

## **ACTS 2 AS PARADIGMATIC NARRATIVE FOR LUKE'S THEOLOGY OF THE SPIRIT**

Max Turner notes that three periods of significant twentieth-century debates over the baptism of the Spirit have occurred. This paper focuses on the third, described in this way: “[The third of these] debates [are] between classical Pentecostals and more traditional Protestantism on the question of whether Jesus’ Jordan experience was a ‘second’ grace of empowering and the pattern for future Christian ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’.”<sup>1</sup> The heart of this debate swirls around the interpretation of Acts 2.

Classical Pentecostals hold Acts 2 in high regard for it contains the foundations of their theology of initial physical evidence for speaking in tongues. Pentecostal ecclesiastical perspectives usually focus on the first four verses of this chapter, without due regard for the rest of the chapter, certainly not in its larger narrative plan of Luke-Acts.<sup>2</sup> Generally, this is because interpreters apply Joel’s text to Acts 2:1-4 selectively rather than comprehensively . . . . “ *Spirit, Scripture and Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Baguio City, Philippines, Asia Pacific Theological Seminary Press, 1995), 99. In his attempt to overcome this, however, he too falls short. It can rightly be said that many use 2:1-4 selectively. Furthermore, the connection of classical Pentecostalism with the holiness traditions complicates the matter even more. Classical Pentecostalism is closely aligned at its roots with non-Pentecostal holiness traditions. Consequently, Pentecostals seldom break from the other interpretation. For instance, the non-Pentecostal, holiness tradition takes fire in 2:3 to refer to purging (i.e., burning out sin) and thus to refer to another definite work of grace. Purging, i.e., the baptism of the Spirit, is then seen to be the work of sanctification. On the other hand, Pentecostals focus on tongues in Acts 2:3-4 as initial, physical evidence of a second work of grace (i.e., an issue of being separate or distinct from salvation) and understand this filling (or baptism, in the

words of classical Pentecostalism) of the Spirit to be an empowerment for ministry. But, many classical Pentecostals also see in this experience a reference to sanctification.<sup>3</sup>

Glances at the current literature of this discussion raise several questions. One is over the use and meaning of the concept “paradigmatic.” I call it a “concept” because several words are used to describe the idea, and those words often are ambiguous or unclear. There is no question about Acts 2 being paradigmatic. Almost everyone, including Dunn, either in articles, monographs or commentaries, thinks that Acts 2 is paradigmatic.<sup>4</sup> However, they do not develop it either exegetically or theologically. But “paradigm” should be connected explicitly with exegetical principles and biblical theology. “Paradigmatic” should involve more than a major theme or two extracted from a passage. It must embrace the significance of the unit in its thematic wholeness, and direct the major thrust of the larger narrative, and be strategically placed to provide the reader with some sort of conditioning for understanding and applying as he or she proceeds.<sup>5</sup> I will, though, use some of what others have said to clarify and expand the meaning of “paradigmatic.”

A second question arises over the exegetical methods employed in the discussion. One neglected method is narrative criticism. Contemporary methods have focused exclusively on such things as form and redaction criticism. Atkinson recently has written of those in this discussion and notes about Dunn, a major figure in this discussion, that “His exegesis is chiefly lexical and syntactical. He does not concern himself overtly with redactional issues, such as the handling by Luke or his sources of Joel 2:28-32 at Acts 2:28-32. Neither does he discuss narratological issues.”<sup>6</sup> I would also suggest that others, such as Robert Menzies, J. B. Shelton, and to a great extent Max Turner, have followed a similar methodology. Shepherd speaks even more pointedly in his introductory chapter in *Narrative Function of Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. After surveying some of the themes in the history of research, he believes that these methodologies have

even obscured the text. He finds two such major methodological categories: Those in “The Search for a Lukan Theology” and others in “The Search for a Pre-Lukan Theology.” He places people like Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann in the first category and James D.G. Dunn and J.H.E. Hull in the latter one.<sup>7</sup> Shepherd then proceeds to lay out his narratological approach. However, while he does connect plot with characterization, two elements in narrative exegesis, his study focuses on the exposition of character within narrative in Luke-Acts with little regard for the more complex issues of narrative, especially in Acts 2 upon which he only touches briefly.<sup>8</sup>

Another neglected method is social science criticism. This focuses on the world behind the text but in a more profound way than just searching partial literary texts that this world produced, such as what form criticism does. This approach pays attention to the way people lived, thought, and experienced things. Scholars of all stripes, including those in the Pentecostal tradition, have been negligent here.<sup>9</sup> There is another side to the social sciences and that involves the use current models.

Nonetheless, scholars are advancing in both areas, focusing on the world behind the text and the world in the text.<sup>10</sup> For example, the wedding of these two approaches shows up in a new book, *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*.<sup>11</sup> Others have contributed significantly as well. I am especially thinking of Ryken, Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, Jr.<sup>12</sup>

### **Current Debate**

Yet, in spite of these advances, the debate goes on. From the developments in the last ten years or so a new level of discussion has emerged. A larger number of scholars now commonly assume that Luke-Acts is historical narrative and as such intentionally contains a theologically didactic component at its center. In Assemblies of God discussions appeared in written form between Gordon Fee and Roger Stronstad. But with the advent of Robert Menzies’ published dissertation the discussion took a step

forward.<sup>13</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, of course, has been both a foe of and an advocate for Pentecostals, although he has been an enduring thorn in the flesh for them.<sup>14</sup> A glance at the more recent articles gives some indication of the interest in this discussion: J. D. G. Dunn, "Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 3 (1993): 3-27; R. P. Menzies, "Luke and the Spirit: A Reply to James Dunn," *JPT* 4 (April 1994): 15-38; J. B. Shelton, "A Reply to James Dunn's 'Baptism in the Spirit': A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts," *JPT* 4 (April 1994): 139-43; R. P. Menzies, "Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts: A Response to Max Turner," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 49 (March 1993): 11-20; R. P. Menzies, James Shelton's *Mighty in Word and Deed: A Review Article*," *JPT* 2 (April 1993): 105-15; and William Atkinson, "Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Luke-Acts," *JPT* 6 (April 1995): 87-131.

