

**‘EMPOWERMENT FOR MISSION’?
THE PNEUMATOLOGY OF LUKE–ACTS:
AN APPRECIATION AND CRITIQUE
OF JAMES B. SHELTON’S
*MIGHTY IN WORD AND DEED*¹**

MAX TURNER

This book is a semi-popular revision of material in Dr Shelton’s PhD thesis, submitted at the University of Stirling in 1982.² As Dr Shelton is now Professor of New Testament in the Department of Theology and Missions at Oral Roberts University, readers can expect a competent and lively discussion of Luke’s view of the Spirit from a basically Pentecostal/Charismatic stance. With others, such as Gordon Fee, Robert Menzies, Roger Stronstad and Chris Thomas, to mention but a few, Dr Shelton represents a new, dynamic, and flourishing Pentecostal biblical scholarship. If it would not sound condescending I would be tempted to say the Pentecostal/Charismatic movement is coming of academic age; it will perhaps sound less condescending (and triumphalist instead?) if I confess I would count myself a part of it, at least of the Charismatic section.

I. AN OUTLINE OF SHELTON’S GENERAL POSITION

What does Dr Shelton offer us? He begins with a methodological chapter, warning us that we must patiently listen to Luke’s *distinctive* contribution before we rush in to harmonise him with Paul and John. Until we have heard the separate voices accurately, we cannot know how to harmonise them; and to harmonise them too quickly simply risks misunderstanding all three. Two such misunderstandings are the ‘non-Pentecostal’ tendency to read Luke–Acts through Pauline spectacles, and so to deduce Luke must be speaking about the gift of salvation given at conversion when he talks of receiving the Spirit (because that is what Paul means) and the opposite error, in some radical Pentecostal circles, of reading Paul through Lucan spectacles, and so deducing from Luke’s connection of Spirit reception with speaking in tongues, that if Paul makes the gift of the Spirit soteriologically *necessary* (Rom. 8:9–11), then anyone who does not speak in tongues must have failed to received the Spirit who saves; i.e. such a person is not yet a Christian (see chapters 1 and 12). We must take great care to let Luke be Luke, and

Paul be Paul, before we try assembling a biblical theology of Spirit. When we do, we discover that Paul explores the significance of the Spirit for ontology (Christian existence); while Luke is pre-occupied with a quite different question, namely the significance of the Spirit for *mission*.

But how do we discover *Luke's* view in the first place? Shelton's answer is redaction-criticism. We must start by carefully analysing Luke's selection, editing, and narrative arrangement of his sources in the Gospel; that will give a base-line perspective from which to analyse Acts (where analysis of use of sources is much more difficult). The main findings of such an analysis (according to Shelton) are as follows:

(1) In the infancy narratives, Luke uses the same *language* ('come upon'; 'fill with'; Spirit 'on'; act 'in the Spirit', etc.) of the experiences of the Spirit he portrays in connection with Elizabeth, Zechariah, John, Simeon (etc.) as he uses (a) of Jesus' experiences of the Spirit and (b) of those of the post-Pentecost church. He sees them all as fundamentally alike, and they usually consist in empowerment to bear witness (so chapter 2).

(2) The Spirit granted to Jesus at Jordan is not so strongly associated with his baptism as in Mark and Matthew, and it is quite clearly an *empowering for proclamation* (as the redactional links with 4:1, 14, 18 and Acts 10:38 demonstrate). While some aspects of Jesus' experience of the Spirit are distinctive to him (Luke 1:35, in particular), once again Luke's use of vocabulary shows he also sees parallels between Jesus' experience of the Spirit and that of the figures in the infancy narratives, before him, and that of the disciples in the church, after him. The Spirit comes 'upon' Jesus (3:21) as 'on' Simeon (2:25) and as he falls 'on' the disciples (Acts 8:16); Jesus is 'full of the Holy Spirit', as is Stephen (Acts 6:3, 5) and Barnabas (11:24); Jesus returns 'in' the power of the Spirit (4:14), which is like Simeon entering the temple 'in the Spirit' (2:27); etc. This means, in the first place, that Jesus' experience is a pattern of that in the church, even archetypal (157).

Of course Professor Dunn too would see Jesus' experience as archetypal, but in quite different terms. Dunn (following Conzelmann) argued Jordan was the great change of eras, from that of the Law and the prophets to that of the kingdom of God. And so it was Jesus' entry into the experience of God's reign, eschatological sonship and new-covenant 'life'.³ As such it was a pattern for the church's reception of the Spirit as entry into the full experience of *salvation*, which was only possible in the era following Pentecost.⁴

But for Shelton, Luke's use of similar terminology of the Spirit throughout Luke-Acts *minimises* any alleged distinction of epochs between the 'time of Israel' (Luke 1-2), the time of Jesus, and the time of the church. Jordan and Pentecost do not signal new eras with qualitatively *different* experiences of the Spirit, the difference is mainly

'quantitative' (i.e. all believers have the Spirit after Pentecost). And, for Shelton, what is archetypal is the experience of the Spirit as charismatic *inspiration* to contest temptation (see especially Shelton, chapter 5 [based on Luke 4:1 and the temptation narrative]), as *empowering to preach* (see especially chapter 6 [mainly on Luke 4:16-30 and related texts]) and to *perform mighty works* (see especially chapter 7), as well as the inspiration of charismatic praise and prayer which bears witness to God (see chapter 8, and especially the section on Luke 10:21-24). That is, according to Shelton, in Luke's gospel, the gift of the Spirit to Jesus (which is archetypal for us) is primarily the gift of the *charismatic* Spirit who empowers for witness.

(3) What lies at the heart of Luke's conception of the Spirit is perhaps made clearest in two highly redactional sections:

(a) In Luke 12:8-12, Luke has removed the blasphemy against the Spirit saying from its Marcan context (where it involved hostile interpretation of Jesus' exorcism by the Spirit), and he has turned it into a warning that in circumstances of opposition, disciples must bear witness to Jesus as the Spirit leads them: it is failure to do so which is now 'blasphemy against the Spirit'. Why has Luke made such a 'bold' change? Because of his 'overriding interest' in the Spirit as empowering for proclamation (107—and see the whole of chapter 9).⁵

(b) In Luke 24:44-53, esp. vv. 48-49, the language of being 'clothed with power from on high' and other contextual markers evoke an Elijah-Elisha typology with respect to Jesus' ascent into heaven—with the Spirit being passed on from Jesus to the disciples *as the power of proclamation or witness*. This portrayal clearly interprets the significance of the forthcoming event of Pentecost (and the point of the whole passage is echoed again in Acts 1:5-8), and strongly suggests that Luke understands it not as the arrival of salvation for the disciples (as Dunn took it), but empowering of the disciples for mission.⁶

Shelton is now free to turn to Acts (his chapter 11), and we might almost anticipate that he would give a strongly Pentecostalist reading, playing down any association of the Spirit with 'conversion' and 'salvation', and underscoring the Spirit as 'empowering for mission or witness'. He does not, however. True, he makes the (valid) point that Luke does not portray *the disciples* at Pentecost as receiving the Spirit in a 'conversion' experience. To quote him (against Dunn):

It seems incredible that Luke would present the disciples as witnesses of Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension; as recipients of his commission (24:47-49) and blessing (24:51); as joyful (v.52; Paul defines joy as a fruit of the Spirit in Gal 5:22), united (Acts 1:14, Paul refers to 'unity of the Spirit' in Eph 4:3); and devoted to prayer (1:14); and yet not see them as converted. Apparently Luke considers the pre-Pentecost believers to be just

that—believers in Jesus, converts to his message, who were about to be empowered for a special mission (128).

