

SPIRIT BAPTISM AS A DISTINCT SUBSEQUENT EXPERIENCE: A LUKAN NARRATIVE ARGUMENT FROM ACTS 8 AND ACTS 10

Gene Coppage

Independent Biblical Researcher

ABSTRACT

This article argues that Luke's narrative in Acts presents Spirit baptism as a sovereign, observable, and categorically distinct event from both initial conversion and water baptism. The primary evidence is drawn from Acts 8:4–17, where the Samaritan converts — already believing and water-baptized — had not yet received the Holy Spirit until the apostles Peter and John arrived and laid hands upon them. This is corroborated by Acts 10:44–48, where the Spirit fell upon the household of Cornelius sovereignly and prior to water baptism, with tongues serving as the observable evidence of reception in both accounts. The article further argues that the geographical and historical context of each event is decisive: Jerusalem at Pentecost hosted a mandatory pilgrimage feast drawing diaspora Jews from sixteen regions, making the Acts 2 linguistic tongues miracle uniquely fitted to that audience; the city of Samaria, by contrast, hosted no such gathering, eliminating the conditions required for tongues to function as a foreign-language instrument. The consistent variable across Acts 8 and Acts 10 — despite their reversed sequences — is the unmistakable separateness of Spirit reception as a datable, witnessed, sovereign event. This convergence of textual, geographical, and sequential evidence constitutes a substantive exegetical case that Spirit baptism is neither simultaneous with conversion nor sacramentally embedded in water baptism.

Keywords: Spirit baptism; Acts 8; Acts 10; Pentecost; tongues; Lukan pneumatology; two-stage initiation; laying on of hands; Cornelius; Samaritan mission

I. INTRODUCTION

The question of whether Spirit baptism constitutes a distinct subsequent experience from initial salvation has occupied New Testament scholarship for more than a century, generating substantial disagreement among exegetes, systematicians, and Pentecostal theologians alike. The debate pivots chiefly on the interpretation of Luke's pneumatological narrative in Acts, and particularly on whether the sequence of events in Acts 8:4–17 represents a normative pattern or an anomalous exception.

The most influential treatment of this question remains James D. G. Dunn's *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (1970), which argues that Acts 8 presents a defective or incomplete faith on the part of the Samaritans, rendering the delayed Spirit reception a correction of inadequate conversion rather than evidence of a two-stage pattern.¹ Dunn's position has been challenged at length by Howard M. Ervin, whose *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (1984) contends that Luke employs standard conversion terminology for the Samaritans and that Dunn's defective-faith hypothesis imports assumptions the text does not supply.² More recently, Max Turner's *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (1996) has attempted a mediating position, acknowledging the complexity of Luke's pneumatology while resisting classical Pentecostal conclusions.³ Turner argues that Luke's pneumatology does not support a rigid two-stage initiation pattern as a universal norm,

contending that Acts 8 is better understood as an exceptional case shaped by the unusual circumstances of the Samaritan mission. The present article engages Turner's reading directly in section IV, arguing that the geographical and historical conditions of the Samaritan context -- conditions Turner does not treat in detail -- provide independent evidence that Acts 8 cannot be dismissed as anomalous without accounting for why the Spirit's observable reception there bore none of the features the linguistic-only tongues position requires.

Two further works shape the present article's framing. Roger Stronstad's *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (1984) argues that Luke develops a pneumatological agenda distinct from Paul's, in which the Spirit functions primarily as the empowering presence for prophetic witness rather than the agent of soteriological transformation -- a reading that supports the two-stage pattern by grounding it in Lukan theology itself rather than in imposed Pauline categories.⁴ Robert Menzies's *Empowered for Witness* (1994) extends Stronstad's thesis, arguing that Spirit baptism in Luke-Acts is consistently missiological in character -- the empowering of already-converted believers for proclamation -- which directly accounts for the command to wait in Acts 1:4-8 even though the disciples were genuinely converted before Pentecost.⁵ The present article builds upon both Stronstad and Menzies while advancing a geographical argument neither scholar develops.

