
A table of contents for *Vox Evangelica* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_vox_evangelica.php

THE SPIRIT IN LUKE-ACTS: A SUPPORT OR A CHALLENGE TO CLASSICAL PENTECOSTAL PARADIGMS?[1]

MAX TURNER

As is well-known, the classical Pentecostal paradigms (excepting that, for example, of Oneness Pentecostalism) separate conversional 'salvation' from subsequent 'baptism in the Holy Spirit'. The latter is usually viewed essentially as empowering for mission. Such views build four-square on Luke-Acts. Two developments within recent Pentecostal New Testament scholarship itself emphasise this: on the one hand, Gordon Fee has agreed with Dunn[2] that, in Paul, reception of the gift of the Spirit in conversion-initiation is vital to the experience of all aspects of Christian existence and service.[3] For Fee, the gift of the Spirit cannot be reduced to some second-stage 'baptism in the Holy Spirit', and, indeed, Paul knows of no such distinct *second* gift of the Spirit, granted as empowering for mission. On the other hand, the most capable New Testament scholar to defend the classical Pentecostal distinction between saving conversion and subsequent baptism in the Holy Spirit is Robert Menzies.[4] But he too admits such a view cannot be found in Paul or John (except by poor exegesis). *It is, rather, Luke's own distinctive contribution to New Testament Theology.*[5] So the leading Pentecostal New Testament experts agree: if the classical doctrine of

---

1 A presentation given to the Pentecostal and Charismatic Research Fellowship held at Regents Park Theological College, Nantwich, December 1996. I have attempted to keep within the constraints of that address, and offer minimal footnoting. This naturally means the descriptions of positions and the arguments which follow lack any resemblance of nuance. For a much more detailed account see my *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, JPTS 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

2 J.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, 1970).

3 Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994). I am informed Fee's affiliations are now Baptist.

4 Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology With Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, JSNTS 54 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JPTS 6 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

5 See Robert P. Menzies, 'The Distinctive Character of Luke's Pneumatology', *Paraclete* 25 (1991), 17-30.

subsequent 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' is to be found at all, it is to be found in Luke's writings.

This paper enquires to what extent Luke can be said to have held such a view. Do the findings of recent research in Luke-Acts support or challenge the classical paradigms? We shall first look at the main arguments used to substantiate the usual Pentecostal interpretation of the Spirit in Acts. For this purpose, I shall look at the strongest case, namely that put forward by Menzies in his doctoral dissertation, recently published in two different editions. Then I shall review his arguments in the light of my own research.

I. MENZIES' DEFENCE OF THE CLASSICAL PENTECOSTAL PARADIGM

As with any good piece of scholarship, Menzies' writing collects the best of the arguments before him and develops them with originality and critical acumen. We can represent his basic position in the following cardinal assertions.

(1) *Christianity emerged from a Jewish context that understood the Spirit almost exclusively as what has been called the 'Spirit of prophecy'.* That is (according to Menzies), Jews, at the time of Jesus, tended to think of the Spirit as giving revelation and inspired speech – little else.[6] They did not think reception of the Spirit was necessary for the salvation of the individual, for in the past such a gift had only been given to a few (chiefly prophets, leaders and kings), and then as a prophetic empowering through which to lead and direct the nation. Only a few pockets of Judaism (e.g., the writers of the Qumran hymnal and of the Wisdom of Solomon) thought reception of the Spirit would transform the receiver ethically and so bring him or her 'salvation' – and these writings (Menzies alleges) were fifteen or more years after Pentecost.[7] The rest either ignored Ezekiel 36 or interpreted it to mean God would first save Israel and then subsequently give her the Spirit of prophecy. Earliest Christianity, according to Menzies, naturally upheld this view, because they had no reason to change it. Paul advanced his 'new' view – that the gift of the Spirit was necessary to *save* the believer – at least in part as a result of reading the then recently-published Wisdom of Solomon. Luke was closer to the pre-Pauline mainstream. Thus:

6 See Menzies' detailed and careful study in *Development*, chs. 2-5.

7 A post-Christian dating of the Qumran hymns is, however, problematic, especially of those thought to have been composed by the Teacher of Righteousness.

(2) *Luke 1-2 clearly presents the beginning of the hoped-for return of the 'Spirit of prophecy' to Israel,* after the relative 'quiet' of the inter-testamental period. Elizabeth, Zechariah, John the Baptist (from the womb), Simeon, and possibly Mary, all receive the Spirit as the giver of *prophetic* gifts.[8]

(3) *Luke 3-4 decisively represents Jesus as receiving the 'Spirit of prophecy' as the power to announce Israel's salvation.* Dunn had earlier argued (against Pentecostals) that Jesus' reception of the Spirit at his Jordan baptism was essentially the beginning of his 'new covenant' experience of 'sonship'. Through this gift Jesus first began to experience the kingdom of God in his own life, and his experience was to become the pattern for those receiving the Spirit, but only *after* Pentecost. Menzies rightly rejects this: it is clear from Luke 1:32-35 and 2:41-52 that Jesus already experienced a type of 'eschatological sonship' to God that went beyond even what Christians receive *after* Pentecost.[9] So what did Jesus' Jordan experience add? It could only be some type of 'empowering for service'. More specifically, it was his empowering as messianic 'Son of God' (hence the allusion to Ps. 2:7) and 'Servant' (cf. the allusion to Isa. 42:1-2) to proclaim the messianic 'good news'. Luke 4:16-21 clarifies Jesus' own understanding of his baptismal experience as a prophetic empowering to proclaim to Israel her eschatological 'release' from bondage to new life.[10] Unlike many Pentecostals, however, Menzies insists that because Luke has returned to the Jewish concept of the Spirit as the 'Spirit of prophecy', he is unwilling to attribute Jesus' acts of power (e.g., healings and exorcisms) to the Spirit, even though Jesus himself, Mark and Matthew had freely done so.

(4) *The key transitional passages between Luke and Acts (Luke 24:46-49 and Acts 1:5-8) anticipate the Spirit as the 'Spirit of prophecy' empowering the apostolic witness which will divide Israel into 'the (saved) church' and 'Judaism-under-judgment'.* That is, for Menzies, Luke interprets John's promise of a messianic 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' as the enabling to 'sift' the wheat of empirical Israel into the grain (= 'true Israel') that is to be kept and chaff (= unbelieving Israel) which is to be burned. Luke 24:49 highlights the Spirit as 'power from on high' to witness, and Acts 1:5-8 confirms this and links it with the Baptist's promise.[11]

(5) *The Pentecost account (Acts 2:1-40) focuses the gift of the Spirit as the fulfilment of Joel's promise of the 'Spirit of prophecy' to all God's people, and*

8 See Menzies, *Development*, ch. 6.

9 Menzies, *Development*, ch. 6.

10 Menzies, *Development*, ch. 8.

11 Menzies, *Development*, 198-204.

the reception of this as the powerful inspiration of witness to Jesus. Whatever the misunderstandings of the disciples within Jesus' ministry, the resurrection appearances themselves, along with the crucial and extensive pre-ascension instruction by Jesus (40 days!; so Acts 1:3), assure that by the ascension the apostolic band are true 'believers'. The promised gift of the Spirit cannot bring them salvation; they have already received this. The parallels with Jesus' Jordan experience (the Spirit descending with sight and sound from heaven to people in prayer) suggests rather the Spirit comes as an empowering *like* his to proclaim good news. This is confirmed by Peter's appeal to *Joel's* promise (Joel 3:1-5 (MT + LXX); 2:28-32 (EVV)) which is archetypally the promise of the Spirit of prophecy, and reconfirmed by the Pentecost narrative itself, which describes the actions of the Spirit in terms of inspired witness to outsiders (in the form of 'tongues', which declare the greatnesses of God, and Peter's inspired preaching). The clear allusions to Joel again in 2:39 specifically identify the gift of the Spirit, promised by Peter to all who repent and are baptised, as Joel's promised gift – and so as the 'Spirit of prophecy'. Everything in Acts 2 points to the Spirit as a *donum superadditum* (that is, a second grace beyond salvation, and distinct from it) of empowering.