But elsewhere his position is rather summed up in his comment: 'Although Luke is not averse to associating the Holy Spirit with conversion, this is not his major pneumatological thrust' (127).⁷ So while Shelton is aware Acts 2:38 could be read as a promise of the charismatic Spirit to those *already* 'saved' and baptised (as Stronstad and Menzies take it), and that support for this reading might be found (e.g.) in the separation of baptism from Spirit-reception in Acts 8:14–17, he does not in fact strongly support such a reading. He thinks Luke is simply 'not clear' (130) and 'ambiguous' (130, 135). That is not to say Dr Shelton thinks *every* passage is unclear; he has no doubts that in Acts 8:14–17; 10;⁸ 11:1–18, and 19:1–7 the gift of the Spirit is empowering for witness (as for the 120 on the day of Pentecost); but in summing up his *whole* discussion of Acts he feels required to conclude that Luke 'does not clearly delineate between the Spirit's role in conversion and empowerment for mission' (135). Why is Luke not clearer? Again we provide the answer in his own words:

It is primarily because the role of the Spirit in conversion is not his major interest. His fundamental concern is to show how the witness concerning Jesus spread. Luke is not averse to associating the Holy Spirit with conversion but, unlike Paul, he does not ardently press ontological issues Luke's major emphasis concerning the role of the Holy Spirit is much simpler: inspiring and empowering witness (135).

A final chapter spells out the significance of Luke's picture, for the scholarly study of Luke, and for the church. To the 'non-Pentecostals' Luke's message is that the gift of the Spirit is stereotypically empowerment to witness; so we should positively expect special endowments of power to occur subsequent to conversion. The Spirit is the driving force of witness, and charismatically inspired witness, with or without glossolalia, is a repeatable pattern in salvation history (161–62).

To his Pentecostal and Charismatic brethren Shelton advises Luke's message is, yes, that God's people are an empowered people; but Luke does not say tongues will always accompany baptism in Spirit, or fullness of Spirit (162, merely often). 'Luke is only peripherally interested in tongues in relation to the fullness of the Holy Spirit; for him, inspired witness is the essential issue' (162). Luke also emphasises rejoicing in salvation rather than power, and the church prays for boldness in witness for herself, and for God sovereignly to accompany the witness with signs (not power for herself); Acts 4:29–31 (162–63). These are timely and wise counsels, for which we should be grateful, and they are delivered in an eirenic spirit not often matched.

As for the distinctive contribution to scholarship on the pneumato-

logy of Luke–Acts, in a section entitled 'Application to Academics' (160–61), Dr Shelton claims two contributions:

(1) to have vindicated redaction criticism as the appropriate method to discern the specifically Lucan voice, and to have found through it that 'for Luke, the dominant function of the Spirit is empowerment for mission, especially in relation to effective witness' (161).

(2) to have shown that 'when it comes to pneumatology, Luke has ignored the so-called three epochs that he allegedly superimposed on the synoptic tradition'. Rather, 'He is primarily interested in how inspired witness occurs in *any* era' (161).

To these we may add a third of potential interest: Shelton claims to have found a specialised redactional meaning for 'full of the Holy Spirit' and 'filled with the Holy Spirit' (136–48). We shall look at these in reverse order after making three general observations on the book.

II. THREE GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON *MIGHTY IN WORD AND DEED*

First, we must note the book is commendably readable, and so will open up the subject to those who have neither the theological training, nor the linguistic skills, nor the patience, to benefit from the many learned, tightly argued monographs, with their extensive quotations in other languages, etc.

Second, however, one must wonder whether Dr Shelton has not sacrificed a little too much to 'user-friendliness'. In one sense he obviously *does* regard his monograph as a contribution to the scholarly literature (witness his appeal to careful redaction criticism, and his quite *extensive* footnoting to technical works in English, German and French); and yet, it must be said, he uses many arguments that can be found in the earlier literature without always explicitly signalling his debt. And there are places too where one would have expected him to use key insights of older contributions where these are in fact passed over.

Of these works that were written before Shelton's own research, it is very surprising indeed that the most important single monograph to be written on Luke's view of the Spirit (and *still* one of the best)—that by Hans von Baer⁹—receives not a single mention, despite the fact that at many points it anticipates Shelton's argument, and in other places argues for contrary views that at least needed a serious answer. The second most important work on the Spirit in Luke–Acts was undoubtedly that by G. Haya-Prats.¹⁰ This essentially argued that, for Luke, the Spirit is a Christianised version of the Jewish 'Spirit of prophecy', a charismatic endowment given to the community of the saved, and so a *donum superadditum*. At many points (in the reviewer's view!), Shelton's own work could have benefited and been strengthened by Haya-

Prats' insights and arguments. But once again there is not a single mention of him. Other giants in the area like Gunkel, Büchsel, Chevallier and George are similarly passed over in silence, along with a crowd of less significant but still important recent works.

Third, Schweizer, Haya-Prats, Kremer, Turner and others had all (albeit in conflicting ways) pointed to the very great importance of the intertestamental Jewish concept of 'the Spirit of prophecy' for the right understanding of Luke-Acts. It provides the essential background not merely for the Joel quotation of Acts 2, but for virtually *all* of Luke's pneumatological material. A study of this area could only have been grist to Shelton's mill (witness the very significant contribution Menzies was able to make to Pentecostal theology because of his careful analysis of this concept). Surprisingly, Shelton by-passes the whole issue. He has just *three* references to intertestamental Jewish literature (to be compared with the quite literally *hundreds* of references in Menzies' study), and barely mentions the concept of 'the Spirit of prophecy' at all.¹¹

In the final analysis, however, an author must be free to write the book he wants to write, not the one the reviewer *wishes* he had written! Accordingly, let us turn to an evaluation of the areas that *are* covered.

III. A SPECIALISED MEANING OF 'FILL WITH/FULL OF THE HOLY SPIRIT'?

This is not the major topic of the book, being defended in much greater detail elsewhere;¹² nevertheless, he devotes a whole section to it, and it affects the rest of his thesis, so we shall examine it briefly.

