and effect in a person’s life. See further discussion in chapter 3.

11. It is worth noting that the noun phrases “baptism in (or with) the Holy Spirit” and the shorter, rather unlovely “Spirit baptism” do not appear in Luke-Acts, or anywhere else in the Bible. Only the verb “baptize” is used in this precise context.

12. Mittelstadt, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 170–205.

13. There are brief articles in *JPT* 19 (2010) studying Paul (by Janet Meyer Everts) and John (by John Christopher Thomas). Dunn replies to these in “Baptism Again.”

12:13 and John 20:22, for reasons that I hope will make sense by then. Otherwise, Luke's writings will be the main focus of our study.

Spirit Baptism and James Dunn

James ("Jimmie") Dunn, Emeritus Lightfoot Professor of Divinity at the University of Durham, is one of Britain's most prominent and influential New Testament theologians in our generation. It is beyond doubt that, through both the students he has personally taught and those preparing for ministry who have read his many books, he has affected the beliefs and biblical understanding of a good proportion of today's Christians. His publishing list is both prodigious and prestigious, and it covers a wide range of the key issues that the New Testament raises for academicians and church members. Only history or eternity will tell which of his many works has had the most impact, but for us Pentecostals one book stands out in its prominence: Dunn's first monograph—his published doctoral research—studying baptism in the Holy Spirit as understood by Pentecostals on the one hand and the New Testament on the other.

As I wrote in a previous section, the modern phase of the Pentecostal debate surrounding Luke-Acts goes back to this book, which I will simply call *Baptism*. Max Turner, an active participant in the debate, calls Dunn's work "one of the most significant books to be written on New Testament pneumatology this century."¹⁴ In this study, Dunn engages with the Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence.¹⁵ Dunn questions this belief: "Does the NT mean by baptism in the Holy Spirit what the Pentecostal understands the phrase to mean? Is baptism in the Holy Spirit to be separated from conversion-initiation,¹⁶ and is the beginning of Christian life to be thus divided up into distinct stages? Is Spirit-baptism something essentially different from becoming a Christian, so that even a Christian of many years' standing may never have been baptized in the Spirit?"¹⁷ On this issue, Dunn reveals his position at the outset: "I hope to show that

14. Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 19, referring, of course, to the twentieth century.

15. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* is subtitled *A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*.

16. Dunn uses the composite term *conversion-initiation* consistently for the "total event of becoming a Christian" (Dunn, *Baptism*, 7), including both the inward subjective (conversion) and ritual external (initiation) aspects.

17. Dunn, *Baptism*, 3.

for the writers of the NT the baptism in or gift of the Spirit was part of the event (or process) of becoming a Christian . . . ; that it was the chief element in conversion-initiation so that only those who had received the Spirit could be called Christians.”¹⁸ It will be immediately apparent to anyone who is not yet familiar with Dunn’s work that he engages in some sharp criticism of this Pentecostal doctrine, though in fact he does so from a position of respect for many aspects of Pentecostalism. It is not surprising, given the sharpness of Dunn’s critique, that many Pentecostals of a more academic bent have replied to him in print, thus spurring the debate that is considered in this book.

It is greatly to James Dunn’s credit that this doctoral dissertation should still, forty years later, be the subject of international debate: a special session of the Society of Biblical Literature conference in New Orleans in November 2009 was devoted to the work and brought out as a series of articles in *JPT* volume 19 (published in 2010). This debate has not, it must be admitted, “raged” continuously for those forty years. The main focus occurred in the first thirty. Nevertheless, one can guess that the average doctoral student would be thrilled to imagine that his or her dissertation might cause as much long-lasting stir as Dunn’s has achieved. Dunn’s hope, expressed retrospectively after those forty years, was that his work would inspire discussion among both sacramentalists and Pentecostals. The former hope has remained unfulfilled,¹⁹ but Dunn cannot justifiably be dissatisfied by the output of replies written from Pentecostal viewpoints. He does, however, remain frustrated by the quality of this output:

I am somewhat disappointed that the debate which my *Baptism* book seems to have occasioned has not revealed more inadequacies of my thesis than it has . . . I offer such insights as I have received in full expectation that in any discussion or debate they occasion, these insights will be qualified, sharpened, corrected, supplemented, etc. by that discussion and debate. And, as a result, which is what I hope for, my own perception of the issue will be clarified and deepened in the process. Here, however, the necessary qualification seems to be modest, and the main thrust of the thesis of *Baptism* seems to retain its validity.²⁰

18. *Ibid.*, 4.

19. With this constituency, “the thesis has been received more like a lead balloon” (Dunn, “Baptism Yet Once More,” 4).

20. Dunn, “Baptism Again,” 43.

This book will review the responses to which Dunn refers and consider from another viewpoint (my own Pentecostal one) whether Dunn's position has been successfully challenged and countered. Is Dunn right to rue the paucity of "inadequacies" that Pentecostals have found in his thesis? And, even if inadequacies have been unearthed, has a justifiable alternative been espoused? These are the questions that will occupy the attention of the next two chapters.