Everything, that is, but two considerations. First, Dunn and others have argued that Pentecost was regarded as the celebration of the giving of the Law at Sinai, and that the Pentecost event evokes this theophany. This might suggest that Pentecost was the giving of the new covenant, just as Sinai was the giving of the old. That might in turn be pressed to mean the gift of the Spirit was fundamental to new covenant existence, not merely a *donum superadditum.* Second, Dunn and many others have pointed to the summary of the vibrant new life of the community that follows Pentecost (2:41-47) as inevitably pointing back to the gift of the Spirit just received.

Menzies disagrees on both points. For him there is no convincing parallel with Sinai evoked here. Judaism had not *yet* come to agree that the feast of weeks commemorated Sinai. And the fire, wind, sound from heaven, etc., of Pentecost were common to theophany scenes, not particular to that at Sinai. And while 2:41-47 certainly points to a vibrant new community, Luke nowhere attributes this explicitly to the *Spirit.*[12] So Dunn's case collapses.

(6) *The remaining chapters of Acts portray this 'Spirit of prophecy' (promised by Joel) exclusively as an empowering for mission (= witness to unbelievers).* The Spirit is always given to those who are already 'saved' disciples (most notably in the case of the Samaritans in Acts 8, who have genuinely believed and been baptised, some time before they receive the Spirit, but also in the case of the Ephesian 'disciples' of Acts 19:1-6). And the gift always comes as an endowment empowering witness (most clearly in the case of Paul, Acts 9). As the 'Spirit of prophecy', the Spirit brings revelation to guide the mission, wisdom to articulate it, and inspiration to preach it powerfully. At no point is reception of the Spirit by a person related to his or her own experience of salvation, or ethical transformation: the Spirit always rather works *through* the believer *for the benefit of outsiders.*[13]

(7) *All this leads to the conclusion that 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' for Luke is specifically the gift of the 'Spirit of prophecy' as empowering for witness.* It is fundamentally separable from conversion-initiation, even if ideally given *at* that point, and normally accompanied by the distinctive and evidential gift of tongues, 'as at the beginning'. Luke knows of no other more 'fundamental' gift of the Spirit to which might be traced the saving gift of the knowledge of God, and ethical transformation. We may derive that from Paul, but not from Luke, who has a different (if complementary) theological agenda. He is rather the theologian of the Spirit as missionary empowering, and his canonical challenge to each of us today is this: have we received the Pentecostal Spirit? If not, we should. In short, Luke (and Luke alone) provides the substantial theological basis for the classical Pentecostal paradigm. So much for the bare bones of Menzies' case. As with most animals, the flesh is much more satisfying. But constraints of space forbid us the full meal. I now offer the skeleton of my response.

II. QUESTIONING MENZIES

There is so much of my friend Menzies' work with which I wish to agree (as, indeed, he agreed with much of my own earlier thesis): in my view, we are not opponents, but very much co-explorers who listen to each other.[14] Principally, I agree with him that for Luke the Spirit is the 'Spirit of prophecy', and that Luke knows of no other gift of the Spirit given to believers. And *everyone* since von Baer's magisterial 1926 thesis

12 Menzies, *Development*, ch. 10.

13 Menzies, *Development*, ch. 11.

14 To those who might (through understandable lack of knowledge) think otherwise, I need, perhaps, to clarify that while we write articles and monographs challenging each other's position, Bob and I also enjoy each other's company, write to each other, and pray for each other.

has agreed Luke is *especially* interested in the Spirit as the driving force of mission.[15] The question is whether the Spirit of prophecy (for Luke) is *just* this, *always* this, and *no more* than this. Here lies our parting of ways. I have argued such a view rests on something of a misunderstanding of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism, and a misunderstanding which I think Menzies carries over into Luke-Acts. But I also suspect that Menzies (like many others) operates with a reductionist view of what 'salvation' *means* in Judaism and in Luke-Acts, and that this once again slews the argument. In particular, over against Menzies' position, I have attempted to demonstrate the following fundamental assertions.[16]

(1) *For Judaism, the 'Spirit of prophecy' performed a broader range of functions than Menzies anticipates, and two of these were regarded as fundamental to the true ethical-religious life of the individual or community.*[17] Paradigmatically, the 'Spirit of prophecy' was considered to give four gifts (in descending order of frequency): (a) revelations, (b) spiritual wisdom/understanding, (c) invasive prophetic speech, and (d) invasive praise/worship.[18] To these four, we should almost certainly now add a fifth, (e) acts of power. For the Bible translators and for Judaism more generally, the Spirit of prophecy was also the 'Spirit of power' (the terms are used interchangeably at certain points in the targums).[19]

15 H. von Baer, *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926).

16 See Max Turner, 'The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception', *NovT* 33 (1991), 124-52; Max Turner, 'The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins', *NTS* 38 (1992), 66-88; Max Turner, 'The Spirit of Prophecy and the Religious/Ethical Life of the Christian Community', in Mark W. Wilson (ed.) *Spirit and Renewal: Essays in Honor of J. Rodman Williams*, JPTS 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 166-90; Max Turner, '"Empowerment for Mission"? The Pneumatology of Luke-Acts: An Appreciation and Critique of James B. Shelton's *Mighty in Word and Deed*', *VoxEv* 24 (1994), 103-22; but above all, in my *Power from on High* and my *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996).

17 See Turner, *Power*, chs. 3-5.

18 See Turner, *Power*, ch. 3, or, with much less detail, *Spirit*, ch. 1.

19 In Turner, *Spirit*, 14-15, I summarised my earlier findings thus: '[H]owever incongruous it may seem, *Judaism did attribute miracles of power to the 'Spirit of prophecy'*. That is, Jews did not think 'Spirit of prophecy' as 'the Spirit as the inspiration of "prophetic" phenomena *alone*', but something more like 'the Spirit which is *typically* associated with "prophetic" phenomena, but also at other times revealed as the "Spirit of power"'. The LXX and the much freer biblical 'translations' of the targums retain the word 'Spirit' (even 'Spirit of prophecy' in the latter) in contexts where miraculous power is meant, e.g., to overcome enemies (*Tg. Jon.* Judges 3:10: cf. 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14), or to transport the prophet to another place (1 Kings 18:12; 2 Kings 2:16; Ezekiel 2:2; 3:12, 14; 8:1, 11:1, 24, etc.), while in 2 Kings 2:9-15 the power by which Elisha divides the waters is specifically identified by the targum as the 'Spirit of prophecy' upon him. Outside the 'translations', we find the Spirit as the author of creation and resurrection first in 2 *Baruch* (21:4; 23:5) and 4 *Ezra* (6:39-41), but then also on several occasions in the rabbis [see *Power*, ch. 4: cf. *m. Sot.* 9.15; *Gen. Rab.* 96.5 (but only in a late MS); *Exod. Rab.* 48.4; *Cant. Rab.* 1.1 §9 and *Pesiq. R.* 1.6]. We may then also note that the Spirit as the power of miraculous deeds is clear in the Palestinian *Biblical Antiquities* (27.9-10; 36.2), in the hellenistic writings of Josephus (*Antiquities* 8.408), and above all in the 'messianic' traditions based in or reflecting Isaiah 11:1-4, discussed below, which in different ways take up the idea of the Spirit as the source of the Messiah's 'might' against his enemies.'

20 See Turner, *Power*, 124-25.

Of these five gifts, we may be inclined to identify invasive prophetic speech, invasive praise and acts of power as 'second blessings' (though even that is a simplification to which we will need to return). What of the other two gifts? Some kinds of 'revelations' and 'charismatic wisdom' inevitably fit in this class. Revelations attributed to the 'Spirit of prophecy' by Jewish writers include many instances of what Pentecostals might call 'words of knowledge': for example, the name of a passing Gentile is said to be revealed to Rabban Gamiliel by the Spirit (*Tosephta Pesahim* 2.15); similarly, by the Spirit Simeon ben Yohai is enabled to see through a scoundrel's claim (*j. Shebi* 9.1 and parallels).