### **Purpose and Methodology**

I will focus on some narrative techniques and apply to them to the meaning of paradigmatic and Acts 2. With this I am not limiting exegesis to the narrative task, however. One's approach must be multi dimensional. The limitations of this paper will not permit a full engagement of all the excellent work scholars have produced on these issues.

I will examine Acts 2 with reference to its internal structure and thereby attempt to establish a foundation for determining its relationship to the larger whole. We can then proceed to make a few suggestions about how it may function in the narrative scheme of Luke-Acts.

As we have noted above, many scholars now believe that Acts is historical narrative, not just historical--that Luke, though narrative (i.e., story, not fictional, but historical), is primarily theological and normative. For example, Grant Osborne in his book on hermeneutics notes:

Benny C. Aker

Assemblies of God Theological Seminary

The major premise of narrative criticism is that biblical narrative is 'art' or 'poetry,' thus centering upon the literary artistry of the author. While many would not deny the presence of a historical nucleus, the tendency is to treat the biblical stories as 'fiction' (with Sternberg being the notable exception). It is certainly true that there is little difference (at the genre level) between historical narrative and fiction, since both utilize the same methods to tell the story: plot, characters, dialogue, dramatic tension. In fact there is nothing inherently anti-historical in taking a 'fictive' approach to biblical narrative. Rather, such a perspective simply wants to recognize the presence of the 'story' genre in biblical history.

As many have noted, the biblical narratives contain both history and theology, and I would add that these are brought together via a 'story' format. The historical basis for the stories is crucial, but the representation of that story in the text is the actual object of interpretation.<sup>15</sup>

And again, Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard have similarly stated:

As they do with the Gospels, many interpreters of Acts succumb to false dichotomies between theology and history. On the other end of the spectrum, conservative students of Acts have been preoccupied with archaeology and other kinds of research, hoping to substantiate the historical trustworthiness of Acts. But in successfully doing so, they have often lost sight of the theological emphasis foremost in Luke's mind. Liberal scholars have often proved more sensitive to Luke's theological insights, but in so doing they have unnecessarily alleged that he contradicts the other evangelists, the epistles of Paul, and historical facts. A third quite recent approach plays down both Luke's theology and historical accuracy in favor of emphasizing those features of Acts that would have proved entertaining and adventuresome for ancient audiences. This approach views Acts akin to a popular novel or historical romance that includes many details simply to enhance its readers' enjoyment and delight.

We believe that it is possible (and desirable) to adopt all three of these perspectives as part of the genre of Acts without pitting any one against the others.<sup>16</sup>

They go on to note that 1) Luke compiles his accounts to teach and 2) and that the minor details convey no theological point.<sup>17</sup>

Narrative teaches theology indirectly rather than directly as do other genre such as epistle and expository or prose. For this reason, narrative is more difficult to interpret theologically than some other genres--theology in it comes through in different ways--through the plot, characterization, or in dialogue, for instance. This kind of

reading/listening material allows for more reader input and more of one's presuppositions to enter the meaning process.<sup>18</sup> Reader response theory alerts us to this fact and allows us to understand why so many interpretations exist.

### **Paradigmatic Function**

Acts 2 serves a paradigmatic purpose<sup>19</sup> but interpreters employ a variety of words for this topic without due care, such as “normativity” and “normal.” Often, it is difficult to understand what they mean. Also, many do not spell out in detail what they mean by “paradigm.”

My definition of paradigm arises from applying the results of literary analysis to Acts 2 and relies upon Leland Ryken's definition of archetypical motifs and type scenes. He writes that "A type scene is a story pattern or situation that recurs often enough in the Bible that we can identify a set of conventions and expectations for each one. Each type scene has its constituent ingredients in an established order. An awareness of such type scenes can become a significant organizing pattern for either individual books of the Bible or the Bible as a whole."<sup>20</sup> Acts 2 as a self-contained, paradigmatic scene embodies all of the elements that occur over and over again throughout Acts. These elements, explicitly and/or implicitly, not only foreshadow and suggest but also shape the reader's understanding of every account.<sup>21</sup> When applied, Acts 2 becomes a paradigm for the extension of the Primitive Church throughout Acts.

If Acts 2 is paradigmatic in this way, then it we would expect to find that Luke placed the most important scene at the beginning, rather than at the end of his narrative.<sup>22</sup> We should not anticipate, then, a climax, i.e., a resolution, at the end of Acts. Rather, Acts contains a rather open-endedness, a feature that be best described as closure with a different type of climax.<sup>23</sup>

### **Narrative Preparation For Acts 2**

Luke has given the reader clues that he intends Acts 2 among all other episodes to

function in a special manner. First, there is the matter of Jesus' anointing. It is well known that, in Luke's Gospel, what is a baptism account in Matthew has become primarily an anointing account.<sup>24</sup> Luke emphasizes Jesus' anointing before his ministry, signifying the importance of being filled with the Spirit. That anointing foreshadows his instructions later in Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:1-8 regarding the disciples' reception and parallels their experience when it comes.

Second, Luke has established a pattern in Jesus' life and teaching on prayer. The way Luke emphasizes prayer and what happens when one is praying helps (foreshadows) the reader to anticipate the arrival of Acts 2. For example, this shows up in Luke 11:1-13, when, in the context of the Lord's prayer, followed by numerous parabolic elements on prayer and petition and concluded by one of Hillel's principles (Qal wa homer, an argument from the lesser to the greater), Jesus says: "How much more will your father who is from heaven [in comparison to an earthly one] give the Spirit to those who ask him." This is a literal translation bringing out "from heaven" which echoes the "sound from heaven" of Acts 2:2. In fact, Luke 11:1-13 anticipates prayer for the Spirit. By the time the readers arrive at Acts 2:2 ( pavnte" oJmou` ejpi; to; aujtoiv / all were gathered in singleness of purpose) they would note that the disciples were praying when the Spirit came.