However, before the content of the debate is reviewed in detail, two things are needed. The first is, for those who have never read Dunn's *Baptism* or who have not done so for decades, to summarize the findings of his research as they relate to Luke's two-volume history of Christian beginnings. The other thing required is an introductory word about the course and dynamics of the debate, and I will come to that later in this chapter. First, we turn to the method and contents of Dunn's doctoral studies.

DUNN'S BAPTISM

The first part of Dunn's book is a study of the Gospels. This begins not with passages, but with historical events: particularly the preaching of John the Baptist and Jesus' anointing at the Jordan River. From the event, Dunn expands to consider the evangelists' interpretations, noting any distinctions between the accounts. This inevitably leads him to consider source-critical and redactional issues. It also means that his remarks about Luke's pneumatology are dispersed among his studies of the other Gospel writers. Nevertheless, his view of the Lukan understanding can be gleaned with relative ease.

In his study of Acts, however, Dunn adopts the method that will serve him for his later studies of the Epistles. He identifies each conversion-initiation context and studies each one, passage by passage. His exegesis is chiefly lexical and syntactical. He does not concern himself overtly with redactional issues, such as the handling by Luke or his sources of Joel 2:28–32 at Acts 2:17–21. Neither does he discuss narratological issues. Another significant difference between Dunn and some of his respondents is that he does not have an early chapter that surveys ideas about the Spirit held within early Judaism. None of these methodological gaps weakens his case, however. What Dunn may lack in discussion of background or in breadth of exegetical method, he more

than makes up for with simple exegetical care. So to the findings of this exegesis we now turn.

The Anointing of Jesus

Dunn's understanding of Luke's pneumatology begins to emerge in his third chapter, "The Experience of Jesus at Jordan." Dunn first points out the superficial plausibility of Pentecostal interpretations of the experience: Christ's experience of the Spirit is a simple paradigm of a subsequent anointing in a Christian life. Luke declared that John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit from birth, and so he very probably understood that Jesus was as well, for Jesus was conceived by the Spirit (Luke 1:35), increasingly filled with wisdom and grace (Luke 2:40, 52), and aware of his divine sonship (Luke 2:49). His anointing might therefore truly be seen as a *second* experience of the Spirit. Furthermore, this anointing was clearly an equipping for future ministry and could rightly be called a baptism in the Spirit.

However, Dunn considers that the greatest weakness of this Pentecostal view is in what it fails to recognize. The anointing beside the Jordan was not, in Luke's eyes, merely something that happened to Jesus. It was the pivotal introduction of a new epoch in salvation history. It was the beginning of the messianic era. Thus while it "may possibly be described as a second experience of the Spirit for Jesus, it was not a second experience of the new covenant."²¹

Dunn's evidence for this claim is first the difference between the future-orientated preaching of John the Baptist ("It's coming!") and the fulfillment-orientated declarations of Jesus himself ("It's come!"). Secondly, the Jordan narrative contains clear eschatological features: the open heaven, the dove, and the heavenly voice. Thirdly, the Jordan event is portrayed as Jesus' entry into a new role, brought on by the new age: the role of representing Israel as the new Adam. Luke portrayed this role not just by paralleling Matthew's depiction of Christ tested in the wilderness for forty days, but even before this by providing Jesus' genealogy back to Adam himself.

So the Jordan experience may be a powerful anointing, but is primarily, even essentially, initiatory. It "initiated the End-time and initiated

21. Dunn, *Baptism*, 24–25.

Jesus into it.”²² As such, it is paradigmatic not of a subsequent Christian experience, but of conversion-initiation itself, for it is this conversion that initiates a follower of Jesus into the new covenant.

The Day of Pentecost

Dunn’s view of Pentecost as it was presented by Luke is very similar to his view of Christ’s anointing: it *was* an empowering, but it was *primarily* initiatory. This is because Pentecost marked the opening of the next epoch in Luke’s three-fold salvation history: the age of the church, which was the age of the Spirit. Until Pentecost, only Christ could receive the Spirit, for the sin of all others was not yet purged by his baptism of fire. But Pentecost was a “watershed in salvation-history, the beginning of the new age and new covenant, not for Jesus this time, but now for His disciples.”²³

How did Luke make this clear, according to Dunn?

- a. Pentecost, and not the cross, was the climax of the “Christ-epoch” of salvation-history.
- b. Pentecost was a new beginning. Not only did its record form the start of a new book, but the event ushered in a new age. The election of Matthias by casting lots (Acts 1:26) was deliberately included beforehand to illustrate life without the Spirit’s activity. But now, and only now, Christ received the Spirit to give (Acts 2:33) and the subsequent outpouring fulfilled Joel’s prophecy of the “last days”: the “distinctively Christian dispensation.”²⁴
- c. Pentecost was the arrival of the new covenant. The “promise” of Acts 1:4; 2:33, 39 recalls the Abrahamic covenant (Dunn invites us to compare Acts 7:17; 13:23; 26:6), for Acts 2:39 (“The promise is to you, and your children, and to all those far off . . .”) mirrors Genesis 17:7–10 (The covenant is for “you and your seed after you for generations”). Furthermore, by the time Luke wrote, Pentecost was celebrated to commemorate Sinai. So “the thought of Pentecost as the giving of the new Torah . . .