Such (relatively trivial) revelations were only thought to be granted to the especially pious, and in such instances the Spirit of prophecy was evidently understood as a *donum superadditum*, enabling (for example) leaders to perform their functions. The same could be said of many gifts of wisdom. According to Exodus 31:3 (and the many traditions based on it), Bezalel was filled with the Spirit of wisdom to enable him to make the covenant furniture. Here again, the Spirit is primarily an empowering for service (though now with some soteriological implications). Similarly, many traditions exploring Numbers 11 see the Spirit granted to the seventy elders as providing the wisdom with which to lead Israel – so, perhaps, a *donum superadditum*.

But, the more important the revelations and the charismatic wisdom given becomes for the group's life, worship and service, the more we shift from the Spirit of prophecy as a *donum superadditum* to the Spirit of prophecy as *central* to the person's life (and that of the community) before God. Thus, for Philo, the Spirit – *as the Spirit of prophecy* – brings the sort of wisdom and awareness of the divine which makes the person see things God's way, and delight to walk in his will.[20] For this reason he can call the Spirit 'the leader in every journey of righteousness' (*Gig.* 55), and possession of it distinguished 'true'

human beings from the ungodly, whom Philo dismissed as mere clods of earth (cf. *Rev. Div. Her.* 57). Philo was by no means alone in this view. Various sectors of Judaism expected the 'Spirit of prophecy' to give either such *important* revelation and/or such ethically *renewing* wisdom that these activities could be regarded as fundamental to true 'life' before God. This can be traced in *Jubilees* 1.21-25, the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (e.g. *T. Sim.* 4.4; *T. Jud.* 20.1-5; *T. Levi* 2.3, and esp. *T. Benj.* 8.1-3), *Joseph and Aseneth* 4.7; 8.9, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach 39:6, Qumran (to which we will return), the rabbis (esp. *Midr. Pss.* 14.6 and *Deut. Rab.* 6.14), and the targums (not least on Ezek. 36).[21] The latter can even generalise the point by paraphrasing Genesis 6:3 to read, 'Did I not put my holy spirit in them that they might perform good deeds? But behold their deeds are evil' (so *Ps.-J.*; cf. *Neofiti*).

Menzies thinks this is a new view in Judaism, developed largely after the beginning of Christianity. Its roots, however, are in the Old Testament; not merely in Ezekiel 36, but especially in Isaiah 11:1-2. Jewish tradition built extensively on the latter. The targum translates 11:1-2:

> And a *king* shall come forth from the *sons* of Jesse, and *the Messiah* shall *be exalted* from *the sons of* his *sons*. [2] And *a* spirit *before* the LORD [= the Holy Spirit] shall rest upon him, a spirit of wisdom and understanding, a spirit of counsel and might, a spirit of knowledge and the fear of the LORD. (Italicised words are the targum redactions of the MT.)

It is this combination, and with strong echoes of the very language of Isaiah 11:1-4, that provides the different 'messianic' portraits in 1 *Enoch* 49.2-3; 62.1-2; *Psalms of Solomon* 17.37; 18.7; 1QSb 5.25; 4Q215 iv.4; 4QpIsa^a 7-10 iii.15-29; 4QMess ar (=4Q534) 3 i.4-11; *Targum Isaiah* 11.1-16, etc.[22]

The Spirit on the Davidic king, in this lively pre-Christian tradition, is clearly a version of the 'Spirit of prophecy' (for the Spirit gives wisdom, understanding, counsel, and knowledge). But here everything Menzies excludes (acts of power and ethical effects) is, by contrast, roundly *included*. This Spirit of prophecy gives the Messiah the mighty

21 See Turner, *Power*, ch. 5.

22 On the Qumran passages see, for example, Craig A. Evans, 'Jesus and the Messianic Texts from Qumran: A Preliminary Assessment of the Recently Published Materials', in *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 83-154.

power by which to liberate Israel (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17-18), and, more important, the wisdom and understanding granted by the same Spirit leads to 'knowledge and fear of the Lord'. Of such, a Paul might say, 'the fruit of the Spirit of prophecy is faithfulness and righteousness' – and, indeed, this is exactly what the writer of 1 *Enoch* 61.1-2 understood Isaiah 11:1-2 to mean: he underscores the ethical dimension of the Spirit's endowment of the messianic figure precisely by describing it as the 'Spirit of righteousness'. That leads me to my second (related) disagreement with Menzies.

(2) *The Jewish hope for the widespread eschatological return of the Spirit of prophecy was probably thoroughly soteriological.* Almost everything we know about second-temple Judaism's hopes for 'salvation' suggests the gift of the Spirit of prophecy (where that was anticipated) would have been fundamental to it. Of course, we need to clarify what we mean by 'salvation', against a widespread reductionist misunderstanding of the term. For many, Menzies included, 'salvation' appears to mean little more than that forgiveness of sins (consequent on faith) which permits entry to the people of God, and assurance of 'life' in the new world to come. The trouble is, that is neither the Jewish understanding nor the Christian one.[23] Jews already largely believed they *had* such 'salvation'.[24] What was circumcision, the covenant, the temple sacrifices, and the day of atonement all about, if not such 'salvation'?

Despite that assurance, Jews felt that since the exile, God was disciplining them with political, social and religious 'hard times' because of their sins. They felt 'sent into exile', and distant from God's blessing, even when living in Israel. They awaited 'salvation' in the sense of glorious release from the oppressive doldrums in which they drifted. They longed to hear the fulfilment of Yahweh's words as spoken in Isaiah 40:1: 'Comfort, O Comfort my people... and cry to

23 One can only voice surprise when J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology, Volume 2: Salvation, the Holy Spirit, and Christian Living* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), virtually reduces 'salvation' to calling, regeneration, justification and initial sanctification (see 186-90, esp. n. 15, and 205-207, where he specifically asserts: 'It is important to relate that none of the New Testament accounts of the coming of the Holy Spirit are concerned with salvation. The occurrence of salvation was essential background for the gift of the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit was not given to bring about salvation' [205]). This is remarkable in a work of Christian *Theology*. In the history of dogma, such a narrow focus has always been regarded as aberrant reductionism. 'Salvation' may commence with these, but its heart is in the doctrine of reconciliation, and embraces the life of experiential *relationship* with God (reversing the alienation of the fall and as a foretaste of the consummation of salvation in resurrection in the new creation).

24 See Turner, *Power*, 133-36.

her... that she has received from the Lord's hand double for all her sins.' This was the 'forgiveness of sins' they looked for: *the one that meant the end of God's period of historical chastisement and a new state of affairs for Israel*. They looked for an Isaianic 'new exodus', in which God would 'return' as king, release his people, and lead them towards a restored Zion (Isa. 40:3-11 and chs. 40-66 generally). Close to the heart of that (Isaianic) hope was liberation from the oppressive powers, and restoration and transformation as a people of righteousness, free to worship and serve Yahweh, and thus to be a light to the nations.[25] But right at the centre of the hope was restoration of the self-revealing presence of God himself, such that each would have immediate knowledge of God, and be inclined to his will (cf. Jer. 31:31-34 and Ezek. 36:22-32) – a reversal of the alienation not merely of the exile, but of 'the fall'.

Now, we must turn to the vital question. *How* was God to make himself known in this immediate and transforming way? Obviously in part through the actions of a Spirit-anointed messianic Servant-herald who combines the strengths of Moses and David and surpasses them. But how was *immediate* and *transforming* knowledge of God to become available *to all*? Isaiah offers the single most obvious Old Testament answer: the pouring out of the Spirit from on high.

> [Zion will be forsaken] until the Spirit comes upon us from on high, and the wilderness becomes a fruitful field... then justice will dwell... and righteousness abide... (Isa. 32:15-16)
>
> I will pour water on the thirsty land,
> and streams on the dry ground;
> I will pour my Spirit on your descendants
> and my blessing on your offspring.