Agreeing with my own 1981 article,¹³ that 'fill with' and 'full of' (when used of persons) are a stylistic trait of Luke's, Dr Shelton suggests I have failed to recognise 'the specialized use of this fullness (i.e. *speaking*)' (151, n.32, my italics). By this Dr Shelton means that where the phrase 'full of the Holy Spirit' is used, it primarily denotes inspiration of charismatic *speech*, even if it also contextually means other things as well. He will make a similar case for 'filled with the Holy Spirit'. Now Dr Shelton is aware that that cannot be the complete story, for the occurrences of 'full of the Holy Spirit' are not ever immediately followed by reported speech, and they are often co-ordinated with qualities that do not require speech (e.g. full of Holy Spirit 'and wisdom' [Acts 6:3]; 'and faith' [6:5; 11:24]), so he needs to adopt the expedient of saying there is always a *contextual* reference to speech, or implication of it. For 'full of the Holy Spirit', that could pull in Luke 4:1 and Acts 6:3, 5; 7:55 and 11:24. But it must be said the references to speech are then not the *primary* semantic focus of the phrase 'full of Spirit', and the association is only strong in Acts 11:24, while merely plausible at 7:55.¹⁴ In the other incidents, wisdom, faith, etc. may later come to expression in the contexts in speech, but the association of *the phrase* with speech is

much looser. I have to conclude 'full of Spirit' does not have the specialised meaning 'inspired to speak'; rather, as I argued in the article mentioned, it is simply one version of a *more general Lucan metaphor*, 'full of X', to designate rich intensity in a person of the (genitival) defining quality (be that e.g. 'leprosy', Luke 5:12; 'good works', Acts 9:36; 'wickedness', 13:10; 'anger', 19:28, or 'the Holy Spirit'). Collocated with 'the Spirit' it means something general like 'markedly endowed with the Holy Spirit' (Luke 4:1; Acts 6:3) or, more specifically, 'immediately inspired/empowered by the Spirit'—for a *variety* of potential charismata (of revelation, wisdom or speech; not of speech alone), which the context will reveal.

For example, the fact that one of the seven 'full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom' in Acts 6:3 is described as speaking evangelistically with charismatic wisdom in 6:10, does *not* mean that the linguistic expression in 6:3 itself carries anything of the semantic sense 'inspired to *speak* authoritatively' (*contra* Shelton, 137–38). The apostles in 6:3 are bidding the church to choose men *generally* marked for their spiritual (charismatic) *wisdom*—and so men others will have confidence in to supervise the distribution of food; and we need to remember that charismatic wisdom (whether spoken or not) was a prototypical charisma of 'the Spirit of prophecy' in the Judaism that provides the background to Luke's understanding of the Spirit, and indeed much more common than 'invasive charismatic speech'.¹⁵ I think it is special pleading to say that 'full of the Spirit' has the specialised meaning 'speaking'.

The same ambiguity attaches to 'filled with'; it too is part of a broader Lucan use collocated with other genitives ('fear', Luke 5:26; 'fury', Luke 6:11; 'amazement', Acts 3:10; 'jealousy', Acts 5:17; 13:45). In most of these contexts, of course, people also speak, but one would not pretend that 'full of (e.g.) amazement' itself *means* 'to *speak* under the inspiration of amazement', any more than 'full of leprosy' means '*speak* as a leper'. Such would defy all the rules of lexical semantics. When collocated with 'by the Holy Spirit', 'filled' denotes inspiration in unusual degree, usually 'spilling over', as it were, into some specified action. That 'action' is often speaking. But that cannot mean that 'filled with the Holy Spirit' itself carries the sense '*to speak* by the Spirit' (*simpliciter*)—though co-ordinated clauses such as Acts 4:8, 'he was filled with the Spirit and said . . .' *would* mean roughly that (and I drew attention to this as a *regular* Lucanism in the article referred to by Shelton).¹⁶ But the latter sense is a result of the co-ordination, not inherent in the phrase 'filled with the Holy Spirit' itself (in which case, of course, the addition of 'and said' would even be redundant).

A subsidiary argument of Shelton's is that while 'full'/'fill' with Spirit would appear to be an excellent way of referring to conversion or initial reception of the Spirit as empowerment, Luke does not so use the term

(except at Acts 2:4, and perhaps at Luke 1:15 and Acts 9:17) for such; why? Because (according to Shelton) it denotes rather inspiration for speech (which accounts for 2:4 and 9:17 as well). He realises his case is liable to come unstuck on Luke 1:15, and says that while John could not 'speak' as such, he still bore witness. Perhaps, but that can only suggest that 'filled with the Holy Spirit' is not a redactional phrase for 'speaking' (or better, 'having the inspiration to speak'); it is more general, and there is no real reason to assume it is less general than it is in the other Lucan redactional collocations of 'fill with' which do *not* involve the lexeme 'Spirit'. And are there not easier hypotheses to explain Dr Shelton's observation that Luke does not restrict 'fill with Spirit' or 'full of the Spirit' to initial reception of the Spirit? Could it not be that 'filled with Spirit' or 'full of Spirit' do not attach exclusively (or even ordinarily) to 'conversion', or initial reception of the Spirit, precisely because these phrases in Luke-Acts may be used to designate relatively *strong* presences or *immediate* inspirations (or both), at whatever point they occur in the Christian's life?

IV. IS LUKE'S PNEUMATOLOGY THE ACHILLES' HEEL OF THE THEORY OF SEPARATE SALVATION-HISTORICAL EPOCHS IN LUKE?

We have substantially outlined Shelton's own position in our initial summary of his chapters. But how strong is his case against Conzelmann and Dunn? An appendix (165-77) gives a more detailed and rather more wide-ranging examination of whether Luke saw Jordan as the change of the ages (Shelton rightly perceives that John the Baptist cannot be confined to an 'Old Testament' epoch [the *mechri* of Luke 16:16 cannot be made exclusive], and that at very least Luke 1:35 drags the 'new age' into Luke 1-2). But his principal (and repeated) argument is the one we noted above, namely that similar redactional *language* of the Spirit throughout Luke-Acts ('full of the Holy Spirit', etc.), and the common factor of empowerment for witness, breaks down the rigid division of epochs; 'blurs' the traditionally accepted divisions of epochs (e.g. 16, 25, 161). There are of course at least two questions here: (1) Is there strong enough support for the thesis that Luke has a threefold division of epochs that the case requires answering? and (2) Do Shelton's observations weaken the thesis?

