

PENTECOSTAL/CHARISMATIC THEMES IN LUKE—ACTS
AT THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY:
THE BATTLE OF INTERPRETIVE METHOD

Paul Elbert*

Church of God Theological Seminary, 900 Walker Street NE
Cleveland, TN 37311, USA
email: pelbert@alltel.net

ABSTRACT

Through interactive dialogue with Evangelical scholars and through an assessment of their interpretive methods, one may identify an ‘apostolic age’ hermeneutic which intrinsically imposes questionable assumptions upon Luke’s two-volume work and upon Paul. The result may be termed Lukan and Pauline cessationism. For Luke, narrative disconnectedness replaces narrative-rhetorical cohesion. His examples and precedents of reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit by disciple-believer-witnesses either undergo mass extinction or reinterpretation, reinterpretation which serves the traditional presupposition of an ‘apostolic age’ instead of the narrative sequencing and personification of Lukan characters. Luke’s fulfilment of prophecy theme is totally ignored. For Paul, similar discursive description of pneumatological experience which Paul assumes is understandable to his selected addressees—language perhaps being urgently and pastorally clarified by Luke’s conventional use of examples and precedents—is disconnected from the common oral and cognitive environment shared within the Jerusalem/Petrine Christianity portrayed by Luke. Via discussion, reflection, and testimony, perhaps the coherency and validity of traditional ‘apostolic age’ hermeneutics might be explored on the battlefield of biblical interpretation.

* P. Elbert (MA, Fuller Theological Seminary; MS in Physics, University of Michigan) is Adjunct Professor of Theology and Science at the Church of God Theological Seminary, Cleveland, TN, USA. He is a member of the New Testament Group of the Tyndale Fellowship for Biblical and Theological Research.

Introduction

Arguing that there is a distinctive Pentecostal hermeneutical paradigm, incorporating a desire to respond experientially to the narrative and discursive theology of New Testament writers, Lewis advocates a mediating position between the extremes of academic isolation and subsuming Pentecostalism under Evangelicalism (with some Holy Spirit emphasis).¹ Lewis suggests that this paradigm is fundamentally non-Enlightenment without being pre-Enlightenment in orientation,² which is harmonious with what DuPree thinks that Pentecostalism is³ and with what Pentecostalism can represent intellectually in the new Era of the Glimpse of God,⁴ where the

1. Paul Lewis, 'Towards a Pentecostal Epistemology: The Role of Experience in Pentecostal Hermeneutics', *The Spirit & Church* 2.1 (2000), pp. 95-125.

2. Lewis, 'Pentecostal Epistemology', p. 124.

3. Sherry Sherrod DuPree, 'In the Sanctified Holiness Pentecostal Charismatic Movement', *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 23.1 (2001), pp. 97-114 (113), namely: 'The Azusa Street Revival sparked the Pentecostal and Charismatic movement. The movement is an emotional movement, with behavior ranging from moaning and shouting in the Spirit to the more sophisticated, ordinary behavior like reading the Bible, especially Acts 2.4, and praying.' While this Christian behavior encompasses experiences like Lukan conversion, praying for and being filled with the Spirit in concert with glossolalia and prophetic-type phenomena exemplified in the book of Acts (in accord with the teaching of the earthly Jesus on prayer), empowered missionary vision, fasting, seeking and being used as givers of Pauline spiritual gifts, praising God in Spirit-filled worship with uplifted hands, dancing in the Spirit, and sufferings, this spirituality as a descriptive category is explored by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, 'The Nature of Pentecostal Spirituality', *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 14.2 (1992), pp. 103-106; and Daniel E. Albrecht, 'Characteristic Qualities of Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality', in his *Rites in the Spirit: A Ritual Approach to Pentecostal/Charismatic Spirituality* (JPTSUP, 17; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 218-51.

4. In the second millennium before Christ, one ancient Near Eastern literary text claimed a beginning for physical reality. In 1963 this cosmic beginning was detected and immediately conveyed the implication of a Beginner. This new 'Era of the Glimpse of God', which humankind entered in 1963 with the discovery of the cosmic background radiation, makes the existence of God an attractive speculation and is conducive to an experiential hermeneutic—one open to the supernatural as delineated in biblical characters' lives—perhaps best represented in Christendom by global Pentecostalism, cf. my 'The Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Review Article', *Trinity Journal* 23.1 (2002), pp. 81-101 (96), also available online at <http://www.pneumafoundation.com/resources/in.depth.shtml>.

experimental findings of modern science and theology intersect in an age of science and technology.⁵ This emerging interpretive paradigm, being articulated by scholars like Lewis and Shelton,⁶ is indeed distinctive with respect to the rationalistic structure of both dispensationalism and sacramentalism,⁷ and perhaps may be likened in its perspective to that of Treebeard in John Tolkien's *The Two Towers*, 'I am not altogether on anybody's side because nobody is on my side'.⁸

From this perspective, Evangelicals⁹ today may be understood as having inherited centuries of suspicion of the supernatural and over a millennium of rationalistic theory¹⁰ as to why selected supernatural activities described

5. On this point, cf. John Polkinghorne, *Belief in God in an Age of Science* (New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 1998), *passim*; and 'Theism', in his *Science and Theology: An Introduction* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 66-83.

6. James B. Shelton, 'Epistemology and Authority in the Acts of the Apostles: An Analysis and Test Case Study of Acts 15.1-29', *The Spirit & Church* 2.2 (2000), pp. 231-47.

7. The epistemology of experience, allied to critical interpretation of New Testament texts, is more convincing, and possesses more interior motivating power than some rationally formatted and traditionally venerated conjectures, no matter how firmly ensconced. *On this basis I would suggest that dispensationalism, with its rigid temporal boundaries imposed upon the New Testament text, and sacramentalism, with its claims of automatic transmission of church-incorporation in paedobaptism and automatic transmission of the forgiveness of sins in personal confession, may both be critiqued as evincing rationalistic excess.*

8. With Lewis, 'Pentecostal Epistemology', p. 125.

9. With Garry J. Williams, 'Was Evangelicalism Created by the Enlightenment?', *TynBul* 53.2 (2002), pp. 281-312 (311), I consider the Reformation and Puritanism as Evangelical movements, given that Calvin and the Huguenots were actively concerned for evangelism. However, Evangelicalism today, in my judgement, is yet strongly influenced by a distrust and hostility toward experience, similar to that articulated in Jonathan Edwards' 1746 *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections*.

10. For a succinct yet comprehensive overview of the effects of rationalism throughout church history, see John McKay, 'Pentecost and History', *The Spirit & Church* 3.1 (2001), pp. 113-28. In a section on 'The Prophets and Modern Ecclesiastism, Rationalism and Paganism' McKay observes that 'The Reformed churches in the main rejected the prophetic way in favor of the doctrinal and the moral, which though biblically founded, came to be set in the context of Enlightenment rationalism. The result was academic aridity and ethical legalism in the church. The situation was exacerbated as theological correctness and moral uprightness became the acknowledged tokens of respectability—and hence a source of pride' (p. 123).

in the New Testament should not and could not be expected to occur.¹¹ To seek and/or to expect these cessationistically filtered supernatural activities of the heavenly Jesus and the Holy Spirit is rationalistically unacceptable or intellectually incredible as far as some Evangelicals are concerned.¹² A wedge between the ministry and the teaching of the earthly Jesus and the ministry of the heavenly Jesus appears to exist in this Evangelical mindset. The heavenly Jesus would not be expected to engage in ministerial activities that contradict the rigid epochs that have traditionally been imposed upon New Testament texts. Other than as an inert rational proposition, one could be led to wonder whether the heavenly Jesus as a person, as in Acts 2.33, even remembers or takes an interest in the teaching of the earthly Jesus.¹³

The distrust and dismissal of experience brought about by suspicion and rationalistic theory is largely to be attributed, in my judgement, to an anti-Lukan concept known as the 'apostolic age' or the 'Pentecostal age'.¹⁴ So ingrained within some Evangelical mindsets are the concretized ramifications of this traditionally presumed epoch, that a knee-jerk reaction towards those who may challenge this hermeneutical blockade and retardation of Lukan interests is not at all unknown, nor is it always a subsurface

11. Cessationistic theory can be traced to Chrysostom and Augustine, the latter cited by Calvin in this regard, but cannot be traced to their fourth-century contemporary Basil; cf. Sang-Whan Lee, 'The Relevance of St. Basil's Pneumatology to Modern Pentecostalism', *The Spirit & Church* 1.1 (1999), pp. 49-76. Perhaps of equal relevance in the patristic domain would be the late second-century thought of Irenaeus, who felt that denial of gender-insensitive prophetic gifts robbed Christians of their ability to become fruitful; cf. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, 'Irenaeus and "Prophetic Gifts"', in Paul Elbert (ed.), *Essays on Apostolic Themes: Studies in honor of Howard M. Ervin* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1985), pp. 104-14.

12. Cf. Elbert, 'Globalization', pp. 87-92.

13. In contradistinction to such an epochally constrained worldview, the heavenly Jesus apparently does so remember and act accordingly, probably programmatically so; cf. Odette Mainville, 'Jésus et l'Esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc: Éclairage à partir d'Ac 2,33', *Science et Spirit* 42 (1990), pp. 193-208; and her *L'Esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc* (Héritage et Projet, 45; Montreal: Editions Fides, 1991), pp. 248, 257-82; Marcel Dumais, 'Ministères, charismes et Esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc', *Église et Théologie* 9 (1978), pp. 413-53.

14. For an assessment of the ecclesial effects and ramifications of this concept within the framework of dispensational theory, see Peter E. Prosser, *Dispensational Eschatology and its Influence on American and British Religious Movements* (Texts and Studies in Religion, 82; Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1999). Dogmatic dispensational periodization receives a harsh critique here (*Dispensational*, p. 269).

phenomenon. Scholarship that may seem to challenge this usually hidden and unarticulated interpretive presupposition¹⁵ may be immediately suspect.¹⁶ An intrinsic impulse may exist with regard to such scholarship, rendering it as likely to be ignored or quickly discarded as to be reflected upon. When challenged, quick and dogmatic ‘solutions’ and position protection emerge from the hermeneutical fog as easily as due reflection. The fanciful epochal dichotomies set in place by Calvin, which he well knew were not ‘biblical’ and which are long overdue for retirement, have not yet been laid to rest, perhaps having served some distant political function. The thoughtfulness normally associated with scholarly enterprise may, even today, seem in short supply when it comes to an intersection with ideas that argue against historically established claims stemming from an ‘apostolic age’.¹⁷ While honoring the legacy of the Reformation has its

15. The long-term deleterious effects of the hidden and unarticulated presupposition are well known; cf. Graham N. Stanton, ‘Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism’, in I. Howard Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Grand Rapids, MI; Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 60–71; Markus Barth, ‘The Problem of Hidden Persuaders’, in his ‘Christ and All Things’, in M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson (eds.), *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett* (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 160–72 (164–68).