25 The significance of Isaianic 'new exodus' hopes for Judaism was first brought to my attention by a doctoral dissertation by Rikki E. Watts ('The Influence of the Isaianic New Exodus on the Gospel of Mark', Cambridge, 1990, forthcoming soon from CUP). One of my own research students, Mark Strauss, then demonstrated the importance of such ideas for the understanding of Luke's Christology (his own PhD is now published as *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfilment in Lukan Christology*, JSNTS 110 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995]). I have tried to show their pervasive influence on Luke's *soteriology* in *Power* (chs. 6, 8-9 and 13); for a brief introduction to 'new exodus' conceptions and their place in Luke-Acts, see *Power*, 244-49. N.T. Wright has now argued that Isaianic 'new exodus' hopes are the key to understanding Jesus' ministry and teaching (*Jesus and the Victory of God* [London: SPCK, 1996]).

> They shall spring up...
> This one will say, 'I am the Lord's',
> another will be called by the name of Jacob... (Isa. 44:3-5)

Ezekiel (11:19; 36:25-27; 37:1-14; 39:29) and Zechariah (12:10) offered essentially the same answer. And Joel's promise (2:28-32) appears to move in the same track, for it links with Isaiah 44:3 through its opening words, 'I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh, your sons and your daughters...' in a context of God's saving 'coming' to Israel. The post-exilic view of the promise of the Spirit, then, is relatively united. The eschatological Spirit poured-out is the saving self-manifesting presence of God, in gifts of revelation, guidance, wisdom and spiritual understanding. These gifts transform his people and lead them in the knowledge of his will. As such, the outpouring of the Spirit anticipated is first and foremost the 'Spirit of prophecy', yet it is simultaneously fundamentally soteriological.

Did intertestamental Judaism forget that? No! Whereas intertestamental Jews often regarded the Spirit in Israel's *past* largely as 'empowering for service, prophecy, etc.', there is no reason to believe they thought in such a restrictive way about the hoped-for eschatological outpouring of the Spirit on all God's people.[26] Judaism continued to nurse Isaianic 'new exodus' hopes, and within that context the outpouring of the 'Spirit of prophecy' would have obvious soteriological import. It is thus not surprising that when the Qumran community senses the Spirit bringing them new revelation and wisdom, the psalmist interprets these in terms of the old promises. In various parts of 1QH 9-17 the psalmist attests his sense of the presence of the 'Spirit of prophecy' in the community. This Spirit brings revelation, knowledge, and wisdom; the Spirit delights with truth, the Law, and knowledge of God (9.32; 12.11-13). Through these gifts, the psalmist feels drawn towards God in adoration (14.12b-13); he feels cleansed and purified *by* such a spiritual vision and understanding (16.11b-12). For him, the revelatory Spirit is simultaneously the soteriological Spirit; the very basis of the transformed 'life' and sustained righteousness of the restored community. This new kind of existence is seen in terms of Ezekiel's new creation (1QH 17.25-26

26 On the three occasions where the rabbis give some indication of the import of Joel's promise, two references interpret it in terms of Ezekiel 36:26-27 (*Deut. Rab.* 6.14 and *Midr. Pss.* 14.6; cf. also the targums). The remaining reference, *Lam. Rab.* 2.4 §8, links it with Zechariah 12:10.

[echoing Ezek. 36:26-27]; similarly 4Q504.5 and 1QS 4.20-23), but it is perceived to be *brought about* by Spirit-given understanding (cf. 4Q434).[27] *Contra* Menzies, this is no novel pneumatology. Given our understanding above, it is exactly what we would expect of a Judaism that believed the promises of Israel's salvation were beginning to be fulfilled amongst them. And it is this 'new exodus' type of salvation and pneumatology we encounter in Luke-Acts.

(3) *Luke 1-2 kick-starts the readers' expectations of a soteriological gift of the Spirit of prophecy in line with Isaianic new exodus expectations.*[28] The canticles (especially Luke 1:68-79 and 2:29-32, but also 1:46-55) are exquisite representations of new exodus hopes for the restoration of Israel, expressed largely in language and imagery drawn from Isaiah 40-55, 60-61, and related Psalms. There is nothing remarkable about the gift of the Spirit of prophecy to Zechariah and Elizabeth. Jews anticipated such occasional gifts to the pious, especially to announce a major new turn of events. Even Simeon's apparently more permanent endowment would not be thought surprising of a pious man who frequented the temple. John the Baptist marks a novum. He is 'filled with the Spirit' from birth (1:15), and so long before he needs the Spirit and power of Elijah (1:17) as a *donum superadditum* for his eschatological ministry. It is his own growth before God that appears to be in view (cf. 1:80?): but Luke makes nothing of this. What is affirmed in 1:32-35, however, shifts the reader into a different gear.

The Davidic-messianic son is *conceived* a 'holy' child by a creative action of the Spirit. The specific form of 'new creation' by the Spirit in view is bound up with Israel's restoration by the allusions to Old Testament passages in 1:35. The Spirit 'coming upon' Mary 'from on High' is a clear allusion to (LXX) Isaiah 32:15. The statement that the power of God will 'overshadow' (*episkiazein*) Mary is most probably an allusion to (LXX) Exodus 40:35, and to the cloud of God's presence (cf. Luke 9:34) which brought God's glory into Israel's camp, and which led her through the wilderness to the promised land. *In sum, the Spirit's creative activity in relation to the messianic 'Son of God' assures he will embody and become the fountainhead of Israel's 'new exodus' restoration.* We have moved a long way from Schweizer's 'Spirit of prophecy' that has no immediate ethical effects (and equally from his view that the Spirit is not concerned with acts in the physical realm)! As H.J. de Jonge has shown, the outcome of the conception by the Spirit is portrayed in Luke

27 See further, Turner, *Spirit*, 15-17.

28 For detailed argument of what follows, see Turner, *Power*, ch. 6.

2:41-51 in terms of Jesus' special *wisdom* and *knowledge* of God as *'Father'*.[29] Already Jesus shows a wisdom that startles the leaders of Israel. Already, too, he knows a duty to his Father which transcends that to his parents (2:49), and a unique divine 'sonship'. This is just what would be anticipated of the Davidic Messiah in circles that developed the hopes of Isaiah 11.

(4) *Luke 3-4 portrays Jesus' Jordan experience as a unique messianic empowering to proclaim and effect Israel's new exodus liberation.*[30] According to our latest evidence and analysis, John the Baptist seems to have anticipated the coming one would cleanse/purify (= 'baptise') Israel by virtue of the powerful and fiery endowment of the Holy Spirit upon him (Luke 3:16-17).[31] That is, the Spirit was expected to accomplish Israel's cleansing restoration through the powerful acts and words of the anticipated messianic figure. Jesus' Jordan experience corresponds to this. With Menzies, we must agree that Jesus' experience there is interpreted by Luke virtually exclusively as a messianic empowering (and Dunn himself now agrees),[32] especially as the Isaianic servant-herald of Isaiah 42 and 61. I would go beyond him on three points and withdraw from him on one. I would go beyond him in arguing:

(a) Luke has recognised here (and plainly develops elsewhere) the Isaianic new exodus motif, and this assures that he sees the salvation Jesus announces primarily about the release, purging, and transformation of Israel as a community enjoying the immediate presence of God in forgiveness and restored sonship.

(b) In Luke 4:18-27, Luke has taken over a good source (he himself never handles the Old Testament the way it is treated here), which understood the Spirit upon Jesus as the power not merely to *proclaim* new exodus good news, but also to *put it into effect* in powerful acts of liberation from evil forces, especially in acts of healing, and occasional raising from the dead (as in 11QMelch and 4Q521).[33] Luke makes his understanding clear especially at 7:22-23 and Acts 10:38. On this issue I perhaps stand with traditional Pentecostalism more than with Menzies.