The first question is too complex to be addressed adequately here. Let us simply say, that while Conzelmann's particular form of the thesis (that Luke thereby de-eschatologises the whole Christian kerygma) has been subjected to devastating attacks (for example, by Ellis, Kümmel, Luck, Marshall, Bovon), and while 'epochs' is probably a quite misleading term (see the criticism of J. Hultgren¹⁷), Fitzmyer has made a good case that it still makes sense to say Luke understands three rather

distinct 'phases' of salvation-history (with Jordan and the ascension-exaltation as the dividers) to which one might give the same *names*, if not the same non-eschatological *content*, as Conzelmann did.¹⁸ The second question thus becomes the more pressing: *Does Luke's pneumatology blur the distinction of epochs (or 'phases')*?

To the reader sensitive to the history of the debate, Shelton's claim must at first sight seem surprising. After all, where did Conzelmann get his idea of three distinct epochs from? He got it from that all-important monograph by Hans von Baer. And how did Hans von Baer himself reach such a conclusion? It was largely on the basis of what he regarded as qualitative differences in the *pneumatology* of Luke 1-2; Luke 3-24 and Acts. That is why it is puzzling that there is no mention of von Baer in Shelton's book (nor any of Tatum, who devoted an article on the pneumatology of Luke 1-2, attempting to show that it supported Conzelmann's understanding¹⁹). Given that Dr Shelton wishes to claim it is Luke's *pneumatology* that blurs the epochs, would he not have been better advised to turn his major guns on von Baer's arguments, rather than Conzelmann's (in which pneumatology plays so little part)?

Against von Baer's position, I am not quite sure how much headway the argument from similar vocabulary of the experiences of the Spirit would count. After all, Baer was himself also the great architect of the *unity* of the pneumatology of Luke-Acts. Fighting off Leisegang's thesis that it is a patchwork of disparate hellenistic conceptions, Baer pioneered the recognition that Luke's pneumatology is basically Jewish—that it is the driving force of redemptive history: in Luke 1-2, both as the Spirit of prophecy, and as the Spirit of new creation (Luke 1:35); then, in the rest of Luke-Acts, as 'the driving power of mission', most notably in giving inspired speech, or power to proclaim.

But Baer did not see this substantial 'unity' as meaning 'uniformity' across Luke-Acts, and thought the differences between the phases should be spelled out in terms of separate epochs. For him, the Spirit as 'the Spirit of prophecy' *without* miracles, and confined to the temple, or to special conceptions/births in Luke 1-2, represented the best in the piety of Israel. Jesus, empowered by the Spirit (3:21; 4:1, 14, 18) not merely to proclaim salvation but to effect it too (in redemptive miracles), has the Spirit in a *qualitatively different* way. The disciples only receive the Spirit at Pentecost (now with the further qualitative difference that the Spirit has become the Spirit of Jesus [16:7], and may be exhibited in e.g. tongues [unknown before Pentecost]). The resolute way in which Luke refuses to say the disciples too have the Spirit in Jesus' ministry, even when they appear to have the same *power* (Luke 10:17-20!),²⁰ coupled with the short period of history *without* the presence of the Spirit (Acts 1:12-2:4; in which the disciples resort to lots), marks an epochal division.

These were impressive arguments. Are they combated by 'common

terminology', and by the common factor of 'empowering'? Could these not more easily be explained as merely phenomenological descriptions, of little *theological* significance? After all, Luke speaks of the Spirit 'coming upon' (*eperchomai epi*) both Mary (Luke 1:35) and the disciples before Pentecost (Acts 1:8); but in the first instance this is (at least primarily)²¹ a gift of the Holy Spirit that will ensure the supernatural conception of the Holy Son of God, while in the second it refers to the Pentecostal Spirit. These seem to me to be such qualitatively *different* activities of the Spirit that the 'common terminology' asserts only the very weakest and incidental congruence (divine presence and activity), not (as Shelton claims) a deliberate attempt to erode any distinction of quality of action or of temporal periods associated with different activities of the Spirit. And as I have suggested above, I suspect the vocabulary of 'full of'/'filled with' the Holy Spirit is similarly very general and phenomenological; does it really provide sufficient congruence to break down the structural and theological distinctives?²² I am more than willing to listen to Dr Shelton, and I think I myself have been guilty of pressing the qualitative distinctions between the gift of the Spirit to Jesus and the gift of the Spirit to the disciples a little too sharply at a number of points,²³ but I think we need more evidence than the linguistic similarities (and the common factor of inspiration/empowerment) before we can claim Luke's pneumatology erodes any distinction of epochs or of different phases in the Spirit's activity.

Another aspect of this argument about terminology that we may need to question, is what I might call its 'orientation'. Shelton tells us:

Luke describes the work of the witnesses in the infancy narratives as well as the ministry of John and *even* that of Jesus in post-Pentecost terms . . . for he wishes to see all of them [the epochs], even the era of Jesus, in terms of the post-ascension church's experience with the Holy Spirit (118).

Or, again, he tells us Luke gives an anachronistic picture in Luke 1–2 because he is less 'interested in defining epochs' than he is 'in identifying the work of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel in terms of the church's experience'. But might it not as easily be said that Luke describes the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus and in the church in *Old Testament* terms (so George and Chevallier; and Stronstad [differently])? After all, the terms 'fill with Spirit' and 'full of Spirit' (on which Shelton bases so much) find their closest analogies in Septuagintal language,²⁴ as do other ways of referring to invasive actions of the Spirit. Chevallier and George can at least offer a reason: Luke wishes to portray the church as an Israel of fulfilment, so he accommodates the church's experience to that of the best of Israel, and then allows the church to surpass it, while retaining some of its essential Jewish character. This is a competing explanation of Luke's language of the Spirit which calls for discussion.

In short we agree on the *data* (some of Luke's terminology of the Spirit crosses the borders of any 'epochs'); but the *interpretation* of the data may need fuller argument before Shelton will be able to convince his colleagues. Some of Luke's language even appears rather to *sharpen* the very periodic distinctions Shelton denies; thus, for example, the language 'to pour out (the gift of the Holy) Spirit' (Acts 2:17, 33; 10:45) and 'to receive (the gift of) the Holy Spirit' (2:38; 8:15, 17, 19; 10:47; 19:2) apply to the post-Pentecost realities *alone*.

V. IS THE SPIRIT, FOR LUKE, EXCLUSIVELY OR EVEN PRIMARILY AN EMPOWERMENT FOR MISSION?

Since Hans von Baer, no contribution of significance to Lucan pneumatology has been able to escape the conclusion that Luke considers the gift of the Spirit to be 'the driving force of mission'. The real controversies lie elsewhere, and fall roughly within the spectrum of the following views:

(1) The gift of the Spirit in Luke–Acts is exclusively the gift of the Spirit of prophecy, understood as an empowering for mission (so [almost] Menzies).

(2) The gift is exclusively a charismatic empowering of the Spirit of prophecy, albeit of more general purpose—e.g. the nurturing of Christian life and the edifying of the church, *as well as* mission (so Haya-Prats).