The present article does not rehearse the full history of this debate. It proposes instead a contribution that has received insufficient attention in the existing literature: a geographical and sequential argument drawn

from the specific historical contexts of Acts 8 and Acts 10. When the physical locations, the populations present, and the narrative sequences of these two accounts are examined together, they yield a convergent case for Spirit baptism's categorical distinctness that does not depend on any single disputed text and cannot be neutralized by appealing to sequence alone.

The argument proceeds in five stages: (1) an exegesis of Acts 8:4–17 establishing the Samaritans' genuine conversion status prior to Spirit reception; (2) an analysis of what Simon the Sorcerer's physical sight in Acts 8:18 requires of the manifestation; (3) a geographical argument contrasting Jerusalem at Pentecost with the city of Samaria; (4) an examination of Acts 10:44–48 as corroborating evidence from a reversed sequence; and (5) conclusions regarding the implications for Lukan pneumatology and the tongues question.

II. THE SAMARITAN MISSION AND THE DELAYED SPIRIT: ACTS 8:4–17

A. The Conversion Status of the Samaritans

The narrative of Acts 8 presents Philip the Evangelist — explicitly identified by Luke in Acts 21:8 as distinct from Philip the Apostle of Acts 1:13⁸ — preaching Christ in a city of Samaria. The crowd's response is described in terms Luke employs consistently throughout Acts for genuine conversion:

But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. (Acts 8:12)⁹

The verb *episteusan* — they believed — is Luke's standard conversion term. Craig Keener observes that Luke uses this construction throughout Acts to denote genuine saving faith, and that there is no grammatical or contextual signal in Acts 8:12 to suggest the Samaritans' faith was defective or incomplete.¹⁰ Dunn's contention that the Samaritans' belief was inadequate rests on the proximity of Simon's superficial faith in verse 13, but as Ervin notes, Luke employs the same verb for both without qualification — the narrative burden of distinguishing them falls on subsequent events, not on any lexical signal attached to the initial description.¹¹

The Samaritans, on the plain reading of Acts 8:12, were genuinely converted and water-baptized believers. This is the foundation upon which the two-stage argument rests, and it must be secured before proceeding.

B. The Theological Force of Acts 8:16

When the Jerusalem church dispatched Peter and John to Samaria upon hearing that the region had received the word of God, Luke inserts a parenthetical statement of decisive theological weight:

For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. (Acts 8:16)

This verse accomplishes three exegetical functions simultaneously. First, it confirms the validity of the Samaritans' water baptism — Luke does not question or relativize it. Second, it establishes that the Spirit had not yet been received — the aorist *epepistei* with the particle *oudepō* ("not yet") presents Spirit reception as a future event from the vantage point of their water baptism.¹² Third, and most significantly, the verse implies no auto-

matic or inevitable connection between water baptism and Spirit reception: the baptism had occurred; the Spirit had not come.

For any pneumatological model that collapses conversion, water baptism, and Spirit baptism into a single simultaneous event, Acts 8:16 constitutes a direct textual obstacle. The Samaritans were saved. They were water-baptized. They had not received the Spirit. Peter and John traveled from Jerusalem specifically to administer what Philip had not — and what the Samaritans did not yet possess. These are sequential, distinguishable, textually attested events separated by time, geography, and the identity of the administering ministers.

The separation in Acts 8 is fourfold: separated in *time* (the apostles arrived subsequent to Philip's ministry); separated in *ministers* (Philip administered one thing, the apostles another); separated in *geography* (the apostles traveled from Jerusalem expressly to administer what was lacking); and separated by *Luke's own explicit parenthetical statement*. No other passage in Acts provides all four forms of separation simultaneously.

C. The Laying On of Hands as the Vehicle of Impartation

The mechanism of Spirit reception in Acts 8:17 is the laying on of hands: Peter and John prayed, laid hands upon the Samaritans, and they received the Holy Spirit. This gesture carries deep precedent in both the Old Testament and Second Temple Jewish practice, functioning as a gesture of blessing, ordination, identification, and transmission.¹³ In Numbers 27:18–23, Moses laid hands on Joshua to transfer authority. The gesture always implied contact and transfer.