29 H.J. de Jonge, 'Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke II. 41-51a', *NTS* 24 (1977-78), 317-54.

30 For detailed argument of the points made here, see Turner, *Power*, chs. 8-9.

31 Cf. Turner, *Power*, ch. 7, against other interpretations.

32 J.D.G. Dunn, 'Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts', *JPT* 3 (1993), 3-27.

33 Turner, *Power*, 250-64.

(c) Nor is this gift of the Spirit to the messianic servant/Mosaic prophet merely empowering to release others. As Luke's redactional change in 4:1 indicates, while Mark and Q merely say the Spirit thrust Jesus into the wilderness to be tempted, Luke says he was led 'in the Spirit' while *being* tempted: i.e. the Spirit aids Jesus in his fight against the tempter (possibly by granting special wisdom and understanding of Scripture and God's will, over against the satanic misuse of them). The Spirit of prophecy upon him is thus of immediate ethical significance too.

I must depart from Menzies, however, when he implies that for Luke Jesus' experience is paradigmatic of later Christian experience. Luke has no concern to make Jesus such a pattern; he wishes rather to demonstrate (over against Jewish suspicion) that Jesus really is the Spirit-endowed Davidic messiah, servant-liberator and Mosaic prophet promised, and that he began to initiate something like the new exodus salvation promised (even if not quite as envisaged by some).[34] Besides, the pattern does not fit what Menzies wishes to say. Menzies wants Jesus to be a paradigm of people who receive the Spirit *once* only, and that purely as the empowering gift of the Spirit of prophecy. But Luke's Jesus has already experienced the Spirit in a much more fundamental way (1:35), and probably understood the Spirit to remain with Jesus from his conception as the Spirit of prophecy giving him wisdom and knowledge of God (so 2:40-52; and he will hardly think John the Baptist knew *more* of the Spirit than Jesus: cf. 1:15, 80?). The Jordan experience is thus more probably a renewal and vocational redirection of the Spirit of prophecy upon Jesus, not his first reception of this.

(5) *When we turn to the key transitional passages between Luke (24:47-49) and Acts (1:1-8), the promised Spirit brings* both *the salvation of the community* and *its empowering to preach.*[35] *No-one* (since von Baer's 1926 thesis) disputes the latter point, and Pentecostals have rightly emphasised it. Luke's clear allusions to Isaiah 43:10-12 and 49:6 show he wishes to portray the church led by the twelve as the remnant of Israel empowered to bring salvation to the rest of Israel and thence to the nations.

But that is only half the story. The transitional passages certainly tell us how the work Jesus started is to be continued. But within the story of Luke-Acts so far, God's new exodus salvation (or 'the kingdom

34 Turner, *Power*, 428-38.

35 For the argument below in detail, see Turner, *Power*, 341-47 and 290-306 (esp. 294-302).

of God') has not yet taken root: Israel has not yet experienced transformation, new community, and the immediate sense of God. To be sure, within the ministry some *individuals* encountered God's reconciling and healing love. And the disciples now understand more fully the import of Jesus' mission, and recognise God's vindication of it in the resurrection/ascension of their Lord. But things still have not coalesced. If the Last Supper points to the cross as the great new Passover, that will bring release to Israel, and God's reign powerfully amongst her, the final pages of Luke and the first chapter of Acts *leave us still waiting for this.*

And now we encounter an added problem of great importance, far too often ignored. If men and women had had a foretaste of salvation in Jesus' ministry,[36] *how was that experience of salvation to be continued and deepened when Jesus departed?* Let us remember that salvation *means* God's liberating and transforming presence in Israel, initiated in 'forgiveness of sins'. It was because Jesus was powerfully endowed with the Spirit that he had been able to make the saving God seem radically present in Israel. So what happens when he leaves in the ascension? The answer of Conzelmann, Flender and Menzies (differently) is that Jesus is still 'present' to grant salvation because his 'name' is with the community and because they have the word of the gospel. Conzelmann quite rightly saw that to make such a claim was to say that the 'salvation' experienced in the church was only a *pale echo* of that experienced in Jesus' own ministry. But, as most now rightly recognise, *that is exactly the reverse of what Luke actually intends his readers to infer.* He wants to tell us how the hopes of Israel's salvation and transformation – which were not extensively realised in Jesus' ministry – were *at last to be met by God in the church.* So the sharp question returns: *how* was God to be more powerfully, self-revealingly, universally and transformingly present amongst his people when Jesus was taken away? Surely no Jew would need any prompting for the answer. It was God's Spirit *above all* who was God's powerful, self-revealing and transforming presence – and precisely *as* the 'Spirit of prophecy'! And Luke knows of no other means (neither the word, nor the 'name' of Jesus have power without the Spirit).[37]

And this is exactly what Luke expresses to his readers when, at Luke 24:49, he speaks of the coming promise as endowing with 'power from on high' (cf. Acts 1:8). This is effectively to quote Isaiah 32:15 (as

36 See Turner, *Power*, chs. 9 and (esp.) 11 for elucidation of this claim.

37 For substantiating detail, see Turner, *Power*, 404-27.

Luke had at 1:35). As we noted above, that was a new exodus promise that, by the Spirit, God would transform Israel from withered desert to lush wonder. Correspondingly, in Acts 1:5, Jesus assures the disciples *they* (with Israel) will be 'cleansed'/'purified' by the Spirit. In short, the promise of the Spirit as 'power from on high' is not missionary empowering alone (or even primarily); it is first and foremost that power promised transformingly to restore Israel, by making God's 'salvation' real amongst her, and thereby also making her a light to the nations and to the end of the earth.

(6) *Pentecost is indeed about the apostolic band being empowered to witness. But it is also about much more than that. It is about how the Messiah, as Lord of the Spirit, begins to exercise his saving rule for and in Israel, transforming her into the servant of Isaiah 49.*[38] As Odette Mainville so persuasively argues,[39] Acts 2:33 is the lynchpin of Luke-Acts. Luke 1:32-33 had promised Jesus would receive the throne of his father David and rule over Jacob for ever. Jesus' ministry resonates with this, at least in the sense that he appears to bring the *beginnings* of God's reign. He ascends to Jerusalem on an ass as a king, and the unwary reader may expect an imminent coronation. Instead, Jesus warns of judgment on Jerusalem, hints of David's throne at the right hand of God rather than in Zion (Luke 20:41-44), claims the new exodus Passover and Israel's restoration will soon be fulfilled (Luke 22:14-30), and is crucified as a messianic pretender. It is left then to Peter, on the day of Pentecost, to draw the strands together. According to Acts 2:24-36, Jesus has been exalted to the eschatological throne seen by David, and now begins to effect his (and God's) rule as Messiah by pouring out God's 'Spirit of prophecy' on his people.

Three observations need to be made here.

(a) Acts 2-3 is the high point of Luke's portrayal of Isaianic new exodus themes: he wishes to assert that with this event Israel's restoration is well and truly under way (and James will argue in Acts 15:14-19 that the Gentiles should now be admitted precisely because Israel *has* been restored – at least in principle).[40] Not surprisingly, Luke describes Pentecost in terms strongly reminiscent of how Jews portrayed Sinai. This has been disputed by Bock and Menzies.[41] But let

38 For the argument below, in detail, see Turner, *Power*, chs. 10, 12 and 13.

39 Odette Mainville, *L'Esprit dans l'Oeuvre de Luc* (Montreal: Fides, 1991).

40 Turner, *Power*, ch. 10.

41 Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, JSNTS 12 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 180-86; Menzies, *Development*, 229-44.

me put the question this way. Let us pretend four students from the Jews College, London, face an Oxford four in 'University Challenge'. The quiz master asks: 'What significant moment in salvation history does the following describe? There is an assembly of the people of Israel. There is a mysterious noise from heaven, wind and a rush of fire. The leader of Israel ascends on high to receive a foundational gift from God, and he then gives it to the people. God's word is divided to the nations and begins to reach to the end of the earth. The day all this happens is the feast of weeks.' The Jews College buzzers would be exploding long before the quiz master got to the end, and their unanimous and utterly confident reply after he read out the full question would be: 'It's the story of Moses at Sinai' (for that is how Jewish tradition heard it). Of course, the quiz-master would then say no, and hand the question over to Oxford, because the answer on *his* card is 'Jesus at Pentecost'. But that is my point: no Jew could possibly miss the Sinai-tradition overtones in the account![42] If Luke relates the Last Supper and Calvary as a fulfilment of Passover, Pentecost is portrayed as a fulfilment of God's gift of the Sinai covenant. Nothing could say more clearly that the Spirit comes as the 'power from on high' to restore Israel.