Third, there are explicit instructions at the end of Luke's Gospel and in Acts 1 about waiting in Jerusalem for the coming of the Spirit. Acts 1 is especially anticipatory in tone and nature. These elements arouse expectation for Acts 2 and help the reader to know that this is what Jesus meant all along.<sup>25</sup>

Fourth, Peter's speech points towards the special nature of Acts 2. Zehnle is particularly helpful here. He notes that the discourse is set apart from other speeches in Acts by its superb composition and extrinsic indications by Luke.<sup>26</sup> Zehnle further says about the speech: 1) the discourse is given on the feast of Pentecost, 2) the speech is

given in the name of the 12 apostles, not just Peter, and 3) there are several solemn words of introduction.<sup>27</sup>

There is one final element that underscores the importance of the narrative in Acts 2 and that is the way Luke introduces it. Luke uses an adverb of time at verse one (ejn tw`/ sumplhrou`sqai), which is best translated, "And when the [day of Pentecost] had fully arrived."<sup>28</sup> The New Testament contains this particular expression only here and in Luke 9:51. Luke shows significant turning points in these two places in his double work. At Luke 9:51, for instance, he introduces his great interpolation, stretching into chapter 19. In 9:51, Jesus sets his face towards Jerusalem and begins his final move to Jerusalem and his death. Likewise, in Acts 2:1, a significant turning point occurs.

### **Narrative Structure of Acts 2**

Acts 2 is a whole with a self-contained plot, definite boundaries, significant setting, characterization, climax, and resolution.<sup>29</sup> The boundaries are temporal and eschatological--everything in chapter 2 (1-47) occurs on the Day of Pentecost. In fact, Peter's speech here is the only one in Acts placed in the context of a feast.<sup>30</sup> Chapter 3 is self-contained as well and distinct in that new characters and theme are introduced. At 3:1 a new time element is given ("And both Peter and John went up to the temple at the ninth hour of prayer"), thus marking off chapter 2.

The structure of chapter 2 is easily discerned according to topic flow. We can accordingly detect four larger movements in this minute self-contained narrative. While many commentators take verses 1-13 as one unit, we can easily break these verses into two sections, between verses four and five.<sup>31</sup> (1) Verses 1-4 describe the coming of the Spirit; (2) 5-12 contain the onlookers' response; (3) 13-39 are Peter's sermon; (4) and 40-47 are Luke's summary and commentary about what happened. Peter's sermon comprises the bulk of the material in chapter 2. This implies that what he says is very important for Luke. Peter's words are an authoritative interpretation and explanation of

the coming of the Spirit on behalf of the twelve for the church.

Furthermore, the plot and climax are easily discerned. When the Spirit comes and the disciples speak in languages they have not learned, the bystanders from other places have a mixed reaction. To clarify matters about what this phenomenon of speaking in these languages means, Peter the spokesperson stands up and preaches under inspiration. The sermon impacted the people and moved them to conversion. The crowd thus moves from confusion to conversion. The point (i.e., climax) at which this turn comes and when they arrive at faith is in verses 37-39 when they ask what they must do. Peter calls them to repentance.

What is crucial to this narrative is the sermon. It provides an apostolic interpretation of this Spirit-event, especially tongues which always cause problems. Peter's sermon has definite structure and movement. While it cannot be established beyond doubt that the sermon is in the form of yelammedenu (the extant, written form comes from a later time in Jewish sources), it is not beyond reason that the sermonic form originated in the synagogue. Even if this were Luke's summary of Peter's sermon, there would remain Jewish influence.<sup>32</sup> The sermon can be divided into three parts. Each part ([1] 14-21; [2] 22-28; [3] 29-36) is clearly marked off and contains the same internal characteristics. Each point [1] begins with an appeal to his audience: (verse 14) "Fellow Jews and all who live in Jerusalem," (verse 22), "Men of Israel," (verse 29) "Brothers"; [2] contains a significant Old Testament quote: (1) verses 17-21, (2) verses 25-28, (3) 34-35; and [3] an explanation of the texts. These explanations connect the work and person of Jesus with the Old Testament and the coming of the Spirit with speaking of tongues.

These points also move in a circular fashion. At verse 14 Peter begins by responding to the crowd's state of confusion and accusation that the apostles are drunk. He replies that Joel's prophecy had come to pass with the arrival of the Spirit and the resultant speaking in tongues. The Spirit has inaugurated the eschatological age, which

is noted by every believer becoming a prophet. The Joel text concludes by saying that the day of salvation has arrived with this coming of the Spirit.

The next point begins with the anointed ministry of Jesus in outstanding signs and wonders. God had set Jesus among the people to perform them. Though lawless people had crucified Jesus, God in his foreknowledge had raised him from the dead. Death was not strong enough to keep David's Lord. God had thus provided salvation for the nations, beginning with Israel.

The third one focuses on Jesus' resurrection and ascension. What is particularly important here is that God has exalted Him to His right hand and given Him the authority to pour out the Spirit. In this position, Jesus is both Lord and Christ. Now Peter has completed a circle--it is this Jesus at the right hand of God who has poured out the Spirit.<sup>33</sup>

### **Biblical Theology and Paradigmatic**

Now from this overview of the structure of Acts 2, let me raise some theological implications. Acts 2 in narrative form has set out theological (i.e., information that contains some oughtness) elements that guide the church in its self-understanding and mission in the world. I wish to address something important to Pentecostals. This is the matter of separability of regeneration and Spirit baptism. The initiation-conversion camp sees no separability. Neither do Roman Catholic charismatic theologians—they only see stages of experience but no separability. At water baptism, for instance, the Spirit, including the charismatic Spirit, is given. He later may express himself in a fuller manner. But for classical Pentecostals, separability is very important, for in this matter lies a significant part of the theology of the Spirit.