(3) The gift is an all-embracing gift including both the Spirit of new covenant life through which we experience our salvation and eschatological sonship *and* special empowering for mission which Luke regards as normative in the church, and which he inevitably highlights and emphasises in his description of 'the expansion of Christianity' (so, I think, von Baer).

(4) In theological terms, the gift is primarily the Spirit of new covenant life through which we experience our salvation and eschatological sonship, with special empowering for mission a more occasional, and specific charisma within the more general saving gift (but one which is a special interest for Luke because of the missiological focus of his writing): so Lampe and (more persuasively) Dunn.

If I have understood Dr Shelton aright he believes that Luke's 'deep level' theology (if I may put it that way) is basically that of option (3),²⁵ though I think he would say that in terms of presentation (the 'surface level' theology) Luke is closer to position (1). I think he is basically right about Luke's 'deep level' theology, but would suggest that position (2) is closer to Luke's 'surface level' theology than position (1). The view that the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit in Acts is primarily an empowerment for mission has a long history in Pentecostal circles, going right back to Parham.²⁶ But it has, in my view, been given rather too much weight,

and has tended to blind some Pentecostalist discussions to other important aspects of Lucan pneumatology. In what follows we shall point to some of the chief problems with position (1), and so for the need of some broader description (such as 'charismatic Spirit')—one which takes more account of the significant things the Spirit does for the church too (to build up and direct God's people, and guard her holiness), and which relates more fully with Luke's soteriology.

Problems for the view the Spirit is exclusively or predominantly 'Empowerment for Mission'

(1) *There are two, and only two texts unambiguously in favour of this position:* Luke 24:47–49 and Acts 1:8. That these are very important texts need not be doubted, standing as they do as guardians of the passage from Luke to Acts. But

(a) *Nothing* in the Jewish background would suggest the expectation of a gift of the Spirit on Israel that was *exclusively* missiologically orientated (not even Isa. 42 and 49:1–6); everything suggests the expectation is of an eschatological gift to Israel (Isa. 11, 32; Jer. 31; Ezek. 36–37; Joel 3, etc., and all the intertestamental traditions dependent on them) which will restore *Israel*, and enable her to walk in close communion with her God. We need not doubt this has very important missiological *consequences* both for alienated Jews and for Gentiles (as Isa. 2:1–4), but mission is not the focus of the gift.

(b) *None* of the material in Luke 1–2 would suggest an exclusively missiological focus to the 'Spirit of prophecy'; there are no outsiders involved, the angelic word of 1:32–35 is about fulfilment of Israel's hopes in her promised Davidid, and directed to a pious Israelite; the prophetic words of the other characters are either recognition oracles (mixed with characteristics of announcement of salvation oracles) (1:42–45, 68–79; 2:29–32) or charismatic thanksgiving (1:46–55), and are again directed to God's people or to God himself. It is misleading, in my view, to characterise these speeches as instances of 'bearing witness', not least because the vector of that metaphor is the advocacy of God's case in the cosmic trial against *unbelief* (which is not the issue in these oracles).

(c) Even in Jesus' own experience of the Spirit, which was mainly an empowering to liberate others and extend God's reign to them, Shelton has correctly pointed to elements of Jesus' own participation and benefit in the gift of the Spirit upon him (e.g. Luke 10:21), and much of the fruit of the Spirit upon him is directed to the repentant, to instruct, guide and strengthen them.

(d) While much of Acts does indeed depict charismata (e.g. of preaching) that are clearly related to 'witness' (in the sense of advocacy of Christ to unbelievers), and so directly missiologically orientated (notably 4:8, 31; 6:10; 8:29, 39; 9:17!; 10:19; 11:12; 13:2, 4, 9; 16:6 and

7), there are equally many texts that have little or nothing to do with mission unless this is construed so widely as to mean *any* kind of service for God's people or outsiders, or unless any activity which is for God's people is seen as enhancing the church, and so making it more missiologically effective. The first of these ploys makes the term 'mission' vacuous, and simply fuses options (1) and (2) of the options cited above. The second always amounts to a 'reading' of events from an arbitrarily chosen missiological *perspective*, rather than a discernment of the author's intention: one simply has *no grounds* to maintain that Luke thinks of (say) Agabus' prophecy of famine (11:28) and the response to it, as primarily 'missiological' because, somehow, indirectly, the church would have been strengthened, and outsiders challenged.

Most notable amongst the many texts that have virtually no missiological significance, and, rather, evidently speak of actions of the Spirit for the benefit of the church herself, are 5:3, 9 (Ananias and Sapphira's sin is a lying to the Spirit; implying the Spirit monitors the holiness of the church); 6:3 (the spiritually wise are to serve tables in the context of a dispute); 11:28 (Agabus' prophecy of famine), and 20:28 (appointment of leaders by the Spirit to the church). A number of other texts relate to purely personal prophecies (e.g. those of warning to Paul, 20:23; 21:4, 11). Of course, some charismata that benefit or direct the church do also have *secondary* missiological significance. As well as clarifying relations between Jews and Gentiles *within* the church, the decision prompted by the Spirit in Acts 15:28 probably made mission to the Gentiles easier; similarly, churches that live in the fear of the Lord, and the comfort of the Spirit, may expect to attract converts (9:31), just as churches encouraged and challenged by men like Barnabas (11:24) would. And missionaries who by God's grace become 'filled with joy and the Holy Spirit' even when they are rejected (13:52) are undoubtedly thereby refreshed for the next bout of mission. But these are *secondary* missiological *effects*, sometimes suggested by the connections in Luke's narrative; they are not evidently the *primary* purposes of the charismata in question.

I have so far steered clear of the main conversion-initiation texts (except 9:17), but they can no longer be avoided. It is regularly argued (e.g. Menzies, Shelton) that the Samaritans (Acts 8) and the Ephesian disciples (Acts 19:1–6) have in one way or another attained authentic faith some time before they receive the Spirit, which is therefore primarily empowerment for mission (as in the case of the disciples at Pentecost, and Cornelius' household receive 'the same gift' [11:17]). But it should be said that in none of these later contexts (Acts 8; 10–11; 19) is there any clear indication that the gift of the Spirit is specifically *mission* orientated. No unbelieving bystanders now hear the invasive charismatic speech (whether tongues or prophecy) and are startled to ask, 'What does this mean?'; nor is it said that any of the people

involved went out to preach. Shelton discovers evidence of 'Spirit-witness' in the invasive charismatic speech of Cornelius' household, which he glosses as 'empowerment to give witness explicitly concerning God's greatness and implicitly concerning their own repentant and therefore acceptable state before God' and so as 'power for mission' (132, and n.22), but this needs to read a great deal into the text that is simply not there.²⁷ Is it not more natural to understand these outbursts of charismatic prophetic praise as rather typical examples of brief invasive and responsive *worship* that Judaism understood occasionally to mark Spirit-inception (and some other encounters with God)?²⁸