(b) The gift given here is indubitably the 'Spirit of prophecy': the appeal to Joel 2:28-32 makes that not merely probable, but certain. And it is this gift that Peter appropriately promises to all who repent and are baptised, for Joel's promise was precisely to *all* God's people (2:38-39). What is more, there is no suggestion that there may be any significant delay between repentance-baptism and Spirit-reception. There are no further conditions to be met (holy seeking, a period of years to reach maturity, a call to mission work, or whatever). The connection is straightforward: you turn and enter God's people, God (in response) will grant his Spirit. Of course, if we think of the Spirit of prophecy merely as some 'empowering for mission' the connection looks odd – not least because the only convert Luke portrays as almost immediately bearing witness to outsiders is Paul. But the connection makes absolute sense if the 'Spirit of prophecy' is understood in wider terms as the Spirit whose revelation, wisdom and charismatic speech promotes, sustains and strengthens the *whole* of the believer's walk before God, as individual, as member of the new exodus community, and so as servant-witness.

42 See Turner, *Power*, 279-89.

(c) A long line of scholars, from Gunkel to Menzies, insist the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2 has nothing to do with the new vibrant life of the community in Acts 2:42-47 (and in the other summaries). The assumption behind this denial is that it makes no sense to attribute ethical effects to the 'Spirit of prophecy'. But, as we have seen, the opposite is true. Spiritual wisdom and understanding were seen as *the key* to a more authentic life before God in a variety of Jewish traditions. Furthermore, such is exactly what we would anticipate from Jews committed to any kind of Isaianic new exodus hopes. And, in the final analysis, if it is *not* the impact of the Spirit received by these new disciples, how *else* do we explain the sudden and otherwise apparently 'coincidental' emergence of exactly the sort of lively, obedient and worshipping new exodus community of salvation, which Jesus taught about and strove for, but did not see in his disciples during his earthly ministry?

(7) *Luke understands the 'Spirit of prophecy' as an empowering which is as essential to experiencing the 'life' of new exodus salvation as it is to powerful witness.*[43] This thesis best explains what follows in Acts. We may highlight three particular matters.

(a) Luke anticipates that the Spirit is *normally* given in conversion-initiation. Acts 2:38-39 states that norm, and Luke can thereafter assume that any references to people 'believing' or 'receiving the word' or 'turning to the Lord' or 'being added to the church', and the like, are all different shorthand ways of referring to the whole *complex* of repentance, faith, baptism and Spirit-reception. Acts 8 marks the first (and only) counter-example, but Luke effectively stylises this as exceptional in 8:16; this laborious 'explanation' would be entirely redundant if Luke or his readers thought there was *usually* a significant time gap between baptism and Spirit-reception.[44]

Here, the unique salvation-historical situation largely explains the situation: this is the first time the gospel has come to a non-Jewish community, and God visibly testifies the Samaritans belong with the 'restored Israel' emerging in Jerusalem by granting the gift that is constitutive for it. That God waited for the *apostles* to be present, and to pray for these converts, may not have been 'necessary' from Luke's point of view, but he could undoubtedly trace God's double wisdom in it. Spirit-reception at the hands of the apostles would the more greatly 'authenticate' the Samaritan acceptance in Jerusalem (and, in contrast to

43 Cf. Turner, *Power*, chs 12-13.

44 On the Samaritan incident, see Turner, *Power*, 360-75, 451-53.

the extension to the Gentiles, Luke records no further doubt on the issue!). The other side of the coin is that the Samaritan reception of the Spirit at the hands of the *apostles* – the Jerusalem leaders – would the more effectively close the historic rift between Samaria and Jerusalem (at least for Christians). It would closely tie the emerging Samaritan church with the Jerusalem initiative.

From an evangelical point of view, we might perhaps ask whether the Samaritan 'anomaly' (between Acts 8:12 and 8:17) is not theologically *problematic*. The answer is probably not. Within an evangelical framework, their acceptance of the gospel puts them in something like the position of the disciples between Easter and Pentecost. They may be 'saved' in the sense of 'justified' (like pious Jews before Jesus), and included within the people destined for heaven/new creation, but they do not themselves yet experience new exodus 'salvation' in the sense of God's immediate self-revealing, wisdom-granting, and charismatic presence. They only feel *that* through *Philip* (endowed by the Spirit) – and, if he were to leave them, it is not obvious how God would continue to be 'present' with them – in any real and dynamic sense – unless they receive the 'Spirit of prophecy' which enables this.

All others mentioned in Acts receive the Spirit within the broader nexus of conversion-initiation. It is so for Paul (Acts 9), for Cornelius' household (Acts 10, 11 and 15), and for the Ephesian twelve (Acts 19). In *Paul's* judgment, the Ephesians (in contrast to Apollos in Acts 18) were *not yet* Christians – he would not have rebaptised them otherwise.[45] And they receive the Spirit in close association with their baptism.

There is, of course, a 'moment' between their Christian baptism (in the sense of submission to the water-rite) and their reception of the Spirit through laying on of hands – just as there must have been a similar 'moments' between their coming to belief, repentance, and their committing themselves to Jesus in baptism. But no doctrine of subsequence of any worth can be built on such splitting up of the 'order of salvation'. As Dunn rightly argued, we should conclude Luke regards believing, repenting, being baptised, and receiving the Spirit, as belonging together as a theologically unified conversion-initiation *complex*, unless there are *regular* cases where reception of the Spirit is granted days, weeks or more *after* conversional (Christian) baptism.

45 See Turner, *Power*, 388-97.

Indeed, the close connection between Spirit-reception and baptism is assumed in Paul's question to them in 19:3. On discovering they did not know of the Spirit, Paul immediately asks what *baptism* it was then that they had received: the implication being, of course, that had they received *Christian* baptism they should surely have received the Spirit. The norm, then, for Luke is that the Spirit is granted in the conversion-initiation complex, and the Samaritan exception proves the rule precisely because it is seen as exceptional. If the 'Spirit of prophecy' is God's way of bringing his people the 'life' of salvation, it is understandable why conversion-initiation and Spirit-reception are so closely integrated. If the Spirit of prophecy were primarily 'empowering for witness', such a close connection with conversion-initiation would, by contrast, be surprising.

(b) While Luke is manifestly interested in the Spirit's part in the expanding mission, it would be a mistake to construe the Spirit as *essentially* empowering for mission to outsiders.[46] Nothing in the Old Testament, or in Judaism, would have prepared for such a view. What is more, Luke does not think all (or even most) new converts were immediately impelled to witness and mission. When Luke summarises the life of the earliest church he tells us that they devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching, broke bread together, prayed and worshipped joyfully together, and had all things in common. Their corporate life was admired by the people (Acts 2:42-47). The one thing we are *not* told is that they bore witness. Rather, Luke gives the impression within the 'summaries' that it was almost exclusively the *apostles* who bore witness (cf. 4:32-37; 5:12-16); and it is the same elsewhere. Of course, he does not mean they and they alone witnessed, but at the same time Luke certainly does not attempt to give the impression *each believer* receives the Spirit as empowering to witness. There is no suggestion that the Samaritans, or Cornelius' household, or the Ephesian twelve were all driven out by the Spirit to be witnesses – indeed there is no

46 See Turner, '"Empowerment for Mission"?', 103-22, and *Power*, chs. 12-13. John Penney's recent monograph (*The Missiological Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*, JPTS 12 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997]) attempts to argue that Luke thought all Christians should receive the Spirit at baptism, because the people of God are called corporately to fulfil the role of the anointed servant of Isaiah 42, 46 and 49. In Lucan terms, according to Penney, that means they are to bear verbal witness from the day of their conversion. And Penney points out that *in fact* most effective evangelistic witness is by recent converts. But in deutero-Isaiah it is the Spirit-restored *life* of Israel that is to be the chief witness to the nations, not merely Spirit-anointed *proclamation*. And, as we shall see, Luke offers no hint of the view that the majority of converts became engaged in Spirit-empowered proclamation to outsiders.

evidence any of them were involved in mission (though that *some* were may perhaps be surmised).[47] By and large, it is the twelve, a household of their 'friends' (4:23, NRSV, 31), and other especially gifted people like Barnabas, Philip, Stephen, Paul, John Mark, Silas, Timothy, Apollos (etc.), that bear witness. Luke knows of some others too (cf. 8:4; 11:19-20): but of *congregational* witness, or witness by the rank and file of the church, there is virtually no mention. Such is surely odd if Luke considered the Spirit of prophecy essentially to *be* empowering for mission.