16. Within scholarly circles historically connected (or wedded) to Calvinistic epochal divisions, and to epochs within epochs, there appears to be little awareness that the continuation of Lukan characters’ experience is even an interesting speculation. Ministerial categories like apostleship are equally over a distant horizon, given that the dispensational closure guaranteed by an ‘apostolic age’ settles such matters ‘once-for-all’, but cf. Jon Ruthven, *On the Cessation of the Charismata: The Protestant Polemic on Postbiblical Miracles* (JPTSup, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), pp. 205–12, 213–20; and his ‘The “Foundational Gifts” of Ephesians 2.20’, *JPT* 10.2 (2002), pp. 28–43.

17. For example, ‘The Holy Ghost cannot be the subject for the church as such, to ask for now, seeing He has thus been given’, so J.N. Darby, *Notes of Addresses on the Gospel of Luke* (London: Race, 1922), p. 136. The Darbian theory of the Calvinistic tradition, oft repeated by Evangelical commentators, that Lukan Spirit-receptions are confined to the ‘old dispensation’ and that they functioned ‘once-for-all’ in a mystic process of osmotic permeation finds expression in the reactionary treatise of W.J. Erdman, ‘The Holy Spirit and the Sons of God’, in R.A. Torrey (ed.), *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* (4 vols.; Los Angeles: Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917), II, pp. 338–52. F.F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954), p. 76, continues the rationalistic exuberance of this ‘once-for-all’ theory, entirely ignoring Luke’s prominent efforts to portray characters’ lives prior to the first Jerusalem Pentecost within a soteriological nexus. Bruce goes further to claim, without adequate syntactical, grammatical, or contextual investigation, that Acts 2.38c

commendable aspects,¹⁸ the Calvinistic application of the ‘apostolic age’¹⁹ is still dominant today, both hermeneutically and intellectually, in some Evangelical worldviews. Both Lukan and Pauline cessationism are active and, as yet, critically unexamined concepts in some Evangelical mindsets.²⁰

indicates the automatic reception of the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit upon repentance, ‘although this is not said in so many words’ (p. 79). However, since the traditional conjecture of ‘once-for-all’ and its presumed osmotic transmission of characters’ experience to future believers is clearly not to be found in the text of Luke–Acts, one must assume that its source lies elsewhere in some unexamined presupposition that has been historically superimposed onto the text of Luke’s two-volume work.

18. While Pentecostals appreciate the work of the Reformers with respect to the recovery of the use of Scripture, they do not pledge allegiance to Reformed ideas or regard themselves as the spiritual heirs of the Reformation; rather it is more descriptive that ‘Pentecostals are Protestants, but often Protestants without the Reformation’ (so Christian Seytre, ‘Le pentecôte’, in Geoffroy Turckheim [ed.], *En compagnie de beaucoup d’autres: Guide théologique du protestantisme contemporain* [Paris: Les Bergers et les Mages, 1997], p. 101). *While some Pentecostals view themselves as evangelical, most view themselves as evangelistic and as a fourth tradition within Christianity, alongside Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism.*

19. On Calvin’s explicit introduction of this theory into his commentary on Acts, which then not incidentally appears unarticulated as an assured fact in Calvin’s sermons on Acts 1–7, see my ‘Calvin and the Spiritual Gifts’, in Richard C. Gamble, (ed.), *Articles on Calvin and Calvinism: An Elaboration of the Theology of Calvin* (14 vols.; New York: Garland, 1992), VIII, pp. 303–31. The Geneva Divine’s willful cessationist theology or ideology not only informs his final exegesis at this point (Acts 2.38), but his reinterpretation is justified by an outright appeal to *his* non-experience and rationalistic speculation, non-experience which overrides and denies the validity of his textual exegesis. Whether his original exegesis may be confirmed to be correct or most probable is not the issue, rather this illegitimate hermeneutical style is characterized by the willful imposition of philosophical bias—*not in any way due to the testimonium of the Spirit*—in order to suit the non-experience or convenience of the interpreter. This technique, oft repeated, served to set the intellectual stage for the destructive legacy of a ‘Calvinistic hermeneutic’ wherein biblical texts can be piously and obviously shifted in meaning—under the guise of exegesis—so as to conform to ‘interpretations’ best befitting the presumption of an extra-biblical epoch. Calvin, however unwittingly, became the progenitor of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’.

20. This modern Evangelical sentiment also has roots in scholastic Protestantism and the deistic Enlightenment which also expressed Christian praxis as a matter of ethics, having cessationistically filtered supernatural components from Luke–Acts and Paul. Jon Ruthven, ‘The “Imitation of Christ” in Christian Tradition: Its Missing Charismatic Emphasis’, *JPT* 16 (2000), pp. 60–77 (64), suggests that ‘With the restriction of the miraculous to the first century on the one hand, and the emphasis on Christianity as morality that developed later, the profile of traditional Christian discipleship was set’.

Such cessationisms are not necessarily latent or dormant, but near the surface. Historically conforming to centuries of tradition, Lukan and Pauline cessationisms are both discernible backgrounds to some contemporary Evangelical interpretation.²¹ In the context of this perceived environment, a cognitive environmental appraisal that all of my Evangelical friends might not completely share, I offer several reflections after five years of participation with scholars within the Evangelical Theological Society (ETS)²² focusing on ‘Charismatic Themes in Luke–Acts and Related Issues’.

21. These ecclesiastical but unlikely biblical backgrounds are kept alive before the English-speaking Evangelical public through the marketing of the old and new editions of the KJV and NIV Scofield Bible. This dispensationally based tome uncritically propagates, without curiosity for authorial intent and narrative continuity, the traditional ‘once-for-all’ osmosis theory of Lukan cessation, to wit, ‘For the Christian to go back to Lk 11.13 is to forget Pentecost’; cf. E. Schuyler English, Frank E. Gaebelein, William Culbertson, Charles L. Feinberg, Allan A. MacRae, Clarence H. Mason, Alva J. Mc Clain, Wilbur M. Smith and John F. Walvoord (eds.), *The New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 1097. As to Pauline cessationism, English *et al* make no attempt to correct the still popular claim among Evangelicals that the τὸ τέλειον (that which is perfect or complete, 1 Cor. 13.10) is a reference to the Bible, but rationally encourage it with the unexamined assertion that ‘Until the New Testament was written, new revelations suited to the new dispensation were given; tongues and the sign gifts are to cease’ (p. 1245). A counterbalance to their theories is offered in similar format by Wesley Adams, French Arrington, Stanley Horton, William Menzies, Robert Shank, Donald C. Stamps, Roger Stronstad, Richard Waters and Roy Winbush (eds.), *Full Life Study Bible: An International Study Bible for Spirit-Filled Christians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993), recently revised and retitled as *Life in the Spirit Study Bible* (2003) to complement French Arrington and Roger Stronstad (eds.), *Life in the Spirit New Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003). The *Study Bible* itself is published by Gospel Publishing House (Springfield, MO) in Chinese, Indonesian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Spanish and Ukrainian, with 26 languages pending (Arabic, Czechoslovakian, French, Hindi, Swahili and Tamil, for example).

22. For informative purposes it may be noted that the Evangelical Theological Society has met annually since 1949. ETS consists mainly of a group of North American scholars who doctrinally emphasize biblical inerrancy. Lukan and Pauline cessationisms are prominent traditions among many of its members. Scofieldian editors MacRae and Walvoord are past presidents of ETS. Biblical and theological discussion is characterized by the society in the following manner: ‘Very rewarding is the experience of subjecting one’s own ideas to the criticisms of colleagues who are not only sympathetic but judicious’; cf. ‘Purpose Statement’ at <http://www.etsjests.org>. However, for ETS members whose research interests may not lie in the mainstream of the predominate doctrinal and traditional backgrounds, sympathetic and judicious criticism

*Discussion, Observations and Testimony*²³

Luke's second treatise, called the book of Acts, would probably have been considered by his Graeco-Roman literary contemporaries, who were seeking further experientially practical information about Christianity, to be a narrative-rhetorically adroit and pastorally applicable exemplar about what the heavenly Jesus continues to do, about his deeds, given that the first treatise describes what the earthly Jesus did and taught (Acts 1.1). The second book could certainly not have been considered by Luke to be entitled 'The Acts of the Apostles', given that it contains no detailed account of any of the apostles except Peter and Paul. John is mentioned briefly on only three occasions, James the son of Zebedee is executed, and much more space is devoted to Stephen and Philip, who are not apostles, than to John and James; similarly for Timothy and Silas.

While understood to be a Gospel of the Spirit by some of its greatest students (here I think of Augustin George and Arnold Ehrhardt),²⁴ its compositional strengths have been undermined and marginalized in their effect (*Wirkungskraft*) by the long-term superimposition and undeclared presumption of an 'apostolic age'. The main Lukan theme of prophetic fulfillment,²⁵ and the twin focus upon examples and precedents as displayed via an experiential nexus of salvation/forgiveness/repentance/faith/

may not be all that reflective or rewarding. If research interests are perceived as too far from the ETS center of gravity, 'criticisms of colleagues' may be less than hospitable as a recurring impulse of excommunicating and disfellowshipping has demonstrated.

23. Let me take this opportunity to thank my Pentecostal colleagues who have served as an advisory board to the Luke-Acts ETS study group and have participated by reading papers: Jim Shelton, my co-worker, together with Ben Aker, Trevor Grizzle, Charles Holman, and Roger Stronstad. In addition to the aforementioned colleagues on the advisory board, other Pentecostal colleagues lent a hand with presentations: Ken Archer, Harold Carpenter, Craig Keener, Julie Ma, Wonsuk Ma, and Keith Warrington. Our Evangelical colleagues whose responses have been gratefully appreciated include Gregg Allison, Bill Larkin, and I. Howard Marshall.

24. Augustin George, *Études sur l'oeuvre de Luc* (Sources Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1978); 'L'Esprit Saint dans l'oeuvre de Luc', *RB* 85 (1978), pp. 500-42; Max-Alain Chevallier, 'Luc et l'Esprit Saint: A la mémoire du P. Augustin George (1915-1977)', *RScR* 56 (1982), pp. 1-19; Arnold Ehrhardt, 'The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles', *StTh* 12 (1958), pp. 45-79.

25. As recently summarized by Brigid Curtin Frein, 'Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfilment', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 22-37.

and conversion,²⁶ and via praying for and receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit/being baptized in the Spirit/being filled with the Spirit,²⁷ are matters of comparatively little reflection among ETS members today. Luke's soteriological nexus and his Spirit-reception nexus, both masterfully illustrated via examples and precedents, remain unrecognized as narrative-rhetorical requirements. Particularly, Lukan portrayals of Spirit-reception remain locked in a frozen paleo-Reformed time capsule, dismissed as nothing more than historical oddities, instigating a 'once-for-all' process of osmosis that trickles down through time to other Christians. Such a perspective may seem confirmed as well by the chapter and paragraph divisions in modern editions of the Greek New Testament, which do not adequately, and sometimes very inadequately, reflect the thematic emphases of Luke's text and the activity of the Holy Spirit in the text.²⁸ To think otherwise about these Lukan portrayals of Spirit-reception and their connection to the ministry of the earthly Jesus challenges the Evangelical view that the Holy Spirit is only genuinely at work in Evangelical Christianity within its own focus on evangelism.²⁹ However, it may be that gradually, in time, the investigations

26. Regarding Lukan conversion, cf. R. Michiels, 'La Conception Lucanienne de la Conversion', *ETHLov* 41 (1965), pp. 42-78.