22. Ibid., 31.

23. Ibid., 40.

24. Ibid., 47.

indicates that for Luke Pentecost was the beginning of the new covenant . . . and that the Spirit is the essence of the new covenant.”²⁵

- d. Pentecost inaugurated the church. Christ’s followers could only confess him as Lord (Acts 2:36) once assured of his exaltation to lordship by the gift of the Spirit. This confession was foundational to the church’s existence. Also, the church’s characteristic activities only now emerged (Acts 2:42). As the church was not born until this time, and since by definition all Christians belong to the church, “there were no Christians (properly speaking) prior to Pentecost.”²⁶
- e. Pentecost was the inception of faith. In Acts 11:17, “Peter tells us . . . that the spiritual state of the 120 prior to Pentecost was precisely that of Cornelius prior to his reception of the Spirit.”²⁷

In conclusion to his chapter about Pentecost, Dunn warns that the life of the 120 prior to Pentecost cannot be used as a paradigm for the experience of today’s new believer, precisely because that life was pre-Christian. Pentecost is itself a paradigm not of a second blessing, but of becoming a Christian.²⁸

The Samaritan Reception

Next Dunn tackles Acts 8:4–25, with its “riddle”: despite the belief and baptism in water of the Samaritan converts, they did not receive the Spirit until some time had elapsed. Seeking to solve this riddle, Dunn presents evidence that Luke was deliberately portraying the initial Samaritan response as defective.

- a. The superstitious Samaritans responded to Simon the Sorcerer without deep discernment. Luke used the same verb *prosechō* (“pay attention to”) of their response to both Simon and Philip, indicating a reaction to Philip’s message and miracles of similar undiscerning superficiality. Its origin, as the word

25. Ibid., 49.

26. Ibid., 51.

27. Ibid., 51.

28. Ibid., 53.

homothumadon (“with one accord”) in Acts 8:6 indicates, was “the herd-instinct of a popular mass-movement.”²⁹

- b. The Samaritans believed *tō Philippō* (“Philip”, in the dative), not *epi ton Kurion* (“in the Lord”). This use of the dative with *pisteuein* (“believe”) signifies mere intellectual assent, Dunn asserts.
- c. Simon’s belief and baptism were shallow and unreforming (Acts 8:9, 13, 18–24), and Luke was clear that his “faith and baptism were precisely like those of the other Samaritans.”³⁰
- d. Because in New Testament times reception of the Spirit was the evidence that someone was a Christian, it follows that “Luke’s aim is to highlight the difference between true and false Christianity.”³¹

Dunn’s conclusion about Luke’s presentation follows naturally: the Samaritans were not Christians until they received the Spirit. Once carefully exegeted, this vital passage offers no support to Pentecostalism after all.

Paul’s Conversion

Luke’s account of Paul’s conversion is, writes Dunn, another key passage for Pentecostalism. Paul is viewed as being converted on the Damascus road, for he addressed Jesus as “Lord,” and was himself subsequently addressed by Ananias as “brother.” Only after three days was he filled with the Spirit (Acts 9:3–5, 9, 17).

Dunn argues that this view misunderstands Luke.

- a. Paul’s *kurie* (Acts 9:5; usually “Lord”) means no more here than “sir” (as it does in Acts 10:4 and 16:30).
- b. Ananias’ “Brother” (Acts 9:17) possibly means “fellow Jew,” and was simply used to put Paul at his ease.
- c. Ananias viewed Paul, when he met him, as someone who still required to have his sins washed away (Acts 22:16).

29. *Ibid.*, 65.

30. *Ibid.*, 66.

31. *Ibid.*, 66.

- d. Paul, testifying much later at his trials, did not distinguish between what God had said on the Damascus road (Acts 26:16–18) and what God said through Ananias (Acts 22:14–15). So his conversion must be regarded as a process lasting for the three days.
- e. Paul's blindness remained for those three days. This is hardly symbolic of completed conversion (!), but rather symbolic, for Luke, of turmoil and of crushing conviction. It was his new sight that displayed his new life, mediated through his reception of the Spirit.

In conclusion, Luke portrayed not Paul's second blessing, but his three-day conversion: "The experience of being filled with the Spirit was as much an integral part of his conversion as his meeting with Jesus."³²

Cornelius' Conversion

This account places the Pentecostal "in difficulty from the start."³³ While some Pentecostals argue that Cornelius was regenerate prior to Peter's sermon (which, Dunn notes, was not Luke's understanding—Acts 11:14, 18), others perceive that he was saved *during* the sermon, viewing his Spirit baptism as a closely succeeding, or simultaneous but distinct, event. These views, argues Dunn, do not fit the evidence. The Spirit fell when Peter was speaking about faith and forgiveness, not about baptism in the Spirit (Acts 10:43–44). Thus at the moment Cornelius trusted God for forgiveness, he actually received the Spirit, "not instead of the promised forgiveness but as the bearer of it."³⁴ The synonymy within Acts 15:8–9 (Dunn also notes Acts 11:14–18) confirms this: "God's giving of the Holy Spirit is equivalent to his cleansing of their hearts."³⁵ Dunn's understanding of Luke is unequivocal: "the baptism in the Spirit *is* God's act of acceptance, of forgiveness, cleansing and salvation."³⁶

32. *Ibid.*, 77–78.