Unless this distinct experience is emphasized in some way(s), it will die out and the work of God will suffer. They base this on experience and a particular interpretation

of church history. On the other hand, I would like to suggest that separability is not what Luke is pushing for. Quite the opposite, as Atkinson has noted well:

In conclusion, those Pentecostal arguments, which wrest baptism in the Spirit from Christian initiation, do not accurately represent Lukan pneumatology. Luke presents a believer (or apparent believer) without the Spirit as an anomaly, an anomaly that calls for an immediate corrective response from the church (Acts 8:15; 19:2-6). Indeed, one might speculate whether Luke's thoughts in recording these incidents include a pastoral concern for his readers, and the hope that anyone encountering such an anomaly in his day might take equally urgent steps to correct it.<sup>34</sup>

Separability would be a pastoral concern to correct; according to Luke it would be aberrant theology and practice. What Pentecostals may mean, then, is that in the *ordo salutis* Spirit baptism follows Spirit regeneration. The theological point pertains to distinctiveness, not separability. Atkinson goes on to say,

If Spirit-reception is a part of Christian initiation, does that mean, as Dunn argues, that for Luke one cannot be a Christian without the Spirit? Petts is able to say 'one can', but he does this by supplying his own definition of a Christian: the Samaritan incident 'shows it to be possible to be a Christian (in the sense of having genuinely believed and been baptized) and yet not to have received the Spirit'.<sup>35</sup>

What I find intriguing, and it pertains to the idea of distinctiveness, is the possibility that different levels of initiation occurred in antiquity, both in the church and outside. Strictly speaking, each experience was not initiatory but one that would usher the adherent into a deeper level of commitment, all leading towards perfection. L.T. Johnson raises this idea in a book previously mentioned.<sup>36</sup> He notes that Paul, especially in Colossians and Galatians, may be dealing with Gentiles who are used to several levels of initiation, each moving further towards perfection, from their pagan environment. Likewise, Judaism had similar ideas of ritual. Could these ancient models shed light on Luke-Acts and, perhaps,

explain not only the distinctive of Spirit-baptism but also the urge of New Testament writers for continued experiences with the Spirit? This possibility needs further exploration.

There is a further point to be made about what I mean with paradigmatic and it has to do with the Pentecostal doctrine of initial physical evidence. (It is important to note that tongues do play a major role in this chapter.) My suggestion is that some classical Pentecostals in their desire to encourage a good thing go overboard and make tongues serve a place that the Bible does not allow. As far as I know, these are good people and well intentioned. Nonetheless, when they emphasize initial physical evidence of speaking in tongues to the point of excluding or including people from the kingdom, they abuse the doctrine. Tongues in this way are not boundary markers. That is, they do not provide a means of identifying who are insiders and who are outsiders. Nor should they promote elitism, consciously or unconsciously. On the other hand, to say that this is initiation-conversion makes the same mistake. Since tongues are so important—the chapter pivots around them—initiation-conversionists also make tongues the boundary, not consciously, though. The primary purpose of tongues in Acts 2 is to testify that Jesus is now the exalted Lord at work in the church and world. This evidence, then, is directly related to the work of Jesus in the world and that is the reason they are prophetic in nature. It is the Spirit who inspires the believer to testify of mighty and wonderful things about what God has done in Christ. This is probably the reason Luke does not mention that the converts at the end of the chapter did not receive the Spirit. The whole purpose of Acts 2 is to show that when the Spirit comes on God's people, they are empowered to proclaim a dynamic and effective message. So, tongues are Christological and evangelistic in intent and underscore the fact that a new age has arrived by means of the Spirit.

However, though the chapter revolves around tongues, they serve in a secondary role (when compared to their function of testifying to the exalted Lord). Tongues provide evidence that believers have God fully at work in their lives. Tongues in this paradigmatic chapter show that the community is charged with the responsibility of evangelizing the world. Ultimately,

they can do it only by being full of the Spirit. God through the Spirit manifests Jesus' Lordship on earth. Since Acts two is paradigmatic and tongues serve a key part in its structure and content, others who follow Jesus and join the community and its mission too will receive the Spirit-baptism and speak in tongues. Luke intends his readers to bring this understanding with them as they read through the book. Since this is what happened at the beginning, this is what is expected to have happened at every step, whether or not they are mentioned at various points in the narrative. This is how paradigmatic episodes function when they are situated at the beginning of the narrative.

Discussions over initiation-conversion have lost sight of other things. "Paradigmatic" speaks more thoroughly about a number of things in Acts 2. For instance, Luke in Acts 2 addresses such matters as the trinity, the message of the church, and the nature of God's community in the last days, and of its mission.

Now, let us deal with Trinitarian matters contained in this chapter. Luke portrays a picture of the trinity in its various roles, not only within the Godhead but also outside. Luke's narrative has established a background for understanding what we read in Acts 2. The Father is the one who does the sending. It is Jesus who comes from the Father, doing his will.<sup>37</sup> Jesus submits to, obeys the Father, and provides salvation through his deeds, including his death and resurrection. Now, exalted at the right hand of the Father, He assumes his messianic rule—Jesus is Lord in the fullest sense. In this role, Jesus has the prerogative as Lord to send the Spirit to do his work in the world. The Spirit, also in submission and obedience, comes from the Father through Jesus. In fact, it is through the agency of the Spirit that believers in the world do the will of God and carry out his purposes. Peter's sermon clearly informs the reader of Acts that tongues demonstrate that Jesus has assumed his throne because it is He who sends the Spirit. This is the function of tongues here. They serve in a Christological manner, witnessing to Jesus' Lordship. Tongues, then, mark off the orthodoxy of the church in its belief and practice in the triune God and give witness to its full manifestation in the world. They were a sign to

assist others to recognize that God had indeed marked off Jesus to be Lord (Acts 2:22-24).

These eschatological people of God were both in continuity and discontinuity with the people of old and different from all other religions around it, including Judaism. To be truly orthodox, that is, to experience and see in a real way Trinitarian manifestations, one must allow for the full expression of the Spirit's work. All of the Spirit's work in the world, though it may be strange in some ways to some (note the mixed reaction of the crowd), is fundamentally Christological.