27. For discussion of these main thematic categories, cf. my 'Luke's Expectation for Theophilus re the Lukan Gift of the Holy Spirit', in *Society for Pentecostal Studies Seattle Conference Proceedings* (2000), available from <http://www.sps-usa.org/catalog.htm>.

28. Codex Sinaiticus, where the title Acts (πράξεις) first appears in the New Testament manuscript tradition to introduce Luke's second treatise, both Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus appending ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ as a decorative colophon at the end of the text, exhibits 293 paragraph or section breaks. The current United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament reduces this rhetorical effort of 293 to 148, where of course 28 of these begin what that Greek New Testament takes as appropriate chapter divisions. Of the 148 paragraph/chapter breaks in this modern edition of the Greek New Testament, 87 receive appellations or entitlements by the editors. Only three of these mention the Holy Spirit. This rhetorically insufficient labeling needs to be addressed in future editions.

29. This exclusiveness is also noted by the Catholic charismatic theologian Peter D. Hocken, 'Is Renewal of the Church Possible?', *The Spirit & Church* 3.2 (2001), pp. 183-208 (199). Hocken is also well aware that this particular manifestation of Evangelical exclusivity, with its roots in a paleo-Reformed paradigm, is potentially dangerous: 'Where these rationalist patterns are operative in the realm of theology they cannot help but be reductionist in their effects—taking a richer reality and filtering it through a theological grid that eliminates non-rational non-logical elements, even at the same time protesting vigorously against those who utilize the same *Zeitgeist* in more blatantly

of biblical scholars in the Pentecostal/Charismatic tradition will make these aforementioned Lukan themes more widely considered.³⁰

The letters of Paul, albeit with expressions rooted in the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition of past Spirit-reception and Spirit-giving being traditionally eclipsed, have dominated Evangelical discussion for generations. But demographics are changing within world Christendom. Comparatively as of now, with respect to Evangelicalism, the Pentecostal/Charismatic Renewal has only a few scholars, while demographically it has many more adherents. The scholarly ratio between Evangelicalism and this New Reformation could, in time, change and even reverse. Given this projection, scholars intrinsically unwedded to and untutored in 'apostolic age' hermeneutics will supervise research dissertations, thereby having the luxury of gaining much needed assistance from their pupils on biblical matters of interest to those with Treebeard's perspective.

While it is now suggested by some that the anonymous writer of the Lukan writings at the heart of the New Testament has a theology and a pneumatology that probably reflects a widespread early tradition totally alien to 'apostolic age' hermeneutics, a tradition accepted and understood by Paul, not distinctive from Paul, such thinking has had little formal impact on ministerial training outside of the global Pentecostal movement and the international Charismatic Renewal. While it is clear that Lukan characters in his first book who participate in his soteriological nexus of repentance/fait/forgiveness/salvation are characters who experience the Spirit through Jesus' own anointing and who experience the Father who welcomes sinners, a narrative inference probably taken to be obvious by Luke, it is characterization and personification with respect to the heavenly Jesus and the

unbelieving ways'; cf. his 'A Charismatic View on the Distinctiveness of Pentecostalism', in Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies (eds.), *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies* (JPTSUP, 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 96-106 (105).

30. In spite of the real threat of the evangelicalization of Pentecostalism with respect to interpretive method, it may be that Lukan scholarship will eventually sense the scholarly impact of these themes if they become further articulated from within the Pentecostal/Charismatic tradition. However, it would be unwise to overlook the potential danger of the evangelicalization of Pentecostal reflection and research. Clark Pinnock worries that 'What concerns me about Pentecostal theology is that certain evangelicals may infect Pentecostal work with an unrelational virus, hamper Pentecostal theological development and diminish Pentecostal vitality. I fear that Evangelicals may sneeze and Pentecostals catch cold.' cf. his 'Divine Relationality: A Pentecostal Contribution to the Doctrine of God', *JPT* 16 (2000), pp. 3-26 (22).

Holy Spirit that are finally developed in his second book that has undergone an ‘apostolic age’ style of truncation. However, in a modicum of intellectual movement within some Evangelicalism today one may detect some unease with cessationism (abrupt or gradual dispensational closure following enscripturation) and a corresponding more fashionable awareness that ‘all the Pauline spiritual gifts are for today’.³¹ Within ETS itself this is apparently not in a context of a response to Pentecostalism or the Charismatic Renewal, nor is it in any direct engagement with scholarship treating this subject;³² rather it would perhaps appear to be demographically driven, or tolerated, if the lack of papers to this effect at annual meetings be a guide. If this detection is now credible as a minor intellectual trend within ETS, it probably does not yet reflect an upsurge among some Evangelical scholars zealously and actively to seek the interpersonal gifts,³³ as I believe Paul intended those addressees to do whom he described as ‘receiving the Spirit’, but instead reflects an admission that, rationally, they can (or may) exist.³⁴ While the idea that spiritual gifts experientially

31. Sam Storms, a charismatic scholar, in his *The Beginners Guide to Spiritual Gifts* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 2002), highlights the ceasing of Pauline cessationism and offers a helpful popular journey into this material. However, in terms of linking Paul’s brief discussion of the *charismata* to the tradition underlying Paul’s thought, to the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition in which he stands, I find that the earlier treatment by Harold Horton, *The Gifts of the Spirit* (Nottingham: Assemblies of God Publishing House, 1934), offers more New Testament contextuality in that he evidently eschews the incoherence of Lukan cessationism in disconnecting the Lukan Paul from the Paul of the letters.

32. As, for example, Heinz Schürmann, ‘Die geistlichen Gnadengaben in den paulinischen Gemeinden’, in his *Ursprung und Gestalt: Erörterungen und Besinnungen zum Neuen Testament* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1970), pp. 236-67.

33. There are certainly exceptions to this slumber by Evangelical scholars who never embraced the traditional dogma of Calvin’s extraordinary-ordinary dichotomies in the first place; cf. the vigorous reflections of Klass Runia, Emeritus Professor of Practical Theology for the Reformed Churches, Kampen, the Netherlands, *Op zoek naar de Geest* (Kampen: Kok, 2000), with a review by Cornelius van der Laan, *Journal of the European Pentecostal Theological Association* 21 (2001), pp. 138-40.

34. This rational admission should be understood in its historical setting. When J. Rodman Williams, in his ‘The Upsurge of Pentecostalism’, *The Reformed World* 31 (1971), pp. 340-44 (341), asserted that Pentecostalism had rediscovered ‘a dimension of the Holy Spirit’s activity that had been long overlooked’, Williams realized full well that this dimension is not captured by the occasional use of an interpersonal spiritual fruit or gift. Further, and this is significant in understanding the trend of admission, in much traditional Reformed/Evangelical scholarship the experiential and/or supernatural

detected and cataloged by Paul are for inter-personal giving or transmission between believers today is not an integral part of the Gospel as portrayed by the Evangelists,³⁵ it is nevertheless a compromise between the rationalism and suspicion of the past and the demographic trends of today.³⁶ This idea allows scholars who otherwise ignore Acts theologically and pneumatologically to speculate that certain selected events narrated in Acts may be described in Pauline language. When a Lukan character prophesies or has a vision, a Pauline spiritual gift is quickly adduced, not the contextual Lukan gift of the Spirit or prior Spirit-reception within the narrative continuity of Luke's fulfillment-of-prophecy theme. We will probably see this kind of speculation continue for a time until it begins to become clear that Luke has a pneumatology reflective of the Christians he writes about and that this pneumatology is to be found sequentially in his own double-work, not in Paul's occasional discursive correspondence, which, I have argued, Luke is attempting to clarify, perhaps with some pastoral urgency, with respect to practical matters like Spirit-reception. However, the wholesale interpretation of Luke through Pauline spectacles is probably coming to an end.³⁷

What then about our past seminar work within ETS? How did this begin and why does it continue? The former editor of *JETS*, Ronald Youngblood, and I had a good working relationship, even though my first *JETS* piece on the Spirit in Matthew probably engendered the biggest 'ho hum' in the

elements in Pauline descriptions of interpersonal spiritual gifts have been supplanted by natural perspectives. This is illustrated by Robert L. Thomas's *Understanding Spiritual Gifts* (Chicago: Moody, 1978), along with my review drawing needed attention to the potential introduction of a new divinity unknown to New Testament writers, courageously printed by Ronald Youngblood, former *JETS* editor, in *JETS* 23 (1980), pp. 182-85. Thomas is a past president of ETS.

35. In saying this, let me clarify by noting that love or charity is not a gift category in Paul, but rather the underlying motivation for seeking and participating in the spiritual practice of a gift process.

36. Cf. the clarification suggested by Benny C. Aker, 'Charismata: Gifts, Enablements, or Ministries?', *JPT* 11.2 (2002), pp. 53-69.

37. I am speculating a diminishment in this approach in spite of yet new theories to recast the Holy Spirit as a clone of a new divinity familiar to Paul, a supposed 'spirit of prophecy'. This approach will also, in my judgement, have little long-term impact, coupled as it is with the supposed pastoral irrelevancy attributed to Lukan portrayals (with delicate variations) of Spirit-reception by believer-disciple-witnesses, cessationism that is imposed before Luke picked up his pen.

history of the society.³⁸ But we are not dialoging with senior Old Testament scholars like Ronald or sympathetic New Testament scholars like Norbert Baumert³⁹ or with ecclesiastical representatives having charismatic clientele to consider, but with scholars who, with rare exceptions, have not yet actually decided to engage directly in dialogue at all.⁴⁰ Perhaps the current trend within ETS is dismissive of scholars who write against dispensational traditions, claiming that to connect Spirit-filling to prophetic inspiration makes illegitimate use of Luke's now supposedly defunct examples and precedents,⁴¹ and further that there are 'no scriptural records of "carnal" Christians shedding their substantial Christian experience by yielding their lives entirely to God' as in the dreaded 'second blessing theology'.⁴²

38. 'The Perfect Tense in Matthew 16.19 and Three Charismata', *JETS* 17 (1974), pp. 149-53. As far as I know, only one ETS member interacted with me (in disagreement) in a Matthew commentary. My suggestion in this study supports the idea that Matthew delineated the difference between the ministry of the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Jesus (cf. Mt. 11.28; 28.20b) in terms of revelatory activity from the heavenly Jesus, an idea unharmonious with the proposition that revelation is confined to enscripturation.

39. Baumert's *Charisma, Taufe, Geisttaufe* (2 vols.; Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 2001) might provide another perspective for our potential dialogue partners who have inherited the interpretive method responsible for Lukan and Pauline cessationism.