Menzies appeals to 9:31 (Luke's summary of the growth of the church in Samaria and elsewhere) as a hint that the gift of the Spirit in 8:17 is empowerment for mission,²⁹ but 9:31 is a long way from 8:14–17, and hardly sufficiently specific to it to demonstrate that the gift is exclusively mission orientated: Luke may well have thought the Spirit, who gives many gifts for many different ends, raised up some to be evangelists (like Philip and Stephen) in Judea, Galilee and Samaria (just as the Spirit raises up overseers in 20:28); and he may have thought a charismatically endowed and holy church also naturally attracted converts—but there is no evidence he restricts the gift in 8:17 *specifically* to 'empowerment for mission, or to give spoken testimony'. Similarly, Luke undoubtedly believed the growth of the church in Ephesus was dependent upon the Spirit given to the church (and especially to Paul), and we may *believe* (though we have no specific evidence for it) that 'the twelve' mentioned in 19:1–6 were fully involved in evangelism,³⁰ but this still comes a long way short of demonstrating that the gift of the Spirit to the twelve in 19:6 is exclusively (or even primarily?) 'empowerment for mission'.

Menzies (following Lampe and Coppens) also argues that the laying on of hands (8:18; 19:6) is a 'commissioning' for the missionary task,³¹ and that this identifies the nature of the gift of the Spirit imparted; but this suggestion too is unconvincing. There are basically three different paradigms for laying on of hands: (1) transfer of power (esp. of 'touch'); (2) invocatory prayer (e.g. for healing) (mixed with (1)), and (3) identification, representation and legal or quasi-legal transfer of authority (e.g. ordination of a student by rabbinical school). The notion of 'commissioning' rests on the third paradigm. But in the passages concerned there is no suggestion of transfer of authority, and right of representation; the laying on of hands which transfers the Spirit conform to paradigms (1) or (2) rather than (3).

Let us summarise our point so far by saying that while there can be no doubt Luke has pressed the importance of the Spirit for mission, nevertheless, if Luke was keen to stress the gift of the Spirit *exclusively* (or even primarily) as endowment for mission (and he would have an uphill struggle against the rest of Christianity if he did so), he has missed

some glorious opportunities to make his point (especially in Acts 8, 10, and 19), and he has said much to undermine his case, and to suggest an endowment of rather more general charismatic character!

(2) *The position that Luke considers the gift of the Spirit either exclusively or even primarily to be empowerment for mission must also face the objection that Luke ties the gift very closely to conversion and baptism.* This is clear at 2:38; at 8:16 (Luke would not bother to say that although the Samaritans were baptised, the Spirit had 'not yet' come upon them [and quickly wheel in the apostles to rectify the situation], if this was simply the normal, assumed, state of affairs) and at 19:1–6 (when Paul discovers the 'disciples' have not received the Spirit, he presses the question of what sort of *baptism* it was, then, that they had undergone. This second question indicates his assumption that *usually Christian baptism would lead to Spirit-reception*).

One can understand the close connection of Spirit to conversion-initiation if it is either a gift necessary for salvation (or as part of the *experience* of salvation), or even if it is a general charismatic endowment for active participation amongst the renewed people of God (including witness), but if Luke has *restricted* the gift of the Spirit to empowerment for mission, then the tight (almost urgent) connection to *conversion-initiation* simply becomes puzzling. For all the importance of mission to Luke, he really does not give the impression that converts are baptised, then immediately pushed out to bear their witness and evangelise. This objection is not a major problem for Shelton, and those like him, who think Luke may view the gift of the Spirit as the power of salvation *as well as* endowment for mission (with Luke much more interested in the latter than in the former), but I think it is a problem for those like Menzies, who insist that for Luke the gift is always (theologically) a post-salvation endowment, for mission alone.

(3) *As a final objection to the view that Luke has restricted the gift of the Spirit to endowment for mission, may I suggest it leads to an entirely reductionist view of 'salvation' in Luke-Acts.* There is a tendency amongst Pentecostal scholars to identify salvation with forgiveness of sins (and consequent future hope) promised to faith and belief in Jesus as Lord. It is on such grounds that Shelton and Menzies can suggest that the disciples between resurrection and ascension (and the Samaritans between their baptism at the hands of Philip and their later reception of the Spirit at the hands of Peter and John) are fully 'saved' believers, for whom the Spirit can then only come as a *donum superadditum*, a second blessing, supplementary to salvation (and hence one whose rationale might be empowerment for mission).

They are probably right to resist all attempts (such as that by Dunn) to suggest there is any lack in the 'faith' of the disciples after the resurrection or in that of the Samaritans after their baptism (but before 8:17). There can be little doubt they were already 'saved', albeit in the

rather minimalist sense described. But *surely* this is a very inadequate understanding of how the NT writers (including Luke) understood salvation. Salvation, for Judaism, and for the NT writers, is reversal of the triple alienation of 'the fall' (alienation from God, from each other, and from creation). While the early Christians believed that many elements of this would only be fulfilled in the new creation, they nevertheless maintained that it had dawned in the church of the Spirit. The Spirit brought the experiential presence of the Father and of the Son to the church, and the church, especially as a charismatic body, was dependent on each other (1 Cor. 12–14), and so began to experience the harmony of all things to which God was restoring humankind in Christ (Eph. 1:9–10, 20–23; 2:11–22; 3:6–10; 4:1–13, etc.). The Spirit was in that sense the bond of peace and unity (Eph. 4:3). While I have just quoted from some classical expressions of this in Paul, the vision was I think virtually universal to the New Testament.

Is Luke different? The nearest he provides to a formal definition of salvation is in Luke 1:71–76, and it involves not merely forgiveness of sins, but freedom from oppressions, and freedom as God's transformed people to serve God without fear, in holiness and righteousness. This is the same sort of allusion to paradisaic harmony restored that we find from Isaiah 9 and 11 (to which the passage alludes) to the final chapters of Revelation. But surely, if Luke believes this 'salvation' is found anywhere it is found in *the church of the Spirit*.

To put the question more sharply, if it is the Spirit of prophecy poured out at Pentecost that brings (as we have noted above) spiritual wisdom, revelation, guidance, joy, prompts the mutual service of the church, sets a guard over her holiness, brings encouragement when she is oppressed, and, above all, enables the *experienced* presence and power of both the Father and the heavenly Lord, *what sort of meagre 'salvation' would the disciples have without this gift*, and with Christ himself departed from them? Not, I think, what Luke means by 'salvation'! The same question may be asked of the Samaritans. Of course, while Philip is with them they at least taste some of these things through the power of God active in *his* life. But with what would they be left if he departed, and they still had not received the Spirit? Could one really say 'salvation has come to them' (in any full-bodied sense) of a group who lack the prime if not only means of experiential awareness of God and of Christ (of course angelophanies, such as Acts 10:3, remain possible, but . . .)?