33. *Ibid.*, 79.

34. *Ibid.*, 80.

35. *Ibid.*, 81–82.

36. *Ibid.*, 82; italics added.

The Ephesian Outpouring

In his next chapter, Dunn studies Acts 19:1–7, an important passage for Pentecostals. They come to any or all of three conclusions: the Ephesians were Christian before meeting Paul; Paul's question implies that a Christian could be without the Spirit; time elapsed between the Ephesians' receiving baptism and their receiving the Spirit.

Dunn understands Luke's words differently. Luke did not present these Ephesians as Christians. They were ignorant about the Spirit and about Jesus. They yet required Christian baptism in water. They were called *tinai mathētai* ("some disciples"). Luke's formula for Christians was *hoi mathētai* ("the disciples"). This unique use of *mathētai* ("disciples") without the article ("the") distanced the group from *the* disciples in Ephesus. Paul's first question ("Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?"), with its *pisteusantes* ("believing"; "when you believed"), was one of "suspicion and surprise." Paul asked, "Did you receive the *Holy Spirit* when you believed?"³⁷—as if his query were, in effect, "What 'spirit' did you receive?" His second question ("Into what then were you baptized?") clarifies the connection in Paul's mind between baptism into Christ and baptism in the Spirit. Furthermore, their second answer ("Into the baptism of John") confirmed his suspicions: they were not Christians. Any time interval that Pentecostals might claim between baptism and the laying on of hands is fictional. The latter is the climax of the former: "the one action leads into and reaches its conclusion in the other with no discernible break."³⁸ In conclusion, Dunn understands Luke to have portrayed just one act of the Spirit in the Ephesians' lives: that baptism in the Spirit whereby they became Christians.

Baptism: Dunn's Conclusions

For Dunn, the evidence has all pointed one way: Luke's pneumatology does not support Pentecostalism's key distinctive: its doctrine of subsequence. Reception of the Holy Spirit, while being an overwhelming experiential empowering, was initiatory in character, bringing the recipient into the new covenant. Jesus' anointing at the Jordan River and the outpouring on the day of Pentecost were essentially unique, for each represented the dawning of a new era: the age of the new covenant, first

37. *Ibid.*, 86; italics original.

38. *Ibid.*, 87.

for Jesus and then for his followers. However, as archetypes of all future Christian experience, they represent not a second blessing, but Christian conversion itself. Luke's picture is only confirmed by all subsequent conversions he described. Baptism in the Holy Spirit is not merely necessarily and automatically co-incident with the cleansing of salvation: "these two are one—two ways of describing the same thing." "Baptism in the Spirit is God's act of . . . salvation."³⁹

While reaching this conclusion about Luke's writings, Dunn also reaches precisely the same conclusion about the rest of the New Testament. Thus he sees a highly consistent picture emerging from the writings of the various authors. There is no dichotomy, for instance, between Luke and Paul. In the views of these and the other New Testament writers, a single overall pneumatology is presented, which includes the teaching that only through reception of the Spirit does someone become a Christian.

DUNN'S LATER CONTRIBUTIONS

Since publishing *Baptism*, Dunn has written three articles that directly and overtly engage with his Pentecostal debaters, as well as various other books, such as *Jesus and the Spirit* and a commentary on Acts, that engage in part with the debate. The first of the three articles, "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts," was published in *JPT* in 1993. The second, published in *JEPTA* in 1998, was called "Baptism in the Holy Spirit . . . Yet Once More." The third, published again in *JPT*, appeared in 2010 under the title, "Baptism in the Holy Spirit . . . Yet Once More—Again." Not only are these titles, with their repetition of "Baptism in the (Holy) Spirit," potentially confusing, but also the later titles might lead us to believe that Dunn has become increasingly bored by the subject and would wish that his various respondents might concentrate on other subject areas in their debates with him. However, such an impression would be far from accurate. He writes in his 1998 article of the Holy Spirit being, in terms of New Testament study, his "first love."⁴⁰ In 2010, he still writes of finding Paul's contribution to New Testament pneumatology "fascinating."⁴¹ And the content of

39. *Ibid.*, 82.

40. Dunn, "Baptism Yet Once More," 3.

41. Dunn, "Baptism Again," 36.

the articles continues to evidence a lively interest in the subjects under discussion. In the following paragraphs I will draw out from the articles any observations Dunn makes about Luke-Acts and its pneumatology that add to what he has covered in his book on the subject.