40. As far as I can tell, both the recent Catholic-Pentecostal Dialogue and the recent Reformed-Pentecostal Dialogue are virtually unknown within ETS today; cf. 'Evangelization, Proselytism and Common Witness: The Report from the Fourth Phase of the International Dialogue (1990–1997) between the Roman-Catholic Church and Some Classical-Pentecostal Churches and Leaders', and 'Word and Spirit, Church and Word: The Final Report of the International Dialogue between Representatives of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and Some Classical Pentecostal Churches and Leaders (1996–2000)', *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 2.1 (1999), pp. 105-51, and 4.1 (2001), pp. 41-72, respectively. Also apparently little known and uninvestigated by the majority of ETS clientele at present is William W. Menzies and Robert P. Menzies, *A Call to Evangelical Dialogue: Spirit and Power, Foundations of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000).

41. Examples and precedents are very much a part of the narrative qualities expected by a competent narrative performance, properly illustrative of the virtues of clarity and plausibility within narrative persuasion, as highly touted by Luke's contemporary, Theon of Alexandria; cf. *Aelius Théon Progymnasmata* (ed. Michel Patillon with Giancarlo Bolognesi; Collection des universités de France; Paris: Société d'édition Les Belles Lettres, 1997).

42. This logic is espoused by the current editor of *JETS*; cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger, 'What Does It Mean to be Filled with the Spirit?', *JETS* 40 (1997), pp. 229-40 (231).

Against this background, the Lord knew I needed some motivation to get interaction going within ETS, although ETS management has been hospitable. Obtaining this motivation was not a pleasant experience, but the Lord has kindly let me know subsequent to the first revelatory motivation I am about to describe, that He is pleased with our efforts in the midst of difficulties. I have shared this revelation with several people, believing that collective judgement of revelation is wise and helps get to the right understanding. At first, I did not understand what was revealed to me, the unworthy sinner that I surely am, but now I believe that I do. At the home of a friend in Atlanta I was standing in his living room when the Lord surrounded me with His presence in an awesome manner. Then strong thoughts entered my mind. Something was dead. This death was very serious and awful. I was somewhat frightened and stood motionless awaiting anything further. My friend stopped talking to me. Then it was repeated; death was serious and had serious effects. Where was this death? The death of what? Of whom? I moved about in the room as if to escape what was being revealed to me, but it came again. I told my friend that something was happening to me. Then, the death was made clear. It was how a certain idea or subject was evaluated, was considered, not on earth where I was, but in heaven. Something is dead in heaven. I moved again. It was very strong and understandable then. Cessationism is dead in heaven. It is not just another bad idea among humankind, but cessationism is dead in heaven. At first, I

Köstenberger ignores the larger New Testament picture that might be gained with reference, for example, to Roger Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984) and to Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness; the Spirit in Luke–Acts* (JPTSUP, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994). While Köstenberger begins with Eph. 5.18, it is exegetically insensitive and extractionary to disconnect language found within the Ephesian letter from its earlier background in the ministry of Paul at Tyrannus' school and from the Spirit-reception by disciple-believers at Ephesus. Köstenberger fails to account for the connections between the text of the letter and that of Acts, connections that are also chronologically significant in light of Paul's relation to Jerusalem/Petrine tradition. Perhaps then Köstenberger's reluctance to countenance or to adequately consider Spirit-filling as portrayed by Luke is influenced by undeclared presuppositions stemming from an 'apostolic age' idea, which is inimical to both Paul and Luke. Further, some fair and balanced interaction with scholars on Eph. 5.18 who do not adopt Köstenberger's extractionist perspective might not have been inappropriate, e.g., Marcus Barth in the commentary tradition, and Howard M. Ervin, *These Are Not Drunken As Ye Suppose* (Plainfield, NJ: Logos, 1968), pp. 74-78; Stronstad, *Charismatic Theology*, pp. 53-55. It may be fairly observed as well that Köstenberger's tactic of dismissing Stronstad by misquoting him is unlikely to be ultimately persuasive.

thought someone had died or was about to die, but that was wrong;⁴³ the revelation concerned a topic, that topic was cessationism, and cessationism is dead where it really counts, in heaven itself. God dislikes it intensely, and I have to conclude that it is now, and has been in the past, regarded in heaven as not just unhelpful, but dangerous.

So, while Evangelicals may claim that ‘Pentecostal’ experience is unrepeatable and cannot be found in Luke’s second book and cannot have any connection with his first book, and that in order to countenance experience according to Lukan descriptions we also have to have new Incarnations, these cessationistic proclamations are not as applicable to ‘all who are afar off’ as their proponents believe them to be. Such proponents seem unaware that the ‘Lord’s Prayer’, the ‘Our Father’, the ‘Apostles’ Creed’, and the ‘Nicene Creed’ do indeed eclipse and ignore the fully developed teaching of the earthly Jesus on prayer and hide his other important teachings and doings, as Moltmann has recently pointed out with respect to the latter two ecclesiastical conceptions.⁴⁴ Since the Lord knew I was about to leave for an ETS meeting, He chose to motivate me in this unpleasant way that I would not easily forget. Also, recently, at my home church, where absolutely none of the above is known or even conceived of, a straightforward prophecy which I do not despise made it clear that there was someone present who had made an agreement with the Lord and the Lord expected that contract to be fulfilled.⁴⁵ While of course that could apply to others,

43. The need for community evaluation is critical, cf. John Goldingay, ‘Old Testament Prophecy Today’, *The Spirit & Church* 3.1 (2001), pp. 27-46 (44-46); E. Earle Ellis, ‘Prophecy in the New Testament Church—and Today’, in J. Panagopoulos, *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today* (NovTSup, 45; Leiden: Brill, 1977), pp. 46-57 (57).

44. Jürgen Moltmann, *Der Weg Jesu Christi: Christologie in messianischen Dimensionen* (München: Kaiser, 1989), p. 171.

45. Prophetic information such as this today is fully consistent with the function of prophecy in Luke’s narrative and with the ministry of characters like Philip’s prophesying daughters (Acts 21.8-9). The fact that these prophetesses do not speak in the narrative does not mean that Luke and Paul, who visited Philip’s home, did not listen to their ministries or that Luke was not impressed enough to recall and record what their ministries might have been. Their silence in his story merely reflects the probability that their ministry was not useful for Luke’s purpose, although his mention of their ministry was deemed useful in that it connects with his understanding of and version of the ongoing gender-inclusive fulfillment of Joel’s programmatic prophecy (Acts 2.16-21). *I suggest that Luke did not find it useful for his purpose to quote from or record any prophetic ministry of these prophesying daughters, just like he did not find it useful for his purpose to quote from or cite any written ministry from Paul’s discursive*

the Spirit impressed upon me right then that this information was for me, because—and this was part of the guidance—I had been thinking about discontinuing the ETS ministry, which, for now at least, should be continued in the face of any discouragement. So, I was given some resolve, which in the natural was difficult to find. For example, when a combative questioner aggressively pointed out that my analysis of the Lukan composition of questions like that posed in Acts 19.2a to disciple-believers,⁴⁶ (in that instance supported by the complementary exegesis of Lake, Cadbury, Hemer, Ehrhardt, Stuhlmacher, Wolter and Zahn with respect to the narratively consistent Christianity of the twelve Ephesians in Acts 19.1 in the eyes of both Luke and Paul), had to be wrong because the great cessationist grammarian, A.T. Robertson, had made a quick uninvestigated dogmatic remark to the contrary, I was calm when responding at length to that questioner. And, as it happened, that same questioner showed up the next day throughout the entire Luke–Acts session, where he remained silent.

Let me close with some personal reminiscences that may be representative of other fellow participants as well; I hope these will be encouraging, perhaps informative, perhaps illuminating. As to the dominance of protecting an established position, particularly one built on the cessationistic and

correspondence. Would Paul tell Philip and his four prophesying daughters that they were not to speak when believers gathered together for worship? Such an understanding of the Lukan Paul is of course absurd and utterly unacceptable; cf. Elbert, 'Globalization', pp. 98-99. Such a misunderstanding of Paul cannot be varnished over, just as it cannot be harmonized with an interpretation of Paul's discursive correspondence which alleges that Spirit-filled women were to remain quiet when believers gathered. Such a misrepresentation of Paul does not begin with the Lukan Paul or with the women that Luke portrays or with the women that the Paul of the letters describes. This misrepresentation does not seek, and historically has not sought, to understand Paul in his prophetic setting, as we know it either narratively or discursively. It is simply a wrongheaded and rhetorically insensitive reading of Paul. It is an 'apostolic age' reading. This interpretation, claiming that Spirit-filled women in the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition, in the Lukan and Pauline tradition, should not preach, a ministry consistent with their prophetic talents, must be discarded by Pentecostals in recognition of the ecclesiastically conforming non-Lukan and non-Pauline tradition that lies behind it. To misrepresent Paul in this way is a tragic distortion of his teaching, conjuring up a cessationistic Paul that Luke never knew.

46. Paul Elbert, 'An Observation on Luke's Composition and Narrative Style of Questions', *CBQ* 66.1 (2004), pp. 98-109. In this study the 152 questions in Luke's first book and the 70 in his second book are analyzed in terms of their narrative connectedness and function in light of the Graeco-Roman literary conventions of narrative-rhetorical composition.

rationalistic assurances stemming from ‘apostolic’ or other ‘ages’ and diverse epochs superimposed presuppositionally upon the text of Luke–Acts at various points, one scholar from Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary asked Howard Marshall and me to state what we believed Luke to mean by the gift of the Holy Spirit. This question allowed me to restate that, for Luke, characters in his first book were deliberately portrayed as having entered into a faith/forgiveness/repentance/salvation experiential nexus during the ministry of the earthly Jesus; further, for Luke, the gift of the Holy Spirit reflected and built upon an ongoing Jerusalem/Petrine tradition, phenomenologically and narratively. It was, for Luke, certainly not just an unspecific Jewish blessing, not something to be given a reinter-pretive shredding, as in current Evangelical commentaries employing ‘apostolic age’ style (à la Darby, imitated recently, for example, by Joel Green)⁴⁷, so as to—in the paleo-Reformed style of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’—brazenly disconnect the gift of the Holy Spirit at Lk. 11.13 from both its narrative foreground and its ensuing development and clarification, reducing