The text records the result without ambiguity: *elambanon pneuma hagon* — they were receiving the Holy Spirit. The imperfect tense here may suggest a progressive reception as hands were laid on each individual in turn, lending further weight to the visible and datable character of the event.¹⁴

A question the text raises but does not resolve is why Philip — himself demonstrably Spirit-empowered — did not impart the Spirit to those he had led to faith. Luke provides no explicit answer. However, his deliberate identification of the two administrators as apostles from Jerusalem, combined with his careful authorial distinction between the two Philips, suggests that the apostolic office carried particular weight in this instance. The case of Ananias in Acts 9:17, who was not an apostle yet laid hands on Paul for Spirit reception, establishes that apostolic office was not an absolute universal requirement — something specific to the Samaritan situation appears to have warranted apostolic involvement, likely the historically and ethnically unprecedented character of Samaritans receiving the Jewish Messiah.¹⁵

III. SIMON'S PHYSICAL SIGHT AND THE OBSERVABLE MANIFESTATION: ACTS 8:18–19

The narrative reaches its most exegetically productive moment in verse 18. Simon, observing Peter and John administer the laying on of hands, responds by offering money for the ability to replicate what he has witnessed:

And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money. (Acts 8:18)

The verb Luke employs is *eidon* (aorist of *horaō*) — to perceive with the physical eyes, to behold visually. This term denotes actual visual perception, not inference or spiritual discernment.¹⁶ Simon did not conclude from contextual evidence that the Spirit had been given. He saw it. The logical implication is exegetically inescapable: if Simon saw the Spirit given, something physically observable accompanied the giving. The Spirit itself is invisible; what Simon's eyes apprehended was the observable effect of the Spirit's reception.

The significance of Simon's professional background must not be minimized. Acts 8:9–11 establishes that Simon had sustained his influence over the Samaritan population "of long time" through sorcery — he was an experienced practitioner of supernatural phenomena, not an untrained observer. His instinct upon witnessing the event was not skepticism but commercial assessment: he recognized a power operating on a categorically different level from anything in his repertoire and sought to acquire it by the mechanism of his trade.

The consistent pattern of Acts identifies tongues as the observable evidence of Spirit reception: at Pentecost (Acts 2:4), at Caesarea (Acts 10:46), and at Ephesus (Acts 19:6). Acts 8 does not name tongues explicitly in connection with the Samaritan reception, but the pattern strongly implies it. More importantly for the present argument, whatever the manifestation was, it was undeniable, repeatable from case to case, and recognizable to a

veteran of supernatural manipulation as something genuinely beyond his craft.

IV. THE GEOGRAPHICAL ARGUMENT: JERUSALEM AND SAMARIA CONTRASTED

A. Jerusalem at Pentecost: The Feast Context

The Acts 2 Pentecost event occurred in Jerusalem during the feast of Shavuot — one of the three mandatory pilgrimage festivals of the Mosaic calendar requiring the presence of every Jewish male before the Lord in Jerusalem (Deut 16:16). The result was an annually recurring phenomenon of extraordinary cultural and linguistic diversity: diaspora Jews from across the Roman Empire and beyond converged on Jerusalem three times yearly, and Shavuot was among the most heavily attended.¹⁷

Acts 2:9–11 enumerates sixteen distinct regions represented in the Pentecost crowd: Parthia, Media, Elam, Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, Libya, Cyrene, Rome, Crete, and Arabia. Joachim Jeremias's landmark study of Jerusalem's festival population estimates that Passover alone brought several hundred thousand pilgrims to the city; Pentecost drew comparable numbers.¹⁸ This was the most internationally diverse Jewish assembly in the ancient world, produced three times annually by covenantal obligation.