In his 1993 article, Dunn responds to the first wave of Pentecostal criticism of his original thesis. As will emerge later in this book, a particular methodological criticism made by more than one Pentecostal is that Dunn unduly homogenizes the breadth of view expressed by the different New Testament writers: he treats Luke and Paul, for instance, as if they had the same pneumatology—and that pneumatology is Paul's! Dunn makes a couple of interesting observations here. One is that, "To criticise me . . . for reading Luke-Acts with Pauline spectacles, is, of course, to acknowledge that my findings are sound so far as Paul was concerned."⁴² Of course, my book is mainly about Luke-Acts, but chapter 4 will briefly broaden out beyond Luke's writing to consider Paul's, and will return then to the question of how Pentecostals regard Dunn's exegesis of Paul's letters, for it is an important aspect of the whole discussion. A related observation offered by Dunn at this time is his admission that "it is only proper for me to acknowledge that my conclusions in *Baptism in the [sic] Spirit* are clearest in Paul and John."⁴³ However, if a reader at the time regarded that admission as the first "chink of light" that would lead to Dunn's backing down concerning his reading of Luke-Acts, that was certainly not to be the case. Dunn remains as forthright as ever concerning his overall conclusions.

Dunn is also careful to reaffirm his agreement with Pentecostalism that Spirit reception as portrayed by Luke is charismatic in nature.⁴⁴ This is an important emphasis, for it will emerge that some Pentecostal critiques view Dunn as in effect anti-charismatic as well as "anti-Pentecostal." This is far from true.

In his 1998 article, Dunn pays greater attention to concepts lying behind the New Testament writings than he does in his book. In a section that asks, "Is There a Primary Conceptuality for the Spirit?" he concludes from his study of the Old Testament and relevant Jewish writings that the answer is affirmative. Even though in the thinking about the Spirit on

42. Dunn, "Baptism: A Response," 224.

43. Ibid. Also *ibid.*, 242: "the soteriological function of the Spirit is much more prominent in Paul than in Luke."

44. Ibid., 226–27, 241.

which Luke must have drawn there is a “spectrum of usage where different meanings run into each other and different conceptualities merge with one another,” there is nevertheless a discernible center to these concepts: there is only one Spirit, who is “the self-manifestation of God in powerful activity.” In relation to humanity, “the primary conceptualisation of the *ruach* [the Hebrew for ‘wind,’ ‘breath,’ or ‘S/spirit’] is as the breath of life, as the life-force, as divinely breathed and sustained vitality.”⁴⁵ This unity of concept—the Spirit granting life—in Luke’s background makes Dunn suspicious of any portrayal of New Testament pneumatology that sharply distinguishes between the views of, say, different authors in the canon. It also causes him to regard it as “scarcely credible” that “Luke does not think of the Spirit as life-giving.”⁴⁶ Whether Dunn has accurately reflected Luke’s conceptual background, and whether he has then imposed his view of that background on what Luke actually writes, will be matters that will naturally emerge later in this book.

At this stage, there is but one further brief comment to be made about Dunn’s view of Lukan pneumatology from his 1998 article, and it concerns Peter’s Pentecost sermon. In a way that Dunn did not do in his book, he now notes that Luke extends the quotation of Joel’s prophecy (Acts 2:17–21) all the way through to Joel 2:32a, which speaks of salvation for all those who call on the Lord. Luke then “repeats the echo of Joel 2:32 at the end of Peter’s speech” (referring to Acts 2:39). Thereby, “Luke deliberately brackets the significance of Pentecost with the complete Joel quotation, and thus highlights the significance of the Spirit as both an inspiring power and a saving power.”⁴⁷ Dunn’s handling of Pentecost will gain fuller attention later, but for now it will suffice to observe that if Luke were deliberately seeking to echo Joel in his quotation of Peter in Acts 2:39 (“The promise is for . . . all whom the Lord our God will call”), he would have extended the quotation not merely to Joel 2:32a, but to the end of Joel 2:32 (“ . . . whom the LORD calls/has called”). This is a closer parallel than the one Dunn identifies at the start of Joel 2:32, which reads, “everyone who calls on the name of the LORD.”

In his 2010 article Dunn responds, with respect to Luke-Acts, to an article written by Roger Stronstad. This does not lead Dunn to offer

45. Dunn, “Baptism Yet Once More,” 8.

46. *Ibid.*, 9, 17.