47. In Darbian style of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’ the tactic is twofold: first, to extract the content of Lk. 11.13 from the immediately preceding teaching of the earthly Jesus on prayer, then, to reinterpret the gift of the Holy Spirit in Luke’s narrative by injecting pleasant speculation supportive of the hidden hermeneutical presupposition of an ‘apostolic age’. This is recently illustrated again by Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 459, who denies outright the persuasive parabolic teaching of the earthly Jesus presented by Luke, assuring his Evangelical readers that ‘Even if the supplications included no request of the Spirit, God grants the Spirit’. *On this method of interpretation, why should obedient prayer in response to Jesus’ teaching at Lk. 11.2–4 not be similarly dismissed?* Whether Green’s contradiction of the earthly Jesus’ teaching on prayer is offensive to the heavenly Jesus is apparently of little or no concern, suggesting that the heavenly Jesus portrayed by Luke not only forgets the teaching of the earthly Jesus on prayer to disciple-believer-witnesses, but that this heavenly Jesus himself is transformed into the new Dispensational Jesus. That the heavenly Jesus in Luke’s second book is portrayed without any hint of such an ‘apostolic age’ driven transformation to the divine is, again, apparently of little or no concern. Green, continuing the tactic, converts the narratively contiguous gift of the Holy Spirit in Luke’s clearly written texts into the reassuring platitude, ‘what is for the best’ (p. 450) – *fait accompli*! Such obvious and blatantly uncritical reinter-pretive shredding, which is offered by scholars without apology, is all the more spectacular given the Evangelical claim to biblical inerrancy, authority, and trustworthiness. *It is quite apparent that none of these concepts in themselves carries enough weight to persuade or to embolden Evangelical scholars, over time, to reverse the more powerful, dogmatic, and insolent grip of hidden and undeclared ‘apostolic age’ presuppositions that have dominated Lukan interpretation in the Reformed tradition.*

it to 'what is for the best' or what is nice.⁴⁸ This is not biblical interpretation in any logical sense, but merely a pious exercise in the repetitious imitation of the philosophical proclivities of Calvinistic hermeneutics (n. 19 above). I reviewed the point that, for Luke, the gift of the Holy Spirit was not salvific, but an expected answer to prayer by Christian believers (in concert on this point with, for example, Giblet, Gunkel, Marguerat, Martin, Menzies, Russell, Schweizer, Shelton, Sullivan; *contra* Dunn, Turner).⁴⁹

48. The cessationistic eclipse or pietistic reinterpretation of the gift of the Holy Spirit and the propensity to disconnect prayer for the gift of the Holy Spirit from its narrative context, undoubtedly influenced by the ingrained 'apostolic age' method of interpretation wherein Luke's second book is approached with the unarticulated assumptions of narrative disconnectedness inherent in Reformed-style *Heilsgeschichte* without *Pneumageschichte*, is a well established tradition. This 'apostolic age hermeneutic' appears grounded in the experience (or non-experience) of interpreters, not in the experience of Lukan characters, given that Luke, consistent with the narrative-rhetorical conventions of his day, provides a clear and vivid phenomenological description of the gift and of the events, characters, places, and times in which the gift appears. Further, Luke's description places the gift firmly within his theme of prophetic fulfillment, allowing readers to anticipate the gift for themselves. Clarity and vividness are appropriately enhanced by a constellation of co-descriptions, further contributing to Lukan expectations and anticipation on the part of readers. All of this literary performance is closely consistent with the Graeco-Roman narrative-rhetorical category of description (*ekphrasis*) as delineated by Theon (*Progymnasmata*; ed. Patillon, pp. xxxviii-ix, 66-69) and similar treatises; cf. Herbert Hunger, 'Progymnasmata und andere Übungsreden' and 'Ekphraseis', *Die Hochsprachliche Profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 12.5.1-2; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1978), I, pp. 92-120, 170-88. *Luke's coherent and ostensibly 'Theonic' literary performance in this regard is ignored, a performance to be expected in a rhetorically minded culture, by the extraction of the gift of the Holy Spirit from its multiple narrative contexts and its non-Lukan reinterpretation as 'what is for the best'*. The erasure of coherent and consistent narrative meaning by the traditional and unexamined paleo-Reformed style of 'apostolic age hermeneutics' applied to the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit is clearly an erasure quite out of place with narrative-rhetorical expectations in Theophilus' literary world (or in any interpretive world where an author's and an addressee's expectations are taken seriously).

49. Some details of this review may be found in n. 27 above. With regard to the former scholars on this point, see J. Giblet, 'Baptism in the Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles', *One in Christ* 10 (1974), pp. 162-71; Hermann Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: The Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul* (trans. R.A. Harrisville and P.A. Quanbeck; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. K. McKinney, G.J. Laughery and R. Bauckham; SNTSMS, 121; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Francis Martin, 'Le baptême dans l'Esprit', *NRT* 106

Perhaps Luke would be disappointed to learn how Christians in later centuries would reinterpret the gift of the Holy Spirit, extracting it from his narrative, reinterpreting it as they told their own story instead of Luke's story. Logically, the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit is connected to the rest of the narrative in which it appears; it is sequentially connected to the rest of Luke's narrative.⁵⁰ A scholar from the Reformed Theological Seminary, who had joined me for lunch the previous day, then became somewhat upset and assured me that my interpretation was far too experiential and that any experience associated with such Lukan language could not now be biblical and would create insurmountable problems because the experience of reading might lose significance. In other words the experience of reading a text might then be accompanied by the same experience that characters have in the text. This appears to be the same fear that the primacy of written revelation makes natural theology dangerous and illegitimate⁵¹ and

(1984), pp. 23-58; Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke–Acts* (JSNTSup 54; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); E. A. Russell, "They believed Philip preaching" (Acts 8.12)', *Irish Biblical Studies* 1 (1979), pp. 169-76; Eduard Schweizer, 'πνευμα κτλ', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 389-455; *idem*, *Heiliger Geist* (Stuttgart: Kreuz, 1978); James B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke–Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991); Francis A. Sullivan, *Charisms and Charismatic Renewal: A Biblical and Theological Study* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant, 1982); also his *Charismes et renouveau charismatique: Etude biblique et théologique* (Loir-et-Cher: Nouan-le-Fuzelier, 1988). With regard to Dunn and Turner, see the critique of their respective positions in Menzies and Menzies, *Spirit and Power*, pp. 69-86, and 87-106, respectively.

50. Raniero Cantalamessa, *The Mystery of Pentecost* (trans. Glen S. Davis; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2001), p. 30, is correct to point out that Jesus says the heavenly Father will 'give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him' (Lk. 11.13). Similar in pastoral intent are Larry Christenson (ed.), *Welcome, Holy Spirit: A Study of Charismatic Renewal in the Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987), p. 85, and Lucy Rooney and Robert Faricy, *Lord, Teach Us to Pray: Leaders Manual* (Vatican City: International Catholic Charismatic Renewal Services, 2nd edn, 1998), pp. 84-91, 103. Cantalamessa, Christenson, Rooney, and Faricy continue in the Pentecostal tradition and in the tradition of Augustin George, who stressed that '*le don de l'Esprit est le don par excellence*' (*Études*, p. 412). On the other hand, perhaps the *pervasive erasure* of the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit within Evangelicalism today is typified by Walter L. Liefeld, 'Parables on Prayer (Luke 11.5-13; 18.1-14)', in Richard N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), pp. 240-62, who *fails even to mention* the obvious connection of the gift of the Holy Spirit in the climactic crescendo of Jesus' instruction at v.13 with the rest of the section (vv. 5-12), literally ignoring v.13 altogether!

51. Polkinghorne, *Science and Theology*, p. 71.

is related to the tension created by the exclusive primacy of *Sola Scriptura* versus a motif of *In Spiritu Sancto*, with experiential fellowship and inspiration in the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition.⁵² When I pointed out that an insurmountable problem does not obviously follow, both experiences (reading and Spirit-reception) being equally valid but simply different, noting that we might want also to be aware of the fact that, for Luke, what Jesus spoke, not what Luke wrote, was the ‘word of God’, a description which Luke would never apply to his own work, a stony silence ensued. So, as is the case with other human endeavors, the first encounter with information seemingly contradictory to an established position can be met with incredulous disbelief, but eventually, if thoughtfulness is given a chance, it might be considered.⁵³

One ETS scholar assured me that if texts were interpreted so as to expect experiential events to occur again as they did in the ‘apostolic age’, then we would be left at the mercy of subjectivism. Our role as rational beings would be diminished, and we would be in ‘bondage’. This bondage was no good because it would supplant the experience of reading Scripture—it would compete with written truth. Jack Deere’s bondage of a Bible deist was unheard of.⁵⁴ Would thoughtful dialogue assist in relieving this perceived ‘bondage’, I asked? No way! Bondage was bondage and that was that. For some, the presumptuous claim of automatic divine action through

52. That inspiration is better than information, opening better the door to transformation, was pointed out to me by my colleague Lee Roy Martin.

53. Perhaps another way to understand our situation—and I do not take the analogy as a perfect parallel—is to keep in mind that heliocentricity took several hundred years to replace geocentricity on the library shelves of Europe. The interpretation of a stationary earth, like the earlier interpretation of a flat earth, had a comfortable and understandable charm to its Christian adherents. Challenges to stationary-earth theology appeared unrealistic, counterintuitive, unnecessary, divisive and disturbing. A new physical perspective was needed to understand this challenge to established ‘biblical’ interpretation. Perhaps similarly, ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’ is being challenged today by a new biblical hermeneutic incorporating an experiential paradigm, as well as by a fresh literary appreciation of connectedness and coherency. A new spiritual perspective may be needed to understand this challenge.

54. Cf. Deere’s *Surprised by the Voice of God: How God Speaks Today through Prophecies, Dreams, and Visions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), pp. 251-69. As to Deere’s recent books, one ETS member, representative of unreflective position protection that is closed to dialogue and dissent, reflective of an unfortunate lack of enjoyment with the very vigorous exploratory dissent and interactive debate that is standard fare in the scientific tradition, declared that ‘We don’t want to hear that message, and we don’t want to hear it from Deere!’

the ecclesiastical administration of sacraments, combined with the cessation of the supernatural following enscripturation, may serve to make Lukan experiential portrayal suspect and bring it into serious question, even though consistent with New Testament language.⁵⁵

55. For those in the Charismatic Renewal not wedded to the supposed connection between cessationism and enscripturation, a pneumatological ecclesiology (*une ecclésiologie pneumatologique*), correcting the presumptuous sacramental insistence of automatic divine action, would be beneficial. In my judgement, the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit is ill-considered in assuming that sacraments are automatically an ecclesial means of grace, clerically transmitted if ministers are Spirit-filled, as does Yves Congar, ‘Pneumatologie dogmatique’, in Bernard Lauret and François Refoulé (eds.), *Initiation à la pratique de la théologie* (4 vols.; Paris: Editions du Cerf, 2nd edn, 1982) II, pp. 485-516 (496). However, Congar’s critical efforts toward a pneumatological ecclesiology are to be applauded; cf. Isaac Kizhakkeparampil, *The Invocation of the Holy Spirit as Constitutive of the Sacraments according to Yves Congar* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1995). The pursuit of a flexible ecclesiology, stressing the freedom of the Spirit, is unharmonious with a tightly constrained sacramental mindset and has little difficulty in describing contemporary New Testament experience with New Testament language.