(c) There are also many 'Spirit' texts in Acts that have virtually no missiological significance, and, rather, evidently speak of actions of the Spirit for the benefit of the church herself.[48] In 5:3 and 9, Ananias and Sapphira's sin is described as a lying to the Spirit and a tempting of the Spirit. The assumption behind the former is that the Spirit *monitors* the holiness of the church; that behind the latter is that the Spirit *promotes* the free and generous paradisal unity of fellowship which Ananias and Sapphira break. In 6:3, the plenitude of the Spirit's wisdom granted the hellenists becomes the basis for choosing them to oversee the church's food distribution in the context of a dispute. Similarly, the Spirit brings fullness of faith (or faithfulness) to Barnabas (11:24) and brings joy in the midst of persecution to him and to Paul (13:52). Of course, such gifts would have fuelled their missionary fervour; but it would be reductionist to limit it to that. Again, in Acts 9:31 the churches of Judea, Galilee and Samaria are said to have been built up and to enjoy God's 'peace' because they walked in the 'fear of the Lord' and in the 'encouragement of the Holy Spirit'. In 15:28, the Spirit is felt to have guided the Jerusalem congregation on the question of whether or not Gentile believers should be required to submit to the Law. At 20:28, we are told the Spirit appoints leaders to the church. Beyond these there are occasions of the Spirit affording prophecies affecting congregations (e.g., 11:28, where Agabus' oracle warning of famine leads to generous aid for the Jerusalem church from Antioch) or more personally directed prophecies (e.g. those of warning to Paul, 20:23; 21:4, 11).

Evidently Luke believes the Spirit brings the dynamic presence of God into the congregation and *for* the congregation. He does not believe the Spirit is merely 'empowering for witness' to outsiders. *The*

47 Against attempts by Shelton and Menzies to deduce an essentially missiological thrust to the gift of the Spirit on the Samaritans, Cornelius and the Ephesian twelve, see Turner, '"Empowered for Mission?"', 116-17, and *Power*, ch. 12.

48 See Turner, *Power*, ch. 13, for extended analysis.

same charismatic gifts which empowered the church's witness – the gifts of revelation, wisdom and inspired speech – *also made God's new exodus salvation powerfully present to the individual believer and to the community.*[49]

We are now in a position to draw together the strands of our argument, and face the question of Luke's relation to the classical Pentecostal paradigms.

III. LUKE AND THE CLASSICAL PENTECOSTAL PARADIGMS

The Pentecostal paradigms are evidently fundamentally right on three cardinal issues.[50] First, they are right to insist that the Spirit promised in Acts was the *powerful* self-revealing presence of the *transcendent* God. The traditional churches have too often tamed the Spirit as the silent immanence of God in the believer, whose presence is largely to be taken by faith. Second, the paradigms are right in their insistence that Joel's promise of the Spirit of prophecy is about a gift of the Spirit that comes to expression in often palpable charismata, such as revelation/guidance, prophecy and tongues. By removing such prototypical gifts from the agenda for today, the cessationist critique of Pentecostalism turns the gift promised by Peter into something essentially *different* from what Luke and his readers would have understood. For cessationists, the Spirit received by believers on the basis of the promise in Acts 2:38-39 is no longer the 'Spirit of prophecy' in any meaningful sense. Third, the classical Pentecostal paradigms are evidently true to Luke's intent in emphasising the connection between the Spirit and mission.

On the following points, however, I think Luke offers more of a challenge to the classical Pentecostal paradigms and praxis.[51]

(1) With the clear exception of Oneness Pentecostals, most classical Pentecostal *praxis* separates conversion-initiation from Spirit-endowment by a considerable passage of time. Luke portrays them,

49 Of course, Luke has little to say about the spiritual experience of the individual believer. But if some notable individuals are mentioned as being 'full of the Holy Spirit' in wisdom, faith and joy (cf. 6:3; 11:24; 13:32), Luke will certainly have believed others experienced the same, and that all would receive these in at least *some* measure: see Turner, *Power*, 408-12.

50 For fuller development of these positives, expressed as a challenge to more traditional Protestant churches, see Turner, *Spirit*, 160-61 and *Power*, 439-45.

51 For a more extensive critique (and literature) see Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 10 and 20, and *Power*, ch. 14, esp. 445-55.

rather, as normally integrated. The separation is perhaps *understandable* given that Spirit-baptism is understood in such circles as a special empowering for service (if usually in a broader sense than Menzies allows), but it is still *not* Lucan.

(2) Much more seriously, the relation between pneumatology and soteriology in Luke-Acts is quite different from that in most Pentecostal paradigms. For Luke, salvation is about the reversal of Israel's 'exile' from God, and the restoration of his liberating self-revealing and transforming presence in the community. Accordingly, Zechariah's prophecy in Luke 1:71-77 describes the coming 'salvation' in terms not merely of forgiveness of sins, but as freedom from oppressions, and freedom to serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness. This is the same sort of allusion to paradisal harmony restored that we find from Isaiah 9 and 11 (echoed in Zechariah's prophecy) to the final chapters of Revelation. And Luke believes that if this 'salvation' is to be found anywhere it is found in *the church of the Spirit.* To this view of 'salvation', Pentecost is absolutely *necessary; not* a *donum superadditum.* Luke knows of no other way that the Father and the ascended Son can make themselves powerfully and transformingly present to the individual and to the community, *except* through the 'Spirit of prophecy'.[52] This logic is surely inevitable, because the 'Spirit of prophecy' is virtually by *definition* the self-revealing organ of communication between God and his people! Indeed, if there *were* some other means, granted at conversion-initiation, then there would be no need for any 'additional gift' of what Judaism and early Christianity understood by the 'Spirit of prophecy'.

Above all, we need to resist the temptation to read Luke-Acts as though we can re-live the experience of the disciples, first experiencing salvation through Jesus, and then receiving the Spirit as a *donum superadditum.* Such a reading involves a serious misunderstanding. Beyond the ascension there is simply *no way* to 'experience Jesus' and his salvation except through the Spirit (as the 'Spirit of prophecy'), who is given precisely to make him 'accessible'. *Luke thus offers an acute challenge to the Pentecostal doctrine of subsequence.*

Of course, some Pentecostal interpreters have sought to by-pass this problem by suggesting the disciples paradigmatically received the Spirit *twice.* On this view, they first received Jesus inwardly by the

52 See Turner, *Power*, 418-27, for substantiation.

Spirit (e.g., on the basis of John 20:22)[53] and then subsequently received the Spirit at Pentecost as a second grace, now purely as empowering for mission. But, as Menzies correctly notes, this is not *Luke's* view. Luke has no counterpart to John 20:22, and he roundly asserts the Spirit had *not yet* come upon the baptised Samaritans (8:16), and that the Ephesian twelve did *not* know anything about such an important 'initial' gift of the Spirit (or any other).