47. *Ibid.*, 17. Dunn makes the same point more briefly in “Baptism: A Response,” 237.

much new material, but there is a little that is worthy of note here. In particular, he has now slightly altered his characterization of the Samaritan reception, recorded in Acts 8:4–24. In his 1970 book, as noted earlier in this chapter, he regarded Philip’s ministry as ineffective: when the apostles Peter and John arrived from Jerusalem, they found credulous attenders to Philip and his miracles, not believing disciples of Jesus. In 1979, replying to one of his critics, Dunn did have to acknowledge of the Samaritan episode that, “this was not the strongest part of my discussion of Acts.”⁴⁸ Yet he continued to defend his position staunchly. By 1996 he was allowing doubt, and considering two possibilities: “Whether the rationale is that the Samaritans’ faith fell short of full commitment to the Lord (8:12), or that baptism even ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus’ was in itself not enough.”⁴⁹ In 2010, however, he can write simply of the “effectiveness of Philip’s ministry,” and admit that his attempt in *Baptism* to explain the Samaritan “riddle” “may not be very successful, and need not be given much weight.”⁵⁰ However, he does not seem to concede what a “foothold” for other readings of Acts he is allowing once he acknowledges any inadequacy in his reading of this passage. This is true, however unusual the situation might have been or appeared and however urgent the remedial action of Peter and John must have been.

THE DEBATE AND DEBATERS

As I mentioned earlier in the chapter, a special session of the Society of Biblical Literature conference in New Orleans in November 2009 was devoted to Dunn’s *Baptism* and its repercussions. One of the contributors to that symposium, and therefore to the series of articles published in *JPT* 19, is the Pentecostal scholar Roger Stronstad, and it is with his reflections that I will begin my study of the debate. He considers the impact of Dunn’s *Baptism* on Pentecostalism and offers two suggestions concerning its extent: in one respect, he claims, Dunn’s work had no effect on Pentecostalism; on the other hand, “Dunn’s challenge forced Pentecostals to articulate a more sophisticated interpretation of Luke’s data about the ‘Baptism in the Holy Spirit.’”⁵¹ By his first suggestion,

48. Dunn, “They Believed Philip Preaching,” 216.

49. Dunn, *Acts*, 111.

50. Dunn, “Baptism Again,” 34 and n. 6.

51. Stronstad, “Forty Years On,” 6.

Stronstad no doubt means that we Pentecostals remain as convinced as ever by our doctrine of subsequence, despite Dunn's best efforts to convince us to the contrary. This may well be true of the great majority of Pentecostals, but Dunn has had at least one (highly prominent) convert: Max Turner.⁵² When Turner first read Dunn's book back in 1970, he found himself exclaiming, "Dunn is *wrong* on Luke."⁵³ It was Dunn's work, and Turner's disagreement with Dunn's position, that led to Turner's choice of doctoral research.⁵⁴ At this stage, as Turner researched his "Luke and the Spirit," he was "a young and enthusiastically Pentecostal student."⁵⁵ The extent to which his views altered, if at all, prior to 1980 (the date his doctoral work was submitted to the University of Cambridge) is unclear. However, as he acknowledges,⁵⁶ and Dunn notes,⁵⁷ his position has altered over the years, as he has continued to engage in the debate stimulated by Dunn's work. His evolving positions are recorded in his writing. Distinctions are discernible between his 1980 doctoral thesis, "Luke and the Spirit," and his more recent major contributions, *Power from on High* and *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, both published in 1996.

I mention Turner particularly at this stage because while he is only one of several debaters with Dunn whose work I shall review, he stands out as someone who has changed his view *and admitted it*. He is also one of the most thorough Lukan pneumatologists among those I discuss. For these twin reasons, my engagement with his views will take up what might otherwise look like an undue proportion of my attention.

Turning now to Stronstad's second suggestion concerning Dunn's impact (in short, that Dunn encouraged us Pentecostals to think),

52. Frank Macchia implies that Gordon Fee has also been influenced by Dunn in developing his view of Spirit baptism (Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit*, 68). Note too how Mittelstadt places Fee first in his list of Pentecostal responses to Dunn's *Baptism*, while admitting that Fee has not actually responded to Dunn as such. The implication is that Mittelstadt suspects at least some influence by Dunn on Fee in this area of doctrine (Mittelstadt, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 49–50). Everts records that she converted the other way: "I reread Dunn and became a Pentecostal" (Everts, "Pauline Letters," 18).

53. Turner, "James Dunn's *Baptism*," 25; italics his.

54. Turner, *Power from on High*, 11; Turner, "Luke and the Spirit," 27–28: "The questions he [Dunn] has raised are those which stimulated this research, and much of this study may be considered as a critique of Dunn's widely accepted hypothesis."

55. Turner, *Power from on High*, 11; cf. Turner, "James Dunn's *Baptism*," 25.

56. Turner, *Power from on High*, 11; Turner, "James Dunn's *Baptism*," 30.

57. Dunn, "Baptism Again," 42: "Our paths which initially had seemed to diverge quite markedly now seemed to be coming closer and closer."