The linguistic miracle of Acts 2 was precisely calibrated to this audience. When the disciples spoke in tongues, every regional group present heard the wonderful works of God declared in their own native dialect — *tais hēmeterais glōssais*, in our own languages (Acts 2:11). The sign served a

global evangelistic function in a single moment because the globally representative audience had been assembled in one place by the Law's own requirements. Paul's interpretive gloss in 1 Corinthians 14:22 — that tongues are a sign to unbelievers — finds its perfect historical referent here: this was a sign to unbelieving Israel, delivered at the moment of maximum international Jewish presence.

B. The City of Samaria: The Absence of All Feast Conditions

The contrast between Jerusalem at Pentecost and the Samaritan city of Acts 8 is total and historically verifiable. Samaria was a region inhabited by a population of mixed Israelite and foreign descent following the Assyrian conquest of the northern kingdom in 722 BCE — a population that had developed its own religious calendar centered on Mount Gerizim rather than Jerusalem.¹⁹ Samaritan worship practices did not align with the pilgrimage feasts of Leviticus 23. There was no Samaritan equivalent of Shavuot that drew international Jewish pilgrimage.

More decisively, the mutual hostility between Jews and Samaritans — documented in the Synoptic tradition (Luke 9:52–53), the Johannine narrative (John 4:9), and extensively in Josephus²⁰ — meant that observant Jews avoided Samaritan territory wherever possible. The common practice of Galilean Jews traveling to Jerusalem by the longer eastern route across the Jordan specifically to bypass Samaria is attested in Josephus and reflected in the New Testament narratives.²¹ Samaria was not a destination for Jewish pilgrimage; it was a territory that devout Jews circumvented.

The population present when the Holy Spirit fell upon the Samaritans in Acts 8 was, by every textual and historical indication, a local Samaritan population. Acts 8:9 identifies Simon as one who had long bewitched "the people of Samaria" — the local inhabitants. There is no textual indication of diaspora visitors, no feast context, no multilingual international assembly. The conditions that made the Acts 2 linguistic miracle both possible and purposeful as a sign are entirely absent.

C. The Unanswerable Question

This geographical contrast poses a question that the linguistic-only interpretation of tongues cannot answer: if tongues in Acts 8 served as a foreign-language instrument for evangelism among foreigners — who were the foreigners? The text names none. The historical context supplies none. The location had none.

Yet Simon saw an unmistakable manifestation. The verb *eidon* demands it. Something physically observable occurred in a location where no multilingual foreign audience existed to receive a linguistic sign. The geographical evidence thus independently corroborates what the Acts pattern already suggests: the tongues accompanying Spirit reception in Acts 8 — whether explicitly named or implied — functioned not as a foreign-language instrument but as the observable evidence of the Spirit's sovereign arrival, directed Godward rather than manward, consistent with Paul's description in 1 Corinthians 14:2 of an utterance that "no man understandeth."

Turner's mediating reading of Acts 8 as an exceptional case does not engage this geographical dimension. Turner acknowledges the ethnic and religious distinctiveness of the Samaritans as contextually significant but does not develop the implication that the city's conditions eliminate the preconditions necessary for the linguistic-only tongues interpretation to hold.²² If the Spirit's observable reception in Samaria produced tongues, those tongues cannot have functioned as a foreign-language instrument in a location with no foreign-language audience. Notably, Turner's own exceptional-case argument strengthens rather than weakens this conclusion: if Acts 8 is exceptional, its exceptionalism lies in the Samaritans' ethnic and religious identity -- not in the nature of the tongues that accompanied Spirit reception. The tongues in Samaria were exceptional only in that they occurred where no linguistic sign to foreigners was possible, which independently confirms the non-linguistic function of tongues as Spirit-reception evidence.

Stronstad's reading of Lukan pneumatology as prophetic and missiological provides additional support.²³ If Luke presents the Spirit consistently as the empowering presence for prophetic witness, then tongues as the observable evidence of that empowering makes coherent sense in Samaria without any foreign-language audience: the evidence confirmed the Spirit's arrival for the witnesses present -- Peter, John, and Simon -- not for foreign listeners who did not exist.