Again, I have to say that Dr Shelton is less vulnerable to this objection than those who hold option (1) (that the gift of the Spirit is purely for mission)—if anyone does *truly* hold it³²—for he allows the gift of the Spirit in Luke is connected with conversion and salvation as well as being an empowering for mission. But I hope that by expressing this objection, I can persuade him (and his sympathetic readers) to reconsider how to describe this empowering gift of the Spirit. Does not the

description 'empowering for mission (or 'for witness')' focus the nature of the Pentecostal gift far *too narrowly*? Does it not encourage us to turn a blind eye to other features of Luke's pneumatology to which he also gives considerable attention? And does it not tend to isolate the Pentecostal gift too sharply from the experience of salvation?

VI. CONCLUSION

In the final analysis I would suggest that recognition of the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy can do justice to all Luke's emphases. The gift is part of 'salvation' both in that it brings the *experience* of God and Christ to the *individual* (and grants spiritual wisdom, leading, etc.), and in that it gives him or her a place in a *community* of the Spirit. In this people of God, the individual is enriched (and experiences fuller salvation) as Christ is present and active in the Spirit in a variety of different gifts and graces. But the same Spirit (the reconciling Spirit that binds God and community together in new harmony) also reaches out to draw others in, and so the gift is, secondly, but inevitably, also empowering for mission. But the gift is an 'empowering for mission' only as *part* (however important a part for Luke and for us) of a more comprehensive gift, the gift of the new covenant 'Spirit of prophecy'. The same gifts of revelation, wisdom, and charismatic speech—the prototypical gifts of 'the Spirit of prophecy'—may serve as the basis for individual Christian 'life' and worship, as the means to guide, comfort and build the church, and as the means to address the outsider.

Dr Shelton has given us a thought-provoking and theologically important book, which should stimulate careful discussion of an area which is significant for the life and mission of the church. It is also inevitably an area in which feelings run high, and the unity of the church is at stake, but he manages to treat the matter with a sensitivity, balance and fairness, from which we may all learn.

Endnotes

- 1 J.B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991).
- 2 Sons and daughters of the rock will note with indignation that the publishers have rendered this 'Sterling' on the back cover!
- 3 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), 32–35, 41–42.
- 4 Dunn, *Baptism*, 38–54.
- 5 I am not convinced that Luke has made the reinterpretation regularly attributed to him (it goes back at least to Hans von Baer's 1926 dissertation, and is redefended by R.P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology With Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 184–85. *Per Contra*, see M. Turner, 'The Spirit and the Power of Jesus' Miracles in the Lucan Conception', *NovT* 33 (1991), 124–52, esp. 142–46 and n.46).
- 6 A more convincing case for roughly the same position is made by Menzies (*Develop-*

ment, 198–200), but he bases it on the much clearer Servant imagery of Isaiah 49:6 that pervades Luke 24:47–49 and Acts 1:8, rather than on the merely possible Elijah–Elisha typology.

- 7 Cf. 129 (on Acts 2:38); ‘Like Paul, Luke is probably not averse to associating the Holy Spirit with conversion’. See also pp. 6, 142, 146, etc.
- 8 Here he is even prepared with Wilckens to think Cornelius’ piety attests he is converted before ever Peter arrives. This cannot be right; his piety shows rather that Cornelius is a God-fearer, and it is precisely these whom Luke most expects to convert to Christianity—a point well made, albeit exaggerated, by J. Jervell, ‘The Church of Jews and Godfearers’, in J.B. Tyson (ed.), *Luke–Acts and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 11–20.
- 9 H. von Baer, *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926).
- 10 G.J. Haya-Prats, *L’Esprit Force de l’Église* (Paris: Cerf, 1975).
- 11 It is not that it is unknown to him, for in a footnote (123, n.38) he avers that ‘in Luke the Holy Spirit is the “spirit of prophecy”’, and then cites Schweizer in support. But we are left wondering why he has not made more of this central point. And as he clearly knows Schweizer’s position he must know that Schweizer and others who claim Luke’s pneumatology is based in the Jewish concept of ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ deduce from this that Luke could not have attributed either miracles or ethical effects to the Spirit (*TWNT* 6:407, and see Haya-Prats, and notably now Menzies). But this ‘problem’ is not reflected in Shelton’s chapter on ‘the Holy Spirit and miracles’ (ch. 7), nor does it receive mention in chapters 5 and 8 where he attributes to Luke the view that the Spirit is the power of ethical righteousness and/or cleansing.

Now I happen to think that Dr Shelton is right, and have argued that Judaism and early Christianity had a broader concept of ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ than that title itself suggests, and that ethical effects and miracles of power were by no means the foreign bodies to the concept that they are often claimed to be—but the issue is so sharply contested that Dr Shelton’s silence on the matters is puzzling.

On the former issue, see M. Turner, ‘The Spirit of Prophecy and the Ethical/Religious 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. On the relation of the Spirit of prophecy to miracles, see the ongoing debate in M. Turner, ‘The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles in the Lucan Conception’, *NovT* 33 (1991), 124–52, and the reply to it by my friend and debating partner Bob Menzies (‘Spirit and Power in Luke–Acts: A Response to Max Turner’, *JSNT* 49 (1993), 11–20). I agree with him entirely that the connection with miracles is relatively rare (and mainly in contexts of reinterpretation of biblical material where the connection was already made) and have been aware of the delicate relationship between ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ and miracles since e.g. my 1980 dissertation. My main point, however, is simply that the translators, paraphrasers and interpreters of the OT evidently did not find the connection of the Spirit of prophecy with miracles problematic (they do not, for example, consistently attempt to translate ‘the problem’ away), and these are the writings to which most Jews would most regularly be exposed. Furthermore, the growth of messianic portraits around the tradition in Isaiah 11.1–4 (in different variations from 1 Enoch to new finds from 4Q) provided the basis for associating the Spirit of prophecy with redemptive miracles: the Messiah receives the Spirit of prophecy as a Spirit of wisdom and of power (to purge and deliver). It is thus not surprising that the tradition before Luke, which also understood the Spirit on Jesus as some sort of messianic variation on the Spirit of prophecy, nevertheless attributed his miracles to the same Spirit. So Luke’s belief that the Spirit on Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy was not liable to compel him to change the tradition and to excise references to miracles.