Second, the message is equally clear and distinct. In quite no other way is the message spelled out in Acts as it is in Peter's sermon in chapter two. Jesus clearly provides God's salvation. He is the Savior. The message would guide and explain the activity of God in the world and distinguish this activity (signs and wonders) from all other "miraculous activity," such as is found in that environment—miraculous signs of magicians, for instance, that could and would lead people astray. Peter shows that the promise of salvation from ancient times through the coming of the Spirit in Joel and fulfilled on Pentecost would inaugurate the age of salvation, the era of the church, so according to Goppelt, Conzelmann, and Dunn, to name a few. Miraculous activity accompanied the message, showing everyone that the gospel came not only in word but also in deed.<sup>38</sup> Jesus was active in the world through the Spirit.

Third, Acts 2 speaks about the nature of God's community. This community has as its head Jesus the Lord. And to seal that commitment, they are baptized in his name. This marks off this community as being unique, as unique as its message. One could not belong to that community without confessing and believing Jesus. It is Jesus that primarily identifies this community, and secondarily the Spirit. To make the coming of the Spirit in this manner the birth of the church or the real mark of conversion is to go from one extreme (ignore the Spirit in Trinitarian theology and practice) to the other (ignore the rightful place of Jesus in God's economy).

We now observe that this community is to be Spirit-anointed. Luke pushes for the ultimate in God's purpose; the community could only accomplish his purpose through the

enablement of the Spirit, not only through proclamation, and signs and wonders but also by being a redemptive-healing community. This is implied at every corner in Luke-Acts and set forth in Acts 2 (cf. 2:44). This community cares for the needs of others. Ultimately, only in community can a person be saved. This brings a new dimension into the picture. For Luke, salvation is not perceived of in terms of regeneration but in restoration of wholeness of personality in community. This is commensurate with Luke's presentation of salvation, as it would be understood in the Greco-Roman world. And it takes a Spirit-filled community to deal with its own great hurts and sins.<sup>39</sup>

Furthermore, this Spirit-filled community was egalitarian.<sup>40</sup> All are now prophets—men and women, young and old, regardless of former status. Being Spirit-filled means that everyone in the community is equally important, with appropriate status of honor. All now are prophets and the way Luke has connected the inspiration of tongues and prophecy goes beyond what is believed by initiation conversion. This also includes the appearance of miraculous activity. Luke appeals just after chapter 2 to the topos of friendship in such a way so as to turn Greco-Roman social conventions and expectations upside down. No longer is patronage and clientage at work in the same manner.<sup>41</sup> Each member of the community takes care of the other and shares all things without the social protocol of its environment. Riches, for example, no longer become a means of securing honor. Another set of guidelines is operative—it is the rule of Jesus through the presence of the Spirit. And Spirit-filled women likewise share the privilege of witnessing to others about Jesus the exalted Lord.

Acts 2:42 identifies four practices of this community. They further identify and strengthen the Spirit-filled group of believers. They are [1] adhering to apostolic teaching; [2] fellowship; [3] breaking of bread; and [4] prayers. One cannot say how important these factors are. They provide a means for maintaining the unity and identity of this new community.

Lastly, Acts 2 speaks about the church's mission in the world. The church bears the presence of its Lord within and among its members. The Spirit-filled community does not

serve a distant God or a dead Lord. God's presence is on and among its members in such a way that it bears powerful witness of Jesus' Lordship to the world through its life and word in the midst of persecution or miraculous intervention. The fact that it is Jesus who gave the Spirit on the day of Pentecost clearly speaks of his present and continuous activity in the affairs of the church and world. In Acts 2, He inaugurates his work from his throne, continuing throughout Acts. For example, in 7:56 Steven saw Jesus standing on God's right side. I. Howard Marshall is right when he makes a classical Pentecostal observation about the closing appearance of Acts. He says that it leaves us in suspense and ponders, "Is the point that it is still going on?"<sup>42</sup>

One other thing about tongues in Acts 2--Pentecostals long have puzzled over why Jesus never spoke in tongues, if as Stronstad and Menzies believe that Jordan and Pentecost events are on the same level. Our analysis and reflection on Acts 2 as paradigmatic narrative offers a solution to this problem. The resolution comes from observations about Luke's Christology and the paradigmatic role of Acts two. Luke's Christology highlights this resolution. In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus the Messianic Savior was providing salvation. His anointing at the Jordan empowered and compelled him into his messianic ministry, culminating in his death and resurrection. However, the ascension was the capstone of his ministry, enthroning him as Lord (cf. Acts 2:32-33). So, Jesus moved from anointed to exalted messiah. Now with his messianic work completed, he commissioned from heaven his disciples to carry on his saving work. But their ministry differed from that of their Lord. Their role was to witness in and to the world that Jesus was its Savior. This is the place of tongues for believers--They distinguish between the work of Jesus and that of his followers. In this light, tongues help to distinguish Lord and disciple, Savior and saved, proclaimed and proclaimer. Jesus' anointing was for a different purpose in one sense, but similar in another. Tongues highlight the difference. This distinctiveness is also featured in another way. Jesus as exalted Lord gave his disciples the Spirit. He was the Giver, they the recipients.

### **Conclusion**

Beyond the appeal to consider Acts two as a paradigmatic narrative, I would call scholars in this discussion to think about other exegetical and theological issues. Scholars in this discussion on Acts 2 and related points need to surface the possibility and implications of these biblical theological issues. For instance, Dunn, who believes and practices unity and diversity, seems to ignore this possibility in his conversion/initiation concept.<sup>43</sup> Menzies goes to the other extreme here. He is too narrow when he believes that prophecy is exclusively and overtly connected with the Spirit. I am aware of what he wants to do and support him in his efforts, but does he push it too far in removing “power” from an immediate connection with Spirit?<sup>44</sup> In this regard, he insists upon diversity that is not contained within unity. And the connection he makes about this uniqueness of the Spirit and prophecy shows less continuity (if any at all) with the New Testament writers and more continuity with Judaism. James Shelton, who shows a more balanced view of diversity within unity, and continuity, displays a mediating position between Dunn and Menzies.