On the other hand, James I. Packer’s claim that charismatic experience cannot be described with New Testament language, and is therefore ‘deeply unbiblical’, may be challenged and corrected as well; cf. my ‘The Charismatic Movement in the Church of England: An Overview’, *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 6.1 (1984), pp. 28-33. Packer, undeterred, in a lecture at Rutherford House, Edinburgh, entitled ‘Charismatic Christianity and Biblical Theology’, *Rutherford House Tape 103* (dated 1989/1990), fails even to surface the possibility that Calvin’s arbitrary confinement of the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit at Acts 2.38, 39 to an artificially devised epoch is quite openly not biblical theology, a point highly germane to his topic. Perhaps this is not surprising since in this lecture he never refers to the narrative theology of Luke–Acts, bypassing Luke–Acts totally, while continuing to mischaracterize the Pentecostal/Charismatic movement as a bogus restoration of ‘sign-gifts’. According to Packer any second work of grace (that is, any certain experience viewed from the natural perspective of suspicion) cannot then stem from doctrine nor be described by well-fitting New Testament texts, new prophetic revelation is non-existent, supposed ‘sign-gifts’ are not restored even though the movement’s ‘theological roots’ supposedly lie therein (a patently false claim), and everything is satisfactorily explainable via Rom. 8.16 and Jn 14.21-23. *It does seem odd, however, that a Christocentric global movement should develop within a century into a major sector of world Christendom with such scant biblical credentials.* In any case, as Packer well knows, the movement he is discussing did not and is not advancing along these lines, perhaps a bothersome fact best ignored, similar to how a circular sun and a circular moon were ignored in flat-earth theology based on the four corners passage (Rev. 7.1).

Another sincere scholar shared that he does not believe that rationalism exists within Evangelicalism today. It is not subservience to human preconceptions of arbitrary epochs superimposed upon New Testament texts, or anti-supernaturalism or skepticism, or the outright denial and/or dismissal of the examples and precedents that Luke sets out in clear detail; rather there is some other factor at work. What then is that factor? Well, he is not sure, but it is not rationalism. Perhaps there are mysterious circumstances afoot other than politics. This sincere scholar wants actively to encourage the usefulness of the book of Acts within Evangelicalism, with main prophetic experiential themes traditionally dampened while emphasizing missions in general terms, hoping that Acts' missionary purpose will not continue to be overlooked and that it will not be employed in sermons to score only moral and ethical points or in classrooms only to argue for historicity and inerrancy. But does not this disconnect the Lukan missionary characters from their narrative world? Might it not be better at this point in time to prepare missionaries in the original version of the Lukan tradition, like, for example, Elva Vanderbout⁵⁶ or Elize Scharten⁵⁷ or theological educator Alice Luce.⁵⁸

56. Julie C. Ma, 'Elva Vanderbout: A Woman Pioneer of Pentecostal Mission among Igorots', *Journal of Asian Mission* 3.1 (2001), pp. 121-140.

57. Cornelius van der Laan, 'Beyond the Clouds: Elize Scharten (1876-1965), Pentecostal Missionary to China', in Ma and Menzies (eds.), *Pentecostalism in Context*, pp. 337-57.

58. Alice E. Luce, formerly an Anglican missionary to India, became a pioneer teacher, evangelist and dedicated pastor in Hispanic missions. Some of the written legacy of this pioneer theological educator is as follows: 'From the Mexican Border', *The Weekly Evangel* (April 28, 1917), p. 12; 'Open Doors in Mexico', *The Weekly Evangel* (Nov 17, 1917), p. 13; 'Mexican Work in California', *The Christian Evangel* (Dec 14, 1918), p. 14; 'Deaf and Dumb Child in Mexico Healed', *The Pentecostal Evangel* (Feb 20, 1932), p. 11. A rewarding perusal of Luce's contributions, contributions obviously spiritually rich and biblically oriented, during the tenure of her Latin-American missionary work make it clear that her understanding of the New Testament was not at all a foreground of the fragmented contemporary popularization among some Evangelicals that 'all the Pauline spiritual gifts are for today'. Rather, her written ministry and its lack of appeal to the rationalistic charm of diverse epochs and their heritage of disconnectedness could serve as a refreshing popular balm for the excision of the Paul of the letters from the complete Lukan Paul and from the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition, other than to argue that Paul's conversion influenced his Christology. As may be observed in her excellent biblical and pastorally able piece 'Physical Manifestations of the Spirit' (*The Pentecostal Evangel* [July 27, 1918], p. 2), she did not just teach about spiritual gifts, but also appealed to 'The Great Physician and His Medicine' (*The*

Another scholar pointed out that we could hardly expect the ‘Pentecostal’ type events in Acts to have been repeated and thereby to have given rise to the same descriptive language that Luke and his contemporaries would later employ and experientially understand.⁵⁹ I would expect that most ETS scholars are quite unaware of Thomas Manson’s reasonable assumption that the Spirit-reception language employed by Paul has obvious linguistic roots in the Christian heritage which Paul respects and seeks to continue. Linguistic roots imply experiential roots and identification of experience by employing commonly shared language. Since Schnackenburg, in the anniversary volume for the Lukan scholar Heinz Schürmann, linked the Spirit-reception and Spirit-giftedness language of Luke to the almost identical language in the Paul of the letters,⁶⁰ this is a topic awaiting further investigation. In fact, when I asked one prominent Evangelical scholar to engage in a formal dialogue with me in our ETS ‘charismatic themes’ venue on this very point, he declined, stating that ‘Pentecostals would have to *prove*’ (emphasis his), that similar and identical Pauline language was connected to language in Luke–Acts. When I assured him that the goal of dialogue was not intended to fashion a formal proof or to advance or protect ecclesiastical domains, but to advance scholarship, he again declined. Of course most Evangelical scholars find little or no distinction between the

Pentecostal Evangel [Sept 6, 1930], p. 6). Her Christocentric, balanced approach included expectant prayer that regarded the heavenly Jesus as a savior connected to the earthly Jesus, as a baptizer in the Holy Spirit in accord with prayerful Lukan expectations and sequential narrative portrayal, and as a sovereign healer. She evidently felt in the latter category, for example, contrary to the dictates of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’ wherein the healing ministry of the earthly Jesus is simply unique, didactic, and ‘once-for-all’, that the merciful, compassionate, and curative dimension of the ministry of the earthly Jesus extended prayerfully to the heavenly Jesus. Further research on Alice Luce may be assisted by the Flower Pentecostal Heritage Center (www.AGHeritage.org).

59. Such claims that there was no common linguistic base due to common experience, no creation of descriptive language based on experience, and no connection between the Spirit-reception language employed by Paul in his occasional discursive correspondence and the narrative portrayals of Lukan characters, including Paul, can be attributed, in my judgement only to cessationistic motivations, not to serious investigation as begun by Thomas W. Manson, ‘Entry into Membership of the Early Church’, *JTS* 48 (1947), pp. 25–33.

60. Rudolf Schnackenburg, ‘Die johanneische Gemeinde und ihre Geisterfahrung’, in Rudolf Schnackenburg, Josef Ernst and Joachim Wanke (eds.), *Die Kirche des Anfangs: Festschrift für Heinz Schürmann zum 65 Geburtstag* (Erfurter Theologische Studien 38; Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1977; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1978), pp. 277–306 (284–85).

Lukan Paul and the Paul of the letters, but when the latter employs language of the former as well as the language of the supposedly extinct examples and precedents narrated by his companion and pupil Luke,⁶¹ unforeseen distinctions and barriers seem to arise. Underlying connections between the concepts of power in Luke–Acts (including Luke’s portrayal of Paul) and in Paul’s letters also suggest a common linguistic tradition within which the two authors operated and communicated. These similarities likewise await fuller investigation.⁶² Questions, like where could Luke, who claims to have researched all things thoroughly and was otherwise so informed about Paul’s missionary work, have lived to be unaware of Paul’s letters,⁶³ and why would Luke not seek to clarify important Spirit-reception

61. Regarding this point of association, so too, Tübingen Professor Johann E. Belser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Biblische Zeitfragen 1/7; Münster: Verlag der Asschen-dorffschen Buchhandlung, 1908), p. 5; Arthur Darby Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (ed. Z. Stewart; 2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), II, pp. 827–28. For balanced discussion of the ‘we-passages’ in Acts, cf. Colin Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (ed. C.H. Gempf; WUNT, 49; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), pp. 312–34. This connection of Luke with Paul is relevant to the discussion of the common Jerusalem/Petrine tradition of descriptive language, and experiential interaction with the heavenly Jesus related thereto, that these two authors would have shared in communication and practice.

62. The recent work of Petrus J. Gräbe, ‘The Pentecostal Discovery of the New Testament Theme of God’s Power and its Relevance to the African Context’, *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 24.2 (2002), pp. 225–42 (226–36), is welcome in this regard. Some of this material is explored further in Gräbe’s *The Power of God in Paul’s Letters* (WUNT, 123; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), *passim*.

63. A point also raised, for example, by Heikki Leppä, *Luke’s Critical Use of Galatians* (Vantaa, Finland: Dark Oy, 2002), p. 21, and by Thomas L. Brodie, ‘Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke’s Use of Sources’, in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke–Acts; New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 17–46 (37), who goes further: ‘Would a researcher like Luke who wanted to highlight Paul and his preaching set to work without bothering to get copies of Paul’s epistles? In what corner was he marooned that he did not know of these documents? In what literary impoverishment did this elegant writer live that he could not get copies of them?’ On the matter of Luke’s probable knowledge of Pauline correspondence, which bears on an argument that Luke and Paul were *both* supportive of the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition and that *both* reflected its linguistic heritage, see also W. Soltau, ‘Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte’, *ZNW* 4 (1903), pp. 128–54; Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: E. Nourry, 1920), pp. 415, 475; Wilhelm Mundle, ‘Das Apostelbild der Apostelgeschichte’, *ZNW* 27 (1928), pp. 36–54 (44); Barbara Thiering, ‘The Acts of the Apostles as Early Christian Art’, in E.C.B. MacLaurin (ed.), *Essays in Honour of Griffithes Wheeler Thatcher* (Sydney: Sydney

language in the letters via explanatory examples and precedents rather than pastorally to confuse with ostensibly similar language conveying a different meaning than that of Paul, are swept under the dispensational rug. Although Luke obviously writes for Theophilus' understanding, using what must have been commonly understandable language for a reader I take to be already familiar with Christian ideas and practices,⁶⁴ the inadequately considered version of pre-Lukan cessationism that is quite common among Evangelicals today⁶⁵ reflects a hermeneutical bias that Theophilus would, I suspect, find difficult to recognize. According to this bias, we would surely not expect any Lukan language relating to experience that quickly underwent mass extinction, even if contained in Paul's letters, to be relevant in

University Press, 1967), pp. 139-89; Morton E. Enslin, 'Once Again, Luke and Paul', *ZNW* 61 (1970), 253-71; 'Emphases and Silences', *HTR* 73 (1980), pp. 219-25; Lars Aejmelaus, *Der Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede, Apg 20.18-35* (Annales Academie Scientiarum Fennicae B232; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), p. 267; William O. Walker, Jr, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus Reconsidered', *JSNT* 24 (1985), pp. 3-23; 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus Revisited: Peter's Speech at the Jerusalem Conference', in Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips (eds.), *Literary Studies in Luke–Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), pp. 77-98; Thomas L. Brodie, 'Towards Tracing the Gospels' Literary Indebtedness to the Epistles', in Dennis R. MacDonald (ed.), *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001), pp. 104-16 (105-10); and Lars Aejmelaus, 'Reopening the Question of Luke's Use of the Pauline Letters', in Heikki Leppä (ed.), *Lukan Use of Pauline Letters and 1 Clement* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetischen Gesellschaft, forthcoming).