I find Dr Menzies’ arguments from Josephus less than convincing. To be sure, Josephus has added references to the Spirit of prophecy, when his LXX source had none; and, yes, Josephus has omitted reference to the Spirit from some biblical

- narratives where this is portrayed as the source of a miracle. That would sound like a strong argument for Menzies’ case that Josephus could not attribute miracles to the Spirit of prophecy—until one notes that we are dealing with a total of just seven references to divine Spirit altogether (in *AJ* 4.108 ‘spirit’ refers to the angel) in all his writings, that his additions of mention of the Spirit in biblical narratives only repeat or represent previous statements in the narrative, that he has also removed references to Spirit as the source of prophetic charismata (not merely at *AJ* 2.87, but by global exclusion), and that (despite Dr Menzies’ attempt to make ‘power’ a buffer between the Spirit on the prophet and the miracle) in *AJ* 4.108 Josephus rather clearly attributes the power of miraculous punishment (the reverse of healing, as it were) to the Spirit: ‘the power of the divine Spirit’ here cannot really mean anything else.
- 12 J.B. Shelton, ‘“Filled with the Holy Spirit” and “Full of the Holy Spirit”: Lucan Redactional Phrases’, in P. Elbert (ed.), *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley H. Horton* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1988), 81–107, and his Stirling PhD (1982), ‘“Filled with the Holy Spirit”: A Redactional Motif in Luke’s Gospel’.
- 13 M.M.B. Turner, ‘Spirit Endowment in Luke–Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations’, *VoxEv* 12 (1981), 45–63 (an article written before my more detailed study of linguistics, and so liable to some revision!).
- 14 Shelton argues that the words ‘Stephen, being full of the Holy Spirit’ are co-ordinated as strongly with the words of 7:56 ‘and he said . . .’, as they are with the preceding ‘and saw the glory of God’ (7:55). I find the case forced here. In 7:55, the Spirit is primarily the organ of revelation affording the vision; the relationship to the following speech may be ‘implied’, but it is not focused.
- 15 See e.g. M. Turner, ‘The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke–Acts: A Question of Origins’, *NTS* 38 (1992), 66–88.
- 16 Turner, ‘Spirit Endowment in Luke–Acts’, 54–55.
- 17 A.J. Hultgren, *Christ and His Benefits: Christology and Redemption in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 79–81.
- 18 See J.A. Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (London: Chapman, 1989), esp. 61–63, but also ch.4. In more detail, Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (I–IX)* (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 179–92.
- 19 B. Tatum, ‘The Epoch of Israel: Luke i–ii and the Theological Plan of Luke–Acts’, *NTS* 13 (1966–67), 184–95.
- 20 Dr Shelton is keenly aware of this (see 92, 118–19), but does not appear to have any explanation of it, other than that for Luke the promise of the Baptist is for Pentecost, not before—which begs the question why? Baer and Dunn at least provide an answer.
- 21 Shelton and Menzies argue 1:35 implies the gift of the Spirit of prophecy to Mary too. *Per Contra*, see M. Turner, ‘The Spirit and the Power of Jesus’ Miracles’, 140, n.42. I am prepared to believe that Luke thinks this coming of the Spirit on Mary remains with her (as the Spirit of prophecy) and so later inspires her Magnificat, but I suggest that is not the focus of 1:35, where we have rather an explanation of the generation of the ‘holy one’ by God’s Holy Spirit.
- 22 Indeed, even with this terminology it could be said there are collocational patterns which may enhance the distinctions. For example, of Jesus it is never said that ‘he was filled with the Spirit and said’, while he is described as ‘full of the Spirit’ without further qualifying collocation. By contrast, no disciple is said to be ‘full of the Spirit’ (*simpliciter*); such statements are qualified by ‘and wisdom’ or ‘and faith’, or attach to some immediate action.
- 23 M.M.B. Turner, ‘Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective’, *TynB* 32 (1981), 3–42.
- 24 We find the following parallel collocations with Spirit in the OT: Exodus 28:3, ἐμπιμπλάναι; 31:3 ἐμπιμπλάναι; 35:31, ἐμπιμπλάναι; Deuteronomy 34:9, ἐμπιμπλάναι; Isaiah 11:3 ἐμπιμπλάναι. Cf. Sirach 39:6, πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται, ‘he shall be filled with a Spirit of understanding’; 48:12, καὶ Ἐλισαίε ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος αὐτοῦ, ‘and Elisha shall be filled with his Spirit’; Wisdom 1:7, πνεύμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην, ‘the Spirit of the Lord fills the world’.

- 25 I am not sure of this, for Shelton does not spell out precisely how Luke relates the Spirit to salvation.
- 26 See e.g. James R. Goff, 'Initial Tongues in the Theology of Charles Fox Parham', in G.B. McNee (ed.), *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 57–71.
- 27 And the second part of Shelton's gloss has nothing to do with empowerment for mission. To use the references given to support the argument that the Spirit is 'endowment for witness' requires an illegitimate semantic swap in the meaning of the phrase from 'an endowment to advocate/preach Christ' to 'an endowment which proves the status of a person as rightfully belonging to God's people'.
- 28 Cf. 1 Enoch 71:11 (and 61:11–12); Josephus, *AJ* 6.166; 6.223; Mek. Shir. 1; ExR 23.2; Nu(TO) 11.25–27; 1 Sam(TJ) 10.6; 19.20; 19.23.
- 29 Menzies, *Development*, 260, following the suggestion of G.W.H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London: Longman's Green and Co., 1956), 72, and R. Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984), 65.
- 30 Menzies, *Development*, argues Luke associates these disciples with Paul's mission at 19:9, 30 and 20:1. But the 'disciples' of these references are the increasing band of believers, not merely the twelve. None of the texts associates them directly with witness.
- 31 Menzies, *Development*, 259–60, 276.
- 32 I have attributed the view to Menzies with the qualification 'almost'. Menzies' fundamental position is: 'the Spirit comes upon the disciples to equip them for their prophetic vocation (i.e. for their role as 'witnesses'). The disciples receive the Spirit, not as the source of cleansing and a new ability to keep the law, nor as a foretaste of the salvation to come, nor as the essential bond by which they (each individual) are linked to God; indeed, *not primarily for themselves*. Rather, as the driving force behind their witness to Christ, the disciples receive the Spirit for others' (*Development*, 207, our italics). While this statement pertains to the disciples at Pentecost, Menzies casts later disciples in their image. *Development*, chs. 10–11, regularly uses partial synonyms for 'empowering for mission', regularly seeks to draw out evangelistic/mission connections, passes over (generally speaking) the ecclesial dimension of the Spirit's work (Haya-Prats was much more balanced there), and plays down any suggestion that the gift of the Spirit is given for the *receptor's* benefit. Nevertheless I justify my qualification 'almost', because just occasionally he gives wider reference: e.g. (when drawing parallels with Luke 1–2, and the Spirit on Jesus) 'empowering to carry out a task' (212, 278); or in reference to the commissioning of the seven in Acts 6:6 (though even here he refers to it as 'commissioning of believers for service in the church's mission', 259). See also 224–25 and the long n.2 there.