Such an 'explanation', however, would certainly leave one asking very sharp questions about Luke's theological competence! (a) Why has he passed over in total silence what is (in theological terms) the more important gift of the Spirit (the one that brings Jesus and his salvation to us) in order to highlight the lesser (charismatic empowering)? (b) Why did Luke *not* recognise the proposed 'initial' gift as a fulfilment of Joel's promise of the 'Spirit of prophecy', when the 'Spirit of prophecy' was clearly primarily concerned with mediating the self-manifesting presence of Christ (and the Father)? (c) If Luke *did* recognise the 'initial' gift as a form of Joel's promised 'Spirit of prophecy', why did he think believers needed a (theologically distinct) *second* ('Pentecostal') gift of the Spirit of prophecy for *mission*? Or, to put it another way, if the believer already has the 'Spirit of prophecy', enabling spiritual wisdom and understanding of the gospel and its application to life, and bringing God's guidance to the believer about his or her day-by-day discipleship and vocation, why is a 'second' gift of the same abilities necessary for activities directed towards 'mission'? (d) In what way could such a second gift possibly be regarded as *theologically* distinct from the initial gift? Would a special empowering for preaching not more naturally be seen as a vocational *redirection* of the initial gift, perhaps coming with some special dedicated charismata (such as 'words of knowledge' or 'gifts of healing')? Would such an experience not be better viewed as *one of a series* of refreshing 'comings' of the *same* (conversional) gift of the Spirit upon a person? (e) If the soteriologically major gift of the Spirit is silently granted in conversion-initiation, why

53 See, e.g., Williams, *Renewal Theology*, Vol. 2, 173, n. 61; 174, 196. John may well have believed the first disciples experienced the reception of the Spirit in several stages. But John did not think this was paradigmatic for believers *after* Jesus' ascension-glorification. Beyond *that*, Jesus could not re-descend to breathe the revelatory wisdom-granting Spirit into new believers. Beyond his complete 'return' to the Father (from a Johannine perspective), Jesus (and the Father) can *only* come to the disciple in the one gift of the Spirit-Paraclete – who is given precisely to replace Jesus. See Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 4-6.

does Luke connect the purely missiological endowment so tightly to that complex?[54]

(3) There is a challenge, too, to the doctrine of 'tongues' as 'initial evidence'.[55] The Judaism out of which Christianity sprang did not usually anticipate 'reception of the Spirit of prophecy' to be attested by some special 'manifestation' (and this was always prophecy or invasive doxology in the speaker's own language, never an unknown language) – such was only to be expected when public attestation was especially appropriate. A dramatic 'manifestation' evidently *befitted* Pentecost as the beginning of the whole eschatological era of the gift of the Spirit. It was also singularly *appropriate* to validate the extension to Samaria and to Gentiles. It might even have been *anticipated* amongst the Ephesian twelve – for a collection of reasons, not least of which is that the matter of whether or not they had received the Spirit was precisely the issue in question. But for the great majority of converts, 'initial evidence' can not have been a matter of significance. The 'evidence', if they needed it, was obvious in their own (often powerful) conversion experience, and in their subsequent immediate *awareness* of God in forgiveness, daily sense of divine 'presence', guidance, growing spiritual wisdom, participation in 'charismata', etc. Only if all these were lacking, would one infer the gift of the Spirit has for some reason been withheld. I would suggest the doctrine of 'initial evidence' is something of a theological 'red herring'. As Larry Hurtado pointed out recently, the doctrine of 'initial evidence' only makes sense when Spirit-baptism is separated from the conversion-initiation complex with which it belongs.[56]

Let me put the challenge of the last two points in a quite different way. Informed Pentecostal writers occasionally suggest that such traditional evangelical leaders as John Stott, Dick Lucas and David Jackman (who oppose the Pentecostal view of Spirit-baptism) have not received what Luke means by the Pentecostal gift. The conclusion

54 Douglas Oss is the latest in a line of Pentecostal interpreters who claim Luke-Acts represents an 'ideal' in which Spirit-accomplished 'salvation' and (the theologically 'subsequent', 'second blessing' of empowering) Spirit-Baptism are usually *temporally coincidental* in one complex of conversion-initiation: see his position in Wayne Grudem (ed.), *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? Four Views* (Leicester: IVP, 1996), 235-83, esp. 243 and 255. But this simply leads back to Questions (b), (c) and (d), and redoubles their force.

55 Against Menzies, *Empowered*, ch. 13, see Turner, *Power*, 357-58, 393-97, 446-49.

56 Larry W. Hurtado, 'Normal, but Not a Norm: Initial Evidence and the New Testament', in Gary B. McGee (ed.), *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 189-201.

drawn is that, *were* they to receive the 'baptism in the Spirit' with 'the speaking in tongues', their already powerful Christian lives and ministries could take off in a some more spectacular way. I must suggest that in Lucan terms that is *nonsense*. Luke's diagnosis would be crystal clear: here are people who are conscious of experientially 'knowing' the Lord in a deep devotional life, who exhibit great spiritual wisdom and understanding, and whose preaching is powerful and effective. *From Luke's perspective, these are all the clearest possible marks of the work of the 'Spirit of prophecy', so they must have received the Pentecost gift*. It should be obvious how I might wish to *extend* the challenge by submitting the cases of all obviously 'lively' Christians, and, indeed, the *majority* of traditional Christians.[57] I would certainly like to see such men and women of God embrace the fuller range of charismata Luke (and Paul!) would naturally attach to the 'Spirit of prophecy', and I would strongly challenge their 'logic' in denying the availability of such gifts. But I would go to the firing squad before being willing to say they had *not* received what *Luke* means by the 'gift of the Spirit'.

In all, I think Luke is much closer to the Paul of 1 Corinthians 12-14 than is usually admitted. For Paul, the one gift of the Spirit granted in conversion-initiation is God's empowering presence which transforms the believer into the likeness of Christ, by making him or her aware of the presence, love, and saving grace of God, and of the challenge of the living Lord to closer discipleship. At the same time, the Spirit is the *charismatic* Spirit who brings this revelation, guidance, spiritual wisdom and understanding to concrete expression in *gifts* to the individual and to the congregation, along with inspired doxology and witness. And the Spirit given is experienced afresh in the multiple givings of ongoing Christian life and refreshment. The one gift of the

57 For elucidation, see Turner, *Power*, 451-53. Here brief objection must be made to the position asserted by Williams (*Renewal Theology*, Vol. 2). Having unjustifiably reduced 'salvation' to the events from calling to justification and initial cleansing of the heart (see n. 23 above), he lumps being 'guided into the truth' (237-41), a real sense of the presence of God (307-309), and fullness of joy (309-11) under the benefits of (subsequent) Spirit-baptism (of which the 'primary evidence' is glossolalia, 212). The logic suggests that (theologically subsequent) Spirit-baptism is necessary for spiritual understanding of Scripture, a joyful sense of God's presence, etc. But surely he must admit that these are exactly things most (non-Pentecostal) traditional evangelicals *normally* associate with conversion and ongoing spiritual life. And most such Christians would argue that precisely such a spiritual understanding of the Scriptures and of God's will is necessary for sanctification. Does Williams deny them these things? If not, why does he think they need what he means by a distinct 'reception of the gift of the Spirit' (as opposed to ongoing and deepening experiences of the Spirit already received)?

Spirit provides the whole experiential dimension of Christian existence and life before God.[58] It is essentially the same, I suggest, for the writer of Luke-Acts.

As a final challenge, I would suggest Luke is much closer to the views of the Spirit expressed in the theologically nuanced sectors of the various charismatic renewal movements (especially to, for example, the 'integrative' expositions of Spirit-baptism described by Lederle)[59] than he is to those represented in the main classical Pentecostal paradigms.

58 For further elucidation of the above claim, and a guide to the literature, see Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 7, 8, 10, 15 and 20.

59 Henry I. Lederle, *Treasures Old and New: Interpretations of 'Spirit-Baptism' in the Charismatic Renewal Movement* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988), ch. 5, and cf. Turner, *Spirit*, chs. 10 and 20.