In biblical theology, much has been said about unity and diversity. While not addressing the issue of a center at length, I do want to say something about it. Diversity is to be contained within a basic unity through the means of continuity. Usually continuity/discontinuity appears in understanding the relationship between Old and New Testaments. However, it will also assist us to perceive the relationship of themes between authors, Some of the elements of the paradigm in Acts 2 show both unity and diversity with other New Testament writers within this continuity.

For one, the matter of community needs to be further explored and developed.<sup>45</sup> It seems to me that the nature of the newly formed community in Acts 2 bears striking similarity at many points with Jesus’ ideal community in the Sermon on the Mount. Surely, this would not be out of order. It was Jesus who taught about his expectations of community, and it was He who had now formed it through the Holy Spirit. Does not this observation correspond to solid

Evangelical, biblical foundations? Is there not continuity between Jesus as reported in Matthew and as reported in Acts? Surely Jesus receives a different reporting (and thus diversity) but the authors write of the same Jesus by the same Spirit.

Another point about unity. Luke's presentation of the Spirit in Acts 2 is similar to that in John's Gospel, especially chapters 14-16. Both Luke and John present the roles of the Father, Son, and Spirit. The Father sent Jesus who finishes his work and ascends. He must return to heaven or else the Spirit cannot come. Jesus' work is thus only finished in his ascension. In that finished state, believers can pray and Jesus will send the Spirit from the Father. Jesus is the focus of the Spirit's activity in both writers. Other material in John's Gospel seems to parallel that in Luke as well, for instance, some of the post-resurrection events, suggesting that Luke and John had some contact. And John's accounting of Jesus and John the Baptism at Jesus anointing (1:32-34) is much more similar to Luke's (3:21-22) than to the other Gospel writers. John's theology of the Spirit implies, some of the time at least, more than just regeneration. What is more, Hebrews and Revelation also contain revelation about Jesus' ongoing activity in heaven (see also the last sentences of Matthew's gospel).

This is not to say that diversity does not exist. John's Gospel, for one, places a rather distinctive emphasis upon the Spirit. Furthermore, Luke himself speaks of different activities of the Spirit. Turner and others have rightly noted that Luke says that the Spirit works in creative ways as well as in prophetic empowerment, for example in Luke 1: 35. It is appropriate to say that Luke knew of the O.T. and later Jewish texts that contain descriptions of a variety of Spirit activities. This only strengthens the view that Luke intentionally focused on the Spirit as prophetic empowerment in Spirit- baptism as opposed to initiation-conversion.

Another point at issue pertains to the distinctive/separability issue. Luke's view of soteriology is closer, if not the same, as that found in the other two synoptics but farther apart from John's gospel, where there occurs a well-articulated view of initiation/regeneration. Yet all four gospels derive from Jesus. John expands his view from what was much more implicit in

teaching. Such things as time, culture, and circumstances had much to do with the emergence of diversity. And John the Baptist's saying about Jesus, "He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit [Mark and John] and fire [Matthew and Luke]," has been repeated, expanded, interpreted, and applied according to the needs of each gospel writer. But each account contains the essential ingredients passed on from John. Again, this observation bears out the principle of continuity and diversity within unity.

Finally, exegesis can be too limited. Redaction and form criticism, while being helpful and necessary, by themselves are not sufficient. There needs to be a multiplex approach. Narrative needs further development and application, as do the social sciences. When exegesis is not fully employed, theology can be truncated. Matters related to method need to be brought to bear on this whole discussion.

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (Paternoster Press edition, 1996. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), 19.

<sup>2</sup>Roger Stronstad senses this when he notes that "This chapter [chap. 5 of his book] arises out of an observation that interpreters of Acts 2 all too often do not do full justice to the significance of Peter's quotation of Joel 2:28-32 (LXX) as the explanation of the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

<sup>3</sup>Stanley M. Horton, *The Book of Acts* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1981), 31, makes the distinction. Pentecostals, though, are not by themselves. Recently, Max Turner, who is not classical Pentecostal, argues that the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2 is for cleansing: "[Luke 24:46-49 and Acts 1:11] prepares [*sic*] for . . . a deepening of the messianic cleansing, restoration and transformation of Israel through the gift of the Spirit which is now the messiah's executive power. The promise of John the Baptist (Lk. 3:16) is interpreted by Acts 1:5 to mean the Spirit will come upon the disciples not merely [for empowerment] . . . but as the power which cleanses and restores the messiah's Israel." Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 268. In fact, chapter 10 is devoted in a large part to this thesis. Even Jean-Jacques Suurmond, who relies on Dunn, Barth, and George Montague, says: "throughout life, the baptism in the Spirit works itself out in countless new cleansing experiences which enable us to live according to the Spirit, becoming a gift for others." "A Fresh Look at Spirit Baptism and the Charisms," *Expository Times* 109:4 (January 1998): 105.

<sup>4</sup>Don Carson is an exception, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), 150 says, "...Acts provides not a paradigm for individual Christian experience...." See also p. 151.

<sup>5</sup>Interestingly, Stronstad has made such attempts. See note 2 above.

<sup>6</sup>William Atkinson, "Pentecostal Responses to Dunn's Baptism in the Holy Spirit," *JPT* 6 (April 1995): 91.

<sup>7</sup>William H. Shepherd, Jr., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 23-29.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 160-66.

<sup>9</sup>While not precisely in the social science realm, Gordon Fee, for one, has brought recent attention to the academy's lack of bringing a spiritual sensitivity to the hermeneutical task in "To What End Exegesis? Reflections on Exegesis and Spirituality in Philippians 4:10-20," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 8 (1998): 75-88. This was originally a presentation at the IBR meeting. Significantly, Luke Timothy Johnson has called the academy to task for its shortsightedness of leaving out experience: *Religious Experience in Earliest Christianity: A Missing Dimension in New Testament Studies* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).