64. Cf. my 'Spirit, Scripture and Theology through a Lukan Lens: A Review Article', *JPT* 13 (1998), pp. 55-75 (66-73).

65. Walvoord's and Turner's views are similar within the sphere of narrative disconnectedness, cf. Elbert, 'Globalization', pp. 90-91. Walvoord and Turner, against the grain of all known narrative-rhetorical convention bearing on understandability, excise the main Lukan character's teaching on prayer from the minds and lives of his disciples. Unhelpful to this narrative excision is its unappealing disconnectedness with narrative facts. This main character is no less than the son of God, the man to whom all the prophets witness, the character who exhorts his hearers to put his teachings into practice and who says that his real relatives are those who obey his teaching. *Perhaps this might suggest that the pervasive erasure of his teaching on prayer from characters' memories would be contrary to Lukan intentions.* Perhaps Walvoord and Turner's appeal to narrative disconnectedness and incoherence will be as convincing as other cessationistic theories, unless their luster eventually be lost in a scrutiny of the presuppositional basis of 'apostolic age' apologetics.

our contemporary application of Paul, even though Paul views himself as part of an earlier preformed tradition.⁶⁶ It might be argued that Paul developed an appreciation for the legacy of epochal truncation in Rome, passing it to Luke, although both appear ignorant of it.⁶⁷

In any case, my arguments that pervasive oral memory and a common and ongoing Jerusalem/Petrine tradition is detectable in Paul's discursive correspondence, correspondence that Luke who has researched all things carefully from the beginning surely, in my tentative judgement, knows about, do not seem highly resonant with the current mind-set of some Evangelicals.⁶⁸ Yet, Luke is an independently minded thinker who, in my view, does not find Paul's letters useful for his theological and pneumatological purpose. A practical telling about the Spirit, rather than elaborate discourse about the Spirit,⁶⁹ is certainly not, however, a narrative constraint for a writer contemplative of the need for urgent clarification of the discursive

66. Paul's continuity with the mother church of Christendom in Jerusalem and its linguistic heritage is well established; cf. Philippe H. Menoud, 'Jésus et ses témoins', *Eglise et Théologie* 23 (1960), pp. 7-20; P. Fannon, 'The Influence of Traditions on St. Paul', in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica. IV. Papers Presented to the Third International Congress on New Testament Studies* (TU, 102; Berlin: Akademie, 1968), pp. 292-307. As to Paul's transmission of earlier tradition, cf. Paul-Gerhard Müller, *Der Traditionsprozess im Neuen Testament: Kommunikationsanalytische Studien zur Versprachlichung des Jesusphänomens* (Freiburg/Basil/Vienna: Herder, 1982), pp. 204-24; E. Earle Ellis, *The Making of the New Testament Documents* (Leiden: Brill, 2nd edn, 2002), pp. 248-51, 256-60.

67. The content of Paul's Miletus speech does not suggest or imply a Lukan characterization of Paul which is at all truncational toward Luke's own development and application of his prophetic-fulfillment theme. Such a cessationistic interpretation of the Miletus speech is wrongheaded, rather, and here I agree with Walton, that 'For Luke, the heart of Christian leadership is to be like Jesus, and the extent to which both the disciples and Paul do and teach what Jesus did and taught—frequently using similar vocabulary—makes this clear' (Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians* [SNTSMS, 108; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000], p. 135).

68. As to this Evangelical *Weltanschauung* or worldview through which the New Testament is read, Wacker, Poloma, Johns, and Archer are undoubtedly correct that a supernatural worldview more akin to that of the New Testament authors themselves provides an alternate *Weltanschauung* to that motivated by a rational modern society; cf. Ken Archer, 'Pentecostal Hermeneutics: Retrospect and Prospect', *JPT* 8 (1996), pp. 63-81 (65).

69. With Marguerat, *First Christian Historian*, p. 128.

correspondence of Paul. Although in light of Reformed tradition, for some, I fear, acceptance of Luke's probable knowledge of Paul's letters, given then his decision not to quote them, would thereby somehow display Luke's narrative inferiority, a perspective highly consistent with the suffocating temporal camouflage long imposed upon Luke's literary accomplishment. Historicity, not narrative theology and pneumatology, has dominated Evangelical scholarship in Acts.⁷⁰ And this is, of course a proper and important enterprise. But if it becomes an exclusive vision, the interpretation of Paul (dispensational and otherwise) can unduly overshadow the Christian tradition, description, and practice as portrayed by Luke.⁷¹ Perhaps absent such rigid preconceptions and the accompanying allegiance to an alien hermeneutic invoked with respect to Luke's narrative world, due consideration and reflection upon differing ideas would function in a more productive manner. I am not sure how well debate and dissent, as productive tools of progress, are working within Evangelicalism at ETS, which appears to me to be a somewhat insular academic operation. Nevertheless, God is at work, as with Apollos, within ETS and its membership, and it is a pleasure to engage in fellowship therein.

As we all know, undue adherence to an established position may prevent, initially at least, otherwise thoughtful scholars, including ourselves, from considering new information. It may also hinder or prevent reflection upon previously articulated information that should be considered. After all, we like ourselves the way we are, and when we surround ourselves with those who are like us, then how can differences, dissent, or valid progress be apparent or very relevant? When my discovery of the consistency of the Lukan syntax of imperative–future middle/passive combinations (as at Acts 2.38) was presented to ETS, a study relevant to Pesch's claim that we live in the time of the Lukan gift of the Spirit (*die Zeit der Geistesgabe*),⁷² not in the 'messianic' or 'apostolic' age where Joel's prophecy was supposedly

70. Perhaps, for some, this dominating interest might not be unfairly paraphrased in its practical manifestation as 'We believe that the events in Acts happened, we just don't want them to happen to us'.

71. Against this possible view, cf. Paul Elbert, 'Paul of the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians: Critique and Considerations', *ZNW* 95/2 (2004) pp. 258–68.

72. Rudolf Pesch, 'Die Gabe des Heiligen Geistes (Apg 2,38)', *Bibel und Kirche* 21 (1966), pp. 52–53 (53). One notes the imperative–future passive combination at Acts 2.38c, a structure in need of syntactical consideration at least within Lukan and LXX usage.

fulfilled,⁷³ the reaction seemed mainly ‘ho hum’, together with ‘who sent for you?’ By and large, with two exceptions, consideration and reflection

73. The truncation or confinement of Luke’s dynamic understanding of prophetic fulfillment, in the case of selected supernatural categories of inspired speech arbitrarily singled out for extinction in Peter’s rendition of Joel’s prophecy, to a supposed artificial and prophetic-quenching epoch (*Zeit*), is standard fare in the commentary tradition on Luke’s second book. Occasionally, in the ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’ of the critical commentary tradition, the concealed and unarticulated presupposition driving the truncation explicitly surfaces as it does in Hans Hinrich Wendt’s comment on the promise (ἐπαγγελία) of the Spirit at Acts 2.33. Although the promise at 2.33 is rightly connected by Wendt to the same promise (*Verheißung*) at Lk. 24.49 and Lk. 3.16, it is disconnected from Jesus’ teaching at Lk. 11.13 by an established tradition preceding Wendt which has confined Jesus’ teaching on prayer to Lk. 11.2-4. The promise at 2.33 is also disconnected by Wendt from the same promise at Acts 1.4, from its exemplary fulfillment in 2.4, and from the ongoing prophetic prediction concerning the promise in 2.39 which goes beyond narrative time.

All of these well-placed narrative contextual instances of a specific promise and their delicate co-descriptions (Lk. 3.16; 11.13; 24.49; Acts 1.4, 5; 2.4, 33, 39), together with the apparent prophetic extension of this promise to repentant hearers both within and beyond the narrative itself at 2.39, would without a doubt be properly considered in the critical exegesis of a classic epic of narrative fiction involving prophetic fulfillment, had such a construction appeared there. Had 2.17-18 been a prophecy by Zeus or Juno in Homeric or Virgilian epic, contained within winged words by Minerva or within a speech by bold Aeneas, with all of the obvious narrative linkages carefully afforded this promise, with its delicately nuanced co-descriptions and its experiential example of inspired speech, we would find classical commentators considering the mythic supernatural prediction of the speaker and looking for its repetition in selected lives as the story unfolded. *Indeed, we might find commentators hailing this narrative continuity as a display of Homeric or Virgilian ekphrasis worthy of rhetorical acclaim.* In this hypothetical case, since the narrative prediction beyond narrative time is a technique of fiction, its ambitious extension beyond the narrative makes for arresting and entertaining reading, while in reality it is quite preposterous and would not call for comment.

On the other hand, Wendt, a critical commentator working from the Greek text, like Calvin too at this juncture (n. 19), reveals that he knows what the well-placed instances of the promise probably suggest or at least imply, he knows that they are there, *they are just not at all useful to or compatible with his operational agenda*, which is to confine such supernatural prophetic predictions to New Testament characters. While Wendt does cite 10.45 and 11.17 (and Heb. 6.4) as instances of the gift of the Holy Spirit in 2.38c, he apparently sees the need for a comment partially explaining his lack of consideration of the train of promise-markers (Lk. 3.16 [Acts 1.5]; 11.13; 24.49; Acts 1.4; 2.33; 2.39), a comment which also serves to quench any untoward expectations on the part of *his* readers for prophetic fulfillment pertaining to 2.38c beyond the narrative.

not surprisingly took a back seat. On the other hand, when this same information was presented at SBL in Rome,⁷⁴ it was recognized by linguists and sundry New Testament scholars, as it had been earlier by several classicists with whom I discussed it extensively,⁷⁵ to be interesting and, as I suggested, a factor to be considered in interpretation; hence the contrasting attitude, ‘Let’s have coffee together and discuss this further’. Similarly, with apologies for mentioning my own work, the aforementioned presentation on

Wendt offers the truncating assertion regarding 2.33 that ‘*Der Messias vermittelt die Geistesbegabung, die nach den Prophetenworte (2.17-18) in der messianischen Zeit verwirklicht werden soll*’, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3/9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 5th edn, 1913), p. 94.

Historically, the truncation of supernatural components of Joel’s prophecy (Acts 2.17-21) is formally inaugurated at 2.39 in the critical commentary tradition on Luke’s second book (ditto with hand-me-down assurances in more popular ‘Evangelical’ tradition). While the critical tradition may sometimes note that at 2.39 the promise is co-described as the baptism in the Spirit, that the Spirit is the object of the promise, that 2.33, 1.4; and Lk. 24.49 cite this promise, and that Lk. 3.16 and 11.13 are to be recognized as relevant foreground, the contiguous example of the promise (2.4) is marginalized or erased from the scene at 2.39, and ensuing narrative examples—examples which connect to supernatural categories in 2.17, 18—are totally disconnected from prophetic fulfillment. The truncation in the critical commentary tradition at 2.39 (as with Wendt) is accompanied by disconnecting speculation, like ‘*mais le don de l’Esprit appartient aux temps messianiques*’, the children of the truncated promise being ‘*la future Eglise*’ (the church of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’ in a supposedly different epoch than Lukan characters), so Loisy, *Actes*, p. 215.