Stronstad is undoubtedly right, as is attested by the very debate that this book reviews. In the earlier decades of the twentieth century, sadly, Pentecostals were not generally well known for their depth of thinking, however profound their personal experience and however dramatic their Christian commitment. For instance, Smith Wigglesworth may have spoken for many early Pentecostals when he declared, “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God—not by reading commentaries!”⁵⁸ Relatively unthinking Bible reading has been criticized from without⁵⁹ and from within: Gordon Fee has written of his fellow Pentecostals, “their attitude towards Scripture regularly has included a general disregard for scientific exegesis and carefully thought-out hermeneutics . . . In place of scientific hermeneutics there developed a kind of pragmatic hermeneutics—obey what should be taken literally; spiritualize, allegorize or devotionalize the rest.”⁶⁰

This phenomenon was perhaps widely present among earlier Pentecostals for the reason that Pentecostal church leaders had not traditionally had the access to academic teaching that was available or sought in other denominations.⁶¹ But in the later decades of the twentieth century, this situation was beginning to change fast—and Stronstad was one of the pioneers: he represented Pentecostals who retained their doctrinal and practical distinctives while engaging with other viewpoints through the rigors of academic research and writing. In fact, Stronstad’s first relevant book was hailed by Clark Pinnock in the following words:

I am quite frankly excited at the appearance of Roger Stronstad’s book *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Until now people have had to recognize Pentecostalism as a powerful force in the areas of spirituality, church growth, and world mission, but they have not felt it had much to offer for biblical, theological and intellectual foundations. But this is fast changing, and with the appearance of this book we may be seeing the first motions of a wave of intellectually convincing Pentecostal theology, which will sweep

58. Quoted by Frodsham, *Smith Wigglesworth: Apostle of Faith*, 73.

59. E.g., MacArthur, *Charismatic Chaos*, ch. 4.

60. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit*, 85–86; similarly, Fee, “Why Pentecostals Read Their Bibles Poorly.”

61. Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism*, 243. For discussion of more recent changes in Pentecostal attitudes to education, see Anderson, “Pentecostals and Academic Theology,” ch. 13.

in upon us in the next decades. Watch out you evangelicals—the young Pentecostal scholars are coming!⁶²

The benefit of some decades of hindsight allows us to judge that Pinnock was right. Furthermore, at least as regards thinking about baptism in the Spirit, Dunn's work has been real "grist to the mill" of this Pentecostal development. The extent to which Dunn's *Baptism* specifically has contributed to this keener Pentecostal thinking is significant,⁶³ and for that we Pentecostals all owe Dunn a great debt of gratitude.

Given Dunn's disappointed comments offered in 2010 and quoted a few paragraphs ago, it seems that Dunn himself may have wanted to encourage this development of Pentecostal thought. It is certainly the case that, back in 1970, he did not view every aspect of Pentecostalism with disdain: far from it. In his preface to *Baptism*, he wrote:

It will become evident that this doctrine [of baptism in the Holy Spirit] cannot escape heavy criticism from a New Testament standpoint, but I would hope also that the importance and value of the Pentecostal emphasis will not be lost sight of or ignored. In particular, the Pentecostal contribution should cause Christians in the "main-line" denominations to look afresh with critical eyes at the place they give to the Holy Spirit in doctrine and experience and in their various theologies of conversion, initiation, and baptism. And any voice which bids us test familiar traditions by the yardstick of the New Testament is to be welcomed.⁶⁴

This is praise indeed from the pen of one who regarded and regards Pentecostalism as resting on such shaky exegetical foundations! However, this reference to Dunn's praise of Pentecostalism is, of course, not to suggest that his kind words extend to Pentecostals' understanding of key passages. Dunn can happily write of New Testament passages being "a crushing rejoinder to Pentecostal ideas," or knocking "the Pentecostals' case on the head," or cutting "the ground away from under the Pentecostal."⁶⁵ No wonder Pentecostals reacted!

Over the years since its publication, then, Dunn's book has evoked a considerable Pentecostal response. It is easy to imagine that any

62. Clark Pinnock, "Foreword," in Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, vii.

63. The significance has been noted recently in Mittelstadt, *Reading Luke-Acts*, ch. 2, which he titles, "The Dunn Factor."

64. Dunn, *Baptism*, viii.

65. *Ibid.*, 107, 123, 135.

Pentecostals worth their salt writing at an academic level about Lukan pneumatology can hardly avoid making at least some reference to Dunn's work. Where it is appropriate, I will refer to their views as the book proceeds. However, in order to gain a due sense of focus and progression, I am going to concentrate particularly on those works that engage explicitly and protractedly with Dunn—and particularly with what Dunn states about Luke-Acts. This will mean reviewing six such responses, offered by the following authors, whom I will list in the chronological order of their first relevant work (either publication or academic submission).

Roger Stronstad

Stronstad is a Canadian Pentecostal, working as Associate Professor in Bible and Theology at Summit Pacific College, Abbotsford, British Columbia. Stronstad's *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*, though published in 1984, represents the earliest response to Dunn in this review, being originally submitted as a Master's thesis at Regent College in 1975.⁶⁶ Stronstad's book is neither overtly nor solely a response to Dunn. Nevertheless, such a response is a marked feature of its contents. While both Pinnock's foreword and the opening paragraph of Stronstad's own text might suggest to the reader that the book will reply equally to "two benchmark books . . . *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* by Frederick Dale Bruner and *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* by James D. G. Dunn,"⁶⁷ the former "benchmark book" is not referred to again by Stronstad, while Dunn's work is mentioned repeatedly, with more of Stronstad's end-notes referring to *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* than to any other book. He has since written *The Prophethood of All Believers*, which as its subtitle implies (*A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*) continues the theme of his earlier work, and *Baptized and Filled with the Holy Spirit*. However, they only refer minimally to Dunn.