<sup>10</sup>William S. Kurz in "Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts," *Biblica* 68 (1987): 195 noted that biblical exegesis is undergoing a paradigm shift—one that is more holistic. "One aspect of this shift is towards treating the narrative biblical texts as narrative." Yet, some remain ensconced in older methods, e.g., Don Carson, in an otherwise excellent book still opts for a position similar to Fee's, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*, especially note p. 150: "The way Luke tells his story, Acts provides not a paradigm for individual Christian experience, but the account of the gospel's outward movement, geographically, racially, and above all theologically." Carson opts for a straightforward reading of Acts as fundamentally history without "narrative." Further, what does Carson mean here with "theologically?"

<sup>11</sup>I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, eds., *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998). Joel B. Green, one of its contributors, has also written an excellent commentary, *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997). Also Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998). Interestingly, Roger Stronstad has opted for a narrative interpretation of Luke-Acts, though in discussion with Fee and Evangelical scholars.

<sup>12</sup>Leland Ryken, *How To Read the Bible as Literature . . . and Get More Out of It* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984); and later in Ryken and Tremper Longman III, eds., *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993); *Research* 8 (1998): 75-88. William W. Klein, Craig Blomberg, and Robert Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1993). It may be that Fee, a Pentecostal scholar, is shifting a bit. These editors take Fee's position as stated in *How To Read the Bible For All Its Worth*, Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983, 1991) to task, pp. 349-50.

In Gordon D. Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991). Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible For All Its Worth*. Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 94-112, chapter 6. Fee has not changed in this second edition. Here are his changes in his chapter on Acts: 1) the chapter title has changed from "Acts: The Problem of Historical Precedent" to "Acts: The Question of Historical Precedent"; on p. 96, first paragraph, he added one sentence to include Luke's use of narrative; the second paragraph there Fee rewrote and lengthened it a bit to include something on Luke's theological interests; p. 106, the second paragraph has been slightly reworded and enlarged; p. 110, second paragraph has been beefed up considerably; and on the same page under #3 he adds a statement that allows for the repetition of some patterns to speak in a normal but not normative manner for the contemporary church. The result is, though, that Fee has spoken clearly on authorial intent, something that he emphasized in Gospel and Spirit. This emphasis goes along with his view on the genre issue.

<sup>13</sup>Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).

<sup>14</sup>James D.G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1970).

<sup>15</sup>Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1991), 153.

<sup>16</sup>*Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*, 344-45. See also the excellent material in chapter 32 of *A Complete*

*Literary Guide to the Bible*. As we have already noted, the former book on pp. 349-50 rejects Fee and Stuart's view of Acts.

<sup>17</sup>These two statements will become important later on in our discussion. Also, I have quoted in a rather lengthy manner to demonstrate my point.

<sup>18</sup>Note what Robert C. Tannehill in *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 1, *The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991), 3, says in regards to the literary connections in the narrative of Luke: "Such connections are complex . . . . Theoretically, we could distinguish three levels [I provide two] of significant connections which contribute to this complexity: (1) Some connections are emphasized strongly and are supported by clear literary signals, such as the repetition of key words and phrases, indicating either that the author consciously intended the connection or that the author's message was bound to certain controlling images which repeatedly asserted themselves in the process of writing. These connections can contribute to our understanding of a narrative's message at a primary level. (2) *Reading a narrative is an imaginative process* [emphasis mine]. From words on a page we must reconstruct a narrative world that probably differs from our own. This imaginative process includes a realm of free play. There are a large number of possible connections and significances that the text may suggest but not necessarily emphasize. . . . Furthermore, there is no clear boundary between these first two levels, since the one shades into the other." I might add that it is this precise factor that bothers scholars in the scholastic tradition, like Fee, who find it hard to see these connections, which are often very subtle--especially with a hermeneutic that reads all types of literature as if it were non-narrative literature. Narrative must be read differently from an epistle, for example.

<sup>19</sup>I prefer this term to "precedent"--in fact I choose not to use this term because I do not believe this term fits what happens in Luke-Acts. "Paradigmatic" is more useful, as will be seen, although, if a better one can be found, fine. See Fee and Stuart, *How to Read*, especially 106-112. In fact, Fee's chapter title includes the word "precedent."

<sup>20</sup>Leland Ryken, *How to Read the Bible as Literature . . . and Get More Out of It* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 191-92. See also Northrop Freye, *The Great Code: The Bible as Literature* (NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1981,1982), 48: "We have spoken of the repeating quality in literature, its allusiveness and its almost obsessive respect for tradition. One of the first things I noticed about literature was the stability of its structural units: The fact that certain themes, situations, and character types, in comedy let us say, have persisted with very little change from Aristophanes to our own time. I have used "archetype" to describe these building blocks, . . . ." See also Leland Ryken, *How to Read the Bible as Literature; and Get More Out of It*, 187-93, and Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1981), 47-62.

<sup>21</sup>While not denying the value of what Fee says, "Nonetheless, we believe that much of Acts is intended by Luke to serve as a model. But the model is not so much in the specifics as in the overall picture," I wish also to take note of the opposite--details can be significant and are paradigmatic. *How to Read*, 101. He does make some attempt to show how individual sections relate to the larger picture--an admirable element.

<sup>22</sup>Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971), 61-66, talks about the significance of the placement and purpose of Acts 2: "Acts 2: An Epitome of Lukan Theology." On p. 66 he especially says (only partially correctly), "The discourse [Peter's] of Acts 2 presents in a nutshell the Lukan notion of what it means to be saved that is maintained consistently throughout the book: The hearers must repent and make a profession of faith in the name of Jesus (by baptism); then they will receive the Holy Spirit and enter the community of the saved." Note also the relevant remark by Orlink alluded to and quoted by James M. Dawsey in "Characteristics of Folk-Epic in Acts," in *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) ed. by David J. Lull, 320-21: "I might add also that the tendency in Acts to settle attention on one hero at a time points to another characteristic of folk narratives: the Importance of Initial and Final Position [sic]. According to Olrik, 'whenever a series of persons or things occurs, then the principal one will come first.'" Orlink's comments are especially relevant.