This geographical argument is, to the author's knowledge, underrepresented in the existing scholarly literature on Acts 8 and the tongues question, and it constitutes the primary original contribution of the present arti-

cle. Neither Dunn, Ervin, Turner, Stronstad, nor Menzies develops the Samaritan location's historical and demographic character as a systematic argument against the linguistic-only tongues position. The argument stands independent of the two-stage debate and would hold even for a reader who remained agnostic on the question of normative Spirit baptism sequencing.

V. ACTS 10:44–48 AS CORROBORATING EVIDENCE: THE REVERSED SEQUENCE

The account of Cornelius's household in Acts 10 provides powerful corroboration for the categorical distinctness of Spirit baptism, precisely because it works in the opposite sequence from Acts 8. In Samaria, the Samaritans believed first, were water-baptized second, and received the Spirit third — through the laying on of hands as a subsequent event. In Caesarea, the Spirit fell upon Cornelius and his household sovereignly while Peter was still mid-proclamation, prior to any laying on of hands and prior to water baptism:

While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. (Acts 10:44–46)

Several features of this account merit careful attention. First, the Jewish believers who accompanied Peter recognized the event not because they were told about it but because they heard the Gentiles speak in tongues and magnify God — the same observable auditory evidence that marked Spirit reception in Acts 2. Second, Peter's immediate response is instructive: "Can

any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts 10:47). Water baptism is presented not as the vehicle of Spirit reception but as the proper response to it — the public seal of what had already sovereignly occurred. Third, the Jewish believers' astonishment signals that this event was recognizable, unexpected, and unmistakable — precisely the qualities of a distinct, datable, observable occurrence.

When Acts 8 and Acts 10 are placed in deliberate juxtaposition, the theological conclusion emerges with particular force. Spirit reception preceded water baptism at Caesarea. Spirit reception followed water baptism in Samaria. In both cases the event was distinct, observable, and separable from every other element of Christian initiation. The sequence varied; the separateness was absolute in both accounts.

This cross-sequential consistency is the strongest possible form of the argument because it cannot be neutralized by appealing to order. A critic who argues that Spirit baptism always follows water baptism is refuted by Acts 10. A critic who argues that it always precedes water baptism is refuted by Acts 8. What neither objection can address is that in both accounts, across both sequences, under different cultural conditions (Jewish converts in Samaria; Gentile converts in Caesarea), with different human instruments (apostolic laying on of hands; sovereign unmediated outpouring), Spirit baptism was a witnessed, recognized, and categorically distinct event.

Luke, writing both accounts, presents this variation in sequence not as a contradiction but as a deliberate demonstration of the Spirit's

sovereignty. Spirit baptism is not a sacramental event embedded in a fixed ritual sequence — it is a sovereign divine act, administered when and how God determines, always distinct, always observable, always separable from the moment of conversion itself.

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR LUKAN PNEUMATOLOGY AND THE TONGUES QUESTION

A. Spirit Baptism and Conversion: A Necessary Distinction

The evidence assembled above supports a distinction within Lukan pneumatology between two operations of the Spirit that are real, genuine, and separable. The Spirit's work in regeneration and indwelling at conversion — what Paul describes in Romans 8:9 as the Spirit of Christ dwelling in the believer — is attested across the Pauline corpus as a universal mark of genuine salvation. This is not in dispute.

Menzies's missiological reading is particularly illuminating here. If Luke presents the Spirit consistently as the empowering presence for prophetic proclamation rather than the agent of regeneration, then the command to wait in Acts 1:4-8 is not a delay of soteriological completion but the withholding of missiological equipment from believers who are genuinely saved but not yet equipped for worldwide witness.²⁴ Acts 1:8 -- "ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses" -- becomes on Menzies's reading Luke's programmatic pneumatological statement: Spirit baptism is the missiological empowering of already-converted disciples for gospel proclamation confirmed by signs. This reading does not require abandoning the soteriological significance of

the Spirit's work in conversion; it requires distinguishing two operations of the same Spirit with different functions -- precisely what the narrative evidence of Acts 8 and Acts 10 supports.