Max Turner

Turner is Professor of New Testament Studies at the London School of Theology. His "Luke and the Spirit" was submitted to the University of Cambridge for a PhD in 1980. As I mentioned earlier, Turner reacted negatively to what Dunn had written in his *Baptism* about Luke, and this

66. Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, v.

67. *Ibid.*, 1.

disagreement affected the choice and the content of Turner's doctoral research. It was not published in full, although some of its content was published in various journal articles over the next few years. His *Power from on High* and *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* both came out in 1996. Of the two, *Power from on High* contains by far the greater detail on Luke-Acts, as is attested by its subtitle: *The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. It is not merely an updating of his doctoral work. It is that, in the sense that it includes much of the latter's content while taking note of subsequent scholarship. But as I noted earlier, it also indicates some degree of change in Turner's viewpoint from his 1980 position, and this adds particular interest to his contribution.

Howard Ervin

The late Howard Ervin (1915–2009) was a Professor of Old Testament at Oral Roberts University. Denominationally a Baptist, he experienced a “personal Pentecost” in about 1962, as someone who already had a significant theological education and a doctorate in theology.⁶⁸ After being baptized in the Spirit, he wrote *These Are Not Drunken, As Ye Suppose*, which was published in 1968. This was one of the first stoutly theological defenses of Pentecostal doctrine.

But the appearance in 1970 of Dunn's work called for a further contribution. Ervin's response to Dunn, *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, was, like Stronstad's *Charismatic Theology*, published in 1984. It is the most overt and direct reply of those under review, as the wording of the subtitle makes clear: *An Engaging Critique of James D. G. Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. He has also since rewritten *These Are Not Drunken, As Ye Suppose* under the title *Spirit-Baptism: A Biblical Investigation*, published in 1987, but in that work he makes little reference to Dunn.

David Petts

Petts was until his retirement the Principal of Mattersey Hall, the training College of the British Assemblies of God. His unpublished MTh thesis was titled, “The Baptism in the Holy Spirit in Relation to Christian Initiation.” This was submitted to The University of Nottingham in

68. Justus du Plessis, “Foreword” in Ervin, *Spirit-Baptism*, xi.

1987.⁶⁹ The second half of his work, titled “An Examination of Key NT Passages,” is a discussion of, in particular, “the now classic contribution of James Dunn along with Howard Ervin’s recent critique of Dunn’s work.”⁷⁰ Dunn’s *Baptism* is referred to constantly throughout this half of the dissertation and largely dictates the content of Petts’ work.

James Shelton

Shelton is a Professor of New Testament and Early Christian Literature at Oral Roberts University. He gained his PhD at the University of Stirling, and his work was published in 1991 under the title *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Shelton’s book contains perhaps the least direct response to Dunn’s thinking of those reviewed here. Nonetheless, his eleventh chapter, “The Holy Spirit and Believers in Acts,” and an appendix, “Jesus, John, the Spirit, and the New Age,” contain sufficient interaction to merit a brief section in this book.

Robert Menzies

Menzies is an American Pentecostal missionary, currently working in Asia. He has two books published on this topic: *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (1991) and *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (1994). In practice, the overlap between these works is so great that the latter can be considered as a republishing of the former. Menzies’ *Development* was originally a doctoral dissertation presented to the University of Aberdeen in 1989. As its name implies, it is, like Stronstad’s book, far more than just a response to Dunn. Nonetheless, a perusal of the text and footnotes of the thesis reveals the degree to which it interacts with him.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, this chapter has introduced us to the topic of the book—the Pentecostal doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit—and shown that an excellent way to study this doctrine is to review a debate that was started by James Dunn in 1970. We have seen the centrality of Spirit baptism as a doctrine to Pentecostalism, and the centrality of

69. Dunn was Petts’ external examiner for this dissertation (email message from Petts to author, July 7, 2010).

70. Petts, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” 43.

Luke-Acts in biblical studies supporting this doctrine. We have also noted the great importance of Dunn's part in the debate surrounding the doctrine. Finally, we have "met" the Pentecostals who sit around the debating table facing Dunn.

Now that I have introduced these themes and these people, I will in the next chapter focus on the Pentecostal respondents to Dunn and set out their critiques of Dunn's work. Again I will do this in chronological order of first relevant publication or academic submission. Then chapter 3 will consider the strengths and weaknesses of the various alternatives to Dunn's position that they have put forward over the years that the debate has lasted. In chapter 4, I will discuss what the findings of the book thus far imply for a view of being "baptized with the Holy Spirit" that listens to other key New Testament scriptures, not just to Luke-Acts. In chapter 5, after a summary and concluding development of the findings of previous chapters, I will consider some practical implications that arise for Pentecostalism today.

SAMPLE