---

<sup>23</sup>This is what Carey C. Newman in "Acts," A Literary Guide, 443, notes well. Marshall places a climax at chapter 15 ("Reading the Book.7: Luke-Acts," 199. He further notes about the ending of Acts: "And there the story ends, leaving us in suspense as to what happened thereafter. Is the point that it is still going on?" Pentecostals also claim this. Certainly this is correct--This is Luke's point, beginning with Acts 2, however. Acts 2 is paradigmatic for in the sending of the Spirit, the last days have begun (cf. Peter's sermon there). Shepherd in his book, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*, sees the work of the Spirit as ongoing conflict/plot. I have no disagreement with that view--he means about the same thing as I do. There are times when he does not clearly distinguish between character and conflict/plot. See Ryken and Longman III, eds., A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible, 443-44

<sup>24</sup>See Aker, "New Directions in Lucan Theology: Reflections on Luke 3:21-22 and Some Implications."

<sup>25</sup>For more on this see the excellent discussion in Robert C. Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Vol. 2: The Acts of the Apostles (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 9-25, "Transition and Preparation."

<sup>26</sup>Peter's Pentecost Discourse, 36-37.

<sup>27</sup>Peter's Pentecost Discourse, 36-37. Wansbrough writes, "The scene in the upper room at Pentecost as described by Luke in Acts 2 is an unforgettable dramatic opening to the mission of the apostles and the Church. . . . It was therefore fitting that the story of the spread of the faith should begin with, and the key-note be given by, a solemn representation of the coming of the Spirit upon the apostles, now finally bereaved of the bodily presence of Jesus, and waiting for his sign to begin the mission with which they had been entrusted. The importance of this scene to the inspired author springs even more into relief when the large part he had in the composition of the narrative, as it stands realized. The other gospels [*sic*] relate other scenes where the Spirit is given or the apostles sent on their mission, but Luke disregards them in order to concentrate all on this great event. . . . Luke . . . is silent about this, throwing all the light on the final, definitive parting after forty days of preparation, which is the ultimate prelude to the inauguration of the Church. . . . Luke chooses Pentecost for full description of the coming forty days before the Ascension . . . ." (pp. 357-58)

"But Pentecost was not merely a convenient choice of day; it had special fittingness for this event. . . the coming of the Spirit as the inauguration of the Church and the beginning of its apostolic mission to all nations," (358).

<sup>28</sup>See for instance, The Narrative Unity, 26-27.

<sup>29</sup>I am not going into detail here because of limitations of this paper. Others have contributed excellent material on Acts 2, some of which are in these notes. I want to focus on the larger movements of the narrative.

<sup>30</sup>See Peter's Pentecost Discourse, 36-37.

<sup>31</sup>Two classical Pentecostals split on where to divide. Stanley M. Horton, *The Book of Acts* (Springfield, MO: GPH, 1981), 33, breaks it thus. French L. Arrington, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 18, includes 1-13 in one section.

<sup>32</sup>See the persuasive discussion by J. W. Bowker in "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form," New Testament Studies 14 (October 1967): 96-111; also Donald Juel, "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2," The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 43 (1981): 543-58.

<sup>33</sup>Max Turner sees the resurrection as the basis for Jesus' status and authority. Dunn places as much emphasis on the ascension as on the resurrection, perhaps even more so. Dunn is more true to Luke's intent here. Surely it is the resurrection that is the capstone of salvation. Verse 31 explicitly connects throne with resurrection. Yet, verses 33 and 34 plainly associate ascension and throne. Further, it is only after this seating, the ascension, that Jesus receives the promise of the Spirit (verse 33). Turner also emphasizes the Moses' motif and plays down David in Acts 2. Menzies, against Turner, opts for David against Moses motifs. Menzies is more on target. The perspective of Jesus as Lord in Acts who does the Father's work from a position of authority certainly fits the Davidic/Messianic emphasis better than the Moses one. Jesus as prophet in the gospel would better fit, perhaps, the Moses motif. However, Moses should not be ruled out entirely.

<sup>34</sup>"Responses to Baptism in the Holy Spirit," 129.

<sup>35</sup>*Ibid.* The Pentecostal would make a distinction between "receive," a word used in this quote, and "baptized."

<sup>36</sup>Religious Experience, 78-102.

<sup>37</sup>Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 29-37 ("God's Design") and 47-49 (The Purpose of God in Luke-Acts"); brings out this

point very well.

<sup>38</sup>Contra Menzies.

<sup>39</sup>Here is where social sciences can contribute. Considerable amount of literature exists on this subject. A good place to start is with Jerome H. Neyrey, ed., *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: 1991).

<sup>40</sup>I do not have time nor space to go into it here but the role of the apostles in Acts is special. Luke appeals to their status as guarantors of the Spirit-tradition to marshal his concerns.

<sup>41</sup>Robert O'Toole, in *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1984), opposes F. Danker's suggestion that the basis of Luke's view of salvation is based on Patronage/clientage concept. See Joel B. Green, *New Testament Theology: The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995): "Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: God as the Savior in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Witness to the Gospel* follows Danker in this regard.

<sup>42</sup>"Reading the Book.7: Luke Acts," 200.

<sup>43</sup>Don Carson differs from Dunn in other ways but for the most part falls into the same camp here in not allowing any real diversity to exist. See, for instance, Showing *the Spirit* and "Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: The Possibility of Systematic Theology," in *Scripture and Truth*, eds. D.A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 65-95.

<sup>44</sup> Would it help to consider Craig S. Keener, who aptly notes that "Luke-Acts refers to the Spirit frequently, but in most cases focuses solely on the Spirit of prophecy or inspired speech . . . , and in other cases usually on ideas more related to this activity than to moral transformation . . ." *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 190?

<sup>45</sup>For example, P.F. Esler in *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), though helpful and provocative, and pointing the way, is still inadequate. Howard Clark Kee's *Who are the People of God? Early Christian Models of Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), I would classify similarly.