Stronstad's contribution reinforces this distinction from a different angle. His argument that Luke's pneumatology is rooted in the Old Testament prophetic spirit tradition -- the Spirit that came upon Moses, the elders, Elijah, Elisha, and the writing prophets for specific acts of empowered proclamation -- rather than in Pauline indwelling soteriology, provides a hermeneutical framework within which the two-stage pattern is not a theological puzzle to be explained away but the expected structural feature of Spirit-activity in Luke's narrative world.²⁵ On Stronstad's reading the Samaritans' prior conversion and subsequent Spirit reception is not anomalous -- it is precisely what the Lukan pneumatological pattern would predict.

What Luke's narrative in Acts presents as a further, distinct operation is the Spirit "falling upon," "being poured out upon," and "coming upon" believers — language consistently different from indwelling, describing an event characterized by observable, audible manifestation, recognizable by witnesses, and separable from both the moment of conversion and the moment of water baptism. The disciples of Acts 1 were genuinely converted before Pentecost; they were commanded to wait in Jerusalem for something they did not yet have (Acts 1:4–8). That command is inexplicable if Spirit baptism were simultaneous with and inseparable from their prior conversion.

B. The Tongues Pattern Across Acts

The examination of Acts 8 in its geographical context has direct implications for the broader tongues question. The Acts 2 linguistic miracle — known human languages recognized by foreign listeners — was uniquely fitted to the Pentecost pilgrimage assembly. The subsequent tongues accounts in Acts (chapters 8, 10, and 19) share no such conditions: no multilingual pilgrimage crowd, no foreign listeners identifying native languages, no evangelistic linguistic function described. What they share is the consistent role of tongues as the observable evidence of Spirit reception — directed Godward, as Paul specifies in 1 Corinthians 14:2, rather than functioning as a communicative instrument to human hearers.

This distinction between the Acts 2 linguistic sign and the Acts pattern of tongues as Spirit-reception evidence is supported by Paul's own description of the congregational tongue in 1 Corinthians 14:2: the speaker addresses God, "no man understandeth," and speaks "mysteries in the spirit." This description is logically incompatible with a known human language: every known human language has native speakers who would understand it, rendering Paul's "no man understandeth" impossible if a recognized human language were in view. The unknown tongue Paul regulates in the congregational setting belongs to a categorically different order — a Spirit-given utterance that bypasses human linguistic comprehension by design.

VII. CONCLUSION

This article has argued that Luke's narrative in Acts presents Spirit baptism as a sovereign, observable, and categorically distinct event from both initial conversion and water baptism. The primary textual evidence is Acts 8:14–17, where the Samaritans' genuine conversion and water baptism are affirmed by Luke's own language, and the subsequent Spirit reception through apostolic laying on of hands is presented as a distinct sequential event separated by time, geography, ministers, and Luke's explicit parenthetical statement. Acts 8:18 adds a further exegetical constraint: the verb *eidon* requires a physically observable manifestation, and Simon's professional background as an experienced manipulator of supernatural phenomena lends credibility to his recognition of a categorically superior event.

The geographical argument advanced in section IV constitutes the article's primary original contribution. The city of Samaria lacked every condition that made the Acts 2 linguistic tongues miracle both possible and purposeful — no pilgrimage feast, no diaspora assembly, no multilingual foreign audience. Yet Spirit reception occurred with unmistakable observable evidence. This independently confirms that the tongues accompanying Spirit reception in Acts functioned primarily as the evidence of the Spirit's arrival rather than as a foreign-language instrument, with the Acts 2 linguistic sign representing a unique and unrepeated phenomenon fitted to a unique historical and covenantal moment.

Acts 10:44–48 corroborates the argument from a reversed sequence. The Spirit preceded water baptism at Caesarea just as it followed water baptism in Samaria. The variable was the sequence; the constant was the

separateness and observability of the event. This cross-sequential consistency constitutes the strongest possible form of the two-stage argument: it cannot be neutralized by sequence-based objections from either direction, and it demonstrates that Spirit baptism bears no fixed sacramental relationship to any ordinance but is rather the sovereign act of God, administered according to His own purposes, always distinct, always recognizable, and never identical with the moment of initial conversion.

NOTES

1. James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today* (London: SCM Press, 1970), 55–72. Dunn's defective-faith hypothesis rests primarily on the observation that *episteusan* in Acts 8:12 is not accompanied by the phrase "in the Lord" (*en tō kyriō*), which he takes as a signal of inadequate Christological commitment. This grammatical argument has been widely criticized; see the response in n. 2 below.
2. Howard M. Ervin, *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: An Engaging Critique of James D. G. Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 19–38. Ervin demonstrates that Luke uses *episteusan* without the qualifying phrase "in the Lord" in numerous unambiguous conversion contexts throughout Acts and that Dunn's lexical criterion is not consistently applied by Luke himself.
3. Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: In the New Testament Church and Today*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998), 38–55, 157–81. Turner acknowledges the narrative distinctness of Spirit reception in Luke-Acts while resisting the classical Pentecostal conclusion that this establishes a normative two-stage pattern for all believers in all times.
4. Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984), 1–20, 49–62. Stronstad argues that Luke's pneumatology is rooted in the Old Testament prophetic spirit tradition — the Spirit that came upon leaders and prophets for specific acts of empowered proclamation — and must be interpreted on its own terms rather than read through Pauline categories. This produces a pneumatology in

which Spirit baptism is the missiological empowering of already-converted believers rather than a component of soteriological initiation.

5. Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 37–52, 182–205. Menzies extends Stronstad's thesis with detailed analysis of the Jewish pneumatological background of Luke-Acts, arguing that Luke consistently presents the Spirit as the agent of prophetic empowerment for mission rather than the agent of conversion or regeneration, and that this missiological reading is the key to understanding both Acts 1:4–8 and the two-stage pattern of Acts 8.
8. Luke explicitly identifies the Philip of Acts 8 as "Philip the evangelist, which was one of the seven" in Acts 21:8, distinguishing him from Philip the apostle listed among the eleven in Acts 1:13. The two men have been historically confused; Luke's double identification in Acts 21:8 — by title (*ho euangelistēs*) and by office (one of the seven deacons of Acts 6:5) — constitutes a deliberate authorial clarification. See F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, NICNT, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 163.
9. All Scripture citations are from the King James Version (public domain). Greek citations are based on the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012).
10. Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012–2015), 2:1527–29. Keener notes that the combination of *episteusan* with the dative object "Philip preaching" follows Luke's standard pattern for genuine conversion responses throughout Acts (cf. Acts 4:4; 13:12; 14:1; 17:12, 34).
11. Ervin, *Conversion-Initiation*, 24–27. Ervin argues compellingly that Luke's use of identical vocabulary for Simon's belief in 8:13 (*episteusen kai autos*) does not resolve the question of genuineness for either party but rather invites the reader to assess both on the basis of subsequent behavior — precisely what the narrative does in 8:18–23.
12. The construction *oudepō gar ēn ep' oudeni autōn epipeptōkos* uses the periphrastic pluperfect with *oudepō* to emphasize the completeness of the Spirit's absence up to that moment. William F. Arndt, Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), s.v. *oudepō*.
13. On the theology and practice of laying on of hands in the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism, see David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), 224–46; and more recently, John Poirier, "The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15 (2005): 123–50.
14. John B. Polhill, *Acts*, NAC 26 (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1992), 220. Polhill notes the imperfect *elambanon* as potentially indicating a sequential reception as each

individual received the laying on of hands, lending the event a progressively observable character visible to all present.

15. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 284–86, suggests the apostolic presence served an ecclesiological validation function — the Jerusalem church formally acknowledging the inclusion of Samaritans in the covenant community, thus preventing a potentially divisive schism along ethnic lines in the earliest decades of the church.
16. BDAG, s.v. *horaō*: "to see, catch sight of, notice"; distinguished from *theōreō* (sustained observation) and *blepō* (physical visual faculty). The aorist *eidon* denotes a specific act of visual perception at a point in time. Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940), s.v. *horaō*, confirms the primary sense as physical visual apprehension.
17. On the pilgrimage feast obligations and their demographic implications for Jerusalem, see E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE* (London: SCM Press, 1992), 128–38; and S. Safrai, "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period," in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, ed. O. Michel et al. (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969), 12–21.
18. Joachim Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, trans. F. H. and C. H. Cave (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 77–84. Jeremias estimates a festival population substantially exceeding the city's resident population, drawing pilgrims from throughout the diaspora.
19. On the origins and religious identity of the Samaritans, see Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 1–35; and James D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968).
20. Josephus documents the depth of Jewish-Samaritan hostility in multiple passages; see *Jewish Antiquities* 9.288–291; 18.29–30; *Jewish War* 2.232–233. The antagonism had roots extending to the post-exilic period and the refusal of Samaritan participation in the Jerusalem temple restoration (Ezra 4:1–5).
21. Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 20.118, describes Galilean Jews traveling through Samaria for pilgrimage and the hostility they encountered. John 4:4 — "he must needs go through Samaria" — is often read as noting an unusual route choice by Jesus, implying the more common avoidance. See Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, AB 29 (New York: Doubleday, 1966), 1:169.
22. Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 157–62, acknowledges the Samaritans' ethnic distinctiveness as contextually significant but does not develop the demographic and geographical conditions of the location as bearing on the tongues question. His treat-

ment focuses on the ecclesiological rationale for the apostolic visit rather than on what the absence of a multilingual pilgrimage audience implies for the nature of the tongues that accompanied Spirit reception. This lacuna is precisely the space the present article's geographical argument occupies.

23. Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 49–62. Stronstad's analysis of the Samaritan Pentecost, as he terms it, emphasizes the prophetic character of Spirit reception and its observable evidence as confirmation of the Spirit's arrival for missiological purposes — an interpretation that coheres naturally with a non-pilgrimage, non-multilingual setting where the evidence served those immediately present rather than a foreign audience.
24. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*, 182–205. Menzies's exegesis of Acts 1:4–8 is particularly germane: he argues that the disciples' command to wait cannot be explained by a soteriological model of Spirit baptism since their conversion is not in question, and must therefore reflect a missiological model in which the Spirit's coming upon them is the specific equipment for the witness task Jesus commissions. This reading makes the two-stage pattern not an anomaly to be defended but the expected structural feature of Luke's pneumatological narrative.
25. Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, 11–28. Stronstad traces the Lukan pneumatological tradition through the transfer of the prophetic spirit from Moses to the seventy elders (Num 11:24–29), from Elijah to Elisha (2 Kgs 2:9–15), and through the writing prophets, arguing that this tradition — rather than Pauline soteriology — is the interpretive matrix for Luke's presentation of the Spirit in Acts. On this reading the Samaritans' prior conversion and subsequent Spirit reception is not theologically problematic but structurally anticipated by the Old Testament prophetic pattern Luke consciously employs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arndt, William F., Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. Anchor Bible 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Book of the Acts*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

- Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone Press, 1956.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*. London: SCM Press, 1970.
- Ervin, Howard M. *Conversion-Initiation and the Baptism in the Holy Spirit: An Engaging Critique of James D. G. Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. Translated by F. H. and C. H. Cave. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- . *Jewish War*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012–2015.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Poirier, John. "The Laying on of Hands in the New Testament." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15 (2005): 123–50.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. New American Commentary 26. Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1992.
- Pummer, Reinhard. *The Samaritans: A Profile*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Purvis, James D. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Safrai, S. "Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period." Pages 12–21 in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Edited by O. Michel et al. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.
- Menzies, Robert P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.

Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.

Turner, Max. *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: In the New Testament Church and Today*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998.

Witherington, Ben, III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Unpublished manuscript. Submitted for peer review. Original work not previously published.