What is interesting in all of this is that Luke is never said to be a deliberate misleader or an inept bungler. Obviously he is neither. Instead, his skillful narrative-rhetorical depictions of prophetic fulfillment are—when at variance with ecclesiastical tradition or with neo-Calvinist presuppositions—just presumptuously confined to, or his text divided up into, various arbitrary epochs or ages which, while no more than pneumatological phantoms, function to destroy narrative continuity as in the encapsulating model of von Baer-Dunn; cf. Elbert, ‘Lukan Expectations’ (n. 27).

74. For informative purposes, it may be noted that the Society of Biblical Literature (SBL), founded in 1880 to advance the public understanding of the Bible and biblical scholarship, hosts its annual meetings in North America and additionally there is an annual international meeting, cf. <http://www.sbl-site.org/>

75. It is a pleasure to acknowledge discussions with Ron Ipock, Department of Classics, University of California at Irvine, and with John Philips, Department of Classics, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. I would like to thank Maria Pantelia, director of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (<http://www.tlg.uci.edu/~tlg>), for kindly scheduling research time and extending the hospitality of the Thesaurus library at the University of California at Irvine.

Luke's narrative style in his composition of questions and their narrative function seemed to get an ETS 'ho hum', but at SBL a warm welcome and a letter of inquiry from a New Testament faculty member at Westminster Theological Seminary expressing a desire to study the matter further. Ingrained presuppositions can prove difficult to reconsider, but the youthful are open; the dispensational cloak that has long suppressed the Lukan voice and the Pauline connection to that voice is lifting.

Some bright spots are encouraging. At the last ETS session in Toronto, several questioners in the audience asked where they could find more information on Luke's understanding of 'being filled' and 'full of' the Holy Spirit. As moderator, I was able to direct them to where such timely and practical information could be found, particularly in Jim Shelton's seminal piece in the Horton festschrift, a newly discovered nugget for our Evangelical friends.⁷⁶ Evidently these questioners were not convinced, as was suggested by the immediately previous speaker, that Lukan portrayals of personal Spirit-receptions/Spirit-fillings by believers were all but irrelevant before Luke wrote.

While my wife and daughter waited for me in the lobby of the ETS hotel, as we prepared to leave for the SBL hotel, I encountered a woman whom I had observed to be present during our entire Luke-Acts session that same morning. She turned out to be the wife of a dean of an institution of higher education that has a long-standing position of militant Lukan cessationism. Her son had rejected the rationalistic underpinnings of this belief and had been witnessing to her. She was reflective and her mind had been opened. The two of us stood all alone and talked without interruption for over half an hour. She asked one question after another and considered the answers. I encouraged her to obey the teaching of the earthly Jesus on prayer in Luke's first book, not to be detoured by ecclesiastical pressures that would surely be brought against her,⁷⁷ not to be content with the

76. Filling the bill on this occasion was Jim's '“Filled with the Holy Spirit” and “Full of the Holy Spirit”: Lukan Redactional Phrases', in Paul Elbert (ed.), *Faces of Renewal: Studies in honor of Stanley M. Horton* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), pp. 81-107.

77. *Traditional Protestant theology deliberately and explicitly eclipses (totally or at best partially) the teaching of Jesus on prayer beyond the 'Lord's Prayer' in the Lukan account (cf. nn. 47 and 48 above), that is Lk. 11.2-4 is 'for today' and 11.5-13 is for the supposed 'apostolic age'.* Rationalistically excised as well are the examples of obedient disciples praying for the gift of the Holy Spirit in accord with Jesus' teaching. Under the hidden agenda of 'apostolic age hermeneutics' these texts are perceived

theoretical admission, independent of Luke–Acts, that spiritual gifts mentioned in Paul’s letters may be for today, an admission often equated with natural talent and secular accomplishment by Evangelical scholars like Robert Saucy,⁷⁸ who, while ‘open’, rely less on pragmatic Pauline understanding of how these gifts are transmitted and given interpersonally *in the Spirit*, and more on notions of epochal boundaries. Rather than scholarly waffling as to whether Paul’s first letter to Corinth should be understood by reading front to back,⁷⁹ she sought encouragement on how prayerfully

as ecclesiastically *verboten*, that is, of a non-applicable, ‘do-not-touch-under-any-circumstances’ kind of biblical material. Any practical pastoral application or appropriation of such material in connection with Luke’s second book is likely to be met with stout resistance by epochalists imbued by training and ecclesial practice in ‘apostolic age’ interpretive methodology. In this scenario, the examples and precedents within the Spirit-reception nexus in the second book are either divorced from Luke’s thematic prophetic-fulfillment theme or are retrofitted to a distant epoch. For a contrary suggestion as to the most effective pedagogic appropriation of such material, cf. Jon Ruthven, ‘“Between Two Worlds: One Dead, The Other Powerless to be Born?” Pentecostal Theological Education vs. Training for Christian Service’, *The Spirit & Church* 3.2 (2001), pp. 273-97 (283-85, 289-92).

78. Saucy, a past president of ETS, sets out his views on the possibility of the supernatural under various suspicions and constraints, one being to meet his criterion that New Testament prophecy to be genuine must be authoritative, not to meet Paul’s criterion that it should edify; cf. his ‘An Open but Cautious View’, in Wayne A. Grudem (ed.), *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? Four Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), pp. 97-148.

79. J. Rodman Williams’ point that 1 Cor. 1 and 2 (with its reference to Spirit-reception) precedes 1 Cor. 12–14 is a valid rhetorically-minded concept rather totally overlooked by Richard B. Gaffin, Jr, ‘A Cessationist Response to C. Samuel Storms and Douglas A. Oss’, in Grudem (ed.), *Miraculous Gifts*, pp. 284-97. Given the distinctively selective and contextually extractive employment of ‘proof texts’ in the theory of epochal imposition/truncation, Ruthven’s argument, that ‘The doctrine of cessationism will one day assume its rightful place in the Museum of Theological Curiosities – joining the Gap Theory, the bodily ascension of Mary and the doctrine that Mussolini is the Antichrist’, has the weight of history on its side; (cf. Jon Ruthven, review of Grudem [ed.], *Miraculous Gifts*, in *Pneuma: Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies* 21.1 [1999], pp. 155-158 [158]). However, just when Ruthven’s Museum of Theological Curiosities will be fully open to the Christian public to view the biers of Lukan and Pauline cessationism as formerly engendered by experiential suspicion and philosophically based epochal periodization, is difficult to anticipate. A guesstimate of several centuries might be apropos, given the grip of underlying rationalistic presuppositions. The current arrogant denial by some of what is reasonably understood to be spiritual reality may not be based entirely upon the rationalistic impulse to divorce the heavenly Jesus from the earthly Jesus, although this disconnectedness is undoubtedly a

to seek and to persist in seeking the Lukan gift of the Holy Spirit, to value and to accept the examples and precedents Luke had provided her, to put herself in the position of Theophilus and to read Luke–Acts *tabula rasa* front to back. I encouraged her to seek the gift of the Holy Spirit and to continue to do so throughout her life and to have Lukan expectations, not to be misled by prayer formulas which deliberately ignore the teaching of the Lukan Jesus and its narrative clarification. All through this conversation, I felt the Lord’s gentle presence. I do not know what will happen to this determined woman when she encounters opposition, but her humble curiosity, after spending years in the halls of ‘apostolic age’ academia, was, for me, very encouraging and refreshing. I do wish her well.

Conclusions

I have attempted to draw out some of the ramifications inherent in an anti-Lukan ‘apostolic age hermeneutic’ that may be of some assistance to future students of Luke’s interconnected volumes, a double-work obviously composed in light of the narrative-rhetorical conventions of the day which valued clarity, description, and coherence. In contrast to the expectations engendered by Graeco-Roman literary achievement, the truncational method of interpretation concretized in the Reformation remains unresponsive to and reinterpretive of the role of the Holy Spirit in New Testament texts. In Luke’s case, the hidden presupposition of cessationism serves to blot out main themes and destroy narrative cohesion, while in Paul’s case it denies the connection of the letters with Jerusalem/Petrine tradition and the examples and precedents described with a common linguistic heritage.

factor in the denial. The evident conflict with Luke’s fulfillment-of-prophecy theme that this tension creates, combined with the non-Pauline fear that somehow revelatory experience will displace the experience of edifying and instructional texts (as in the real Paul, Rom. 15.4), reminds me of Robert Jastrow’s now famous poetic picture (*God and the Astronomers* [New York/London: Norton, 1978], p. 116). Jastrow depicts some dogmatic atheists confronted with the beginning of the cosmos in 1963, when humankind entered into the Era of the Glimpse of God: ‘For the scientist who has lived by his faith in the power of reason, the story ends like a bad dream. He has scaled the mountains of ignorance; he is about to conquer the highest peak; as he pulls himself over the final rock, he is greeted by a band of theologians who have been sitting there for centuries.’ *When those wedded to the Dispensational Luke and the Dispensational Paul, have explored the last possible tidbits of their thought, perhaps they too, God willing, may be greeted in a similar way by New Testament theologians: Luke and the Paul of Acts, writer of letters.*

Some conservative Evangelicals have historically been better at defending set doctrines of the past rather than constructively changing past blunders. The neo-Calvinist evangelical coalition, whether Wesleyan-Arminian, Baptist, or Reformed, thinks of itself as ‘biblical’ Christianity when, in fact, it evinces a stubborn traditionalism which strongly resists fresh insight into New Testament texts and their cognitive environment from a new perspective unwedded to rationalism. Perhaps an understandable and commendable desire to defend the existence and practices of Lukan characters within history tended to overshadow a due desire to see things through the eyes of characters in the narrative world, to participate in the connectedness of *their* story.⁸⁰ Instead, this preoccupation with historical and source criticism often leads to the conclusion that what Luke writes is just too difficult to understand, too remote, that is, incompatible with respect to the perspective of an interpreter’s story who is locked out of the narrative world because of atomistic readings engendered by exposure to an atomistic commentary tradition, by anti-supernatural bias, or by rational assent to overt or implicit cessationism. It is inevitable that the impulse of reinterpretation in the guise of exegesis, ecclesiastically conforming or not, must come under scrutiny. Yet, the extra-biblical and incoherent practice of ‘apostolic age hermeneutics’—with its strange residue of disconnectedness—will likely retain a puzzling allure. Nevertheless, future scholars trained to ask ‘How do we know?’ and ‘Why do we believe?’ should not be intimidated over the long-term by assertions of highly dubious plausibility, assertions intimately and ultimately allied to the narratively uncritical, rationalistic, and exegetically presumptuous epochs presupposed by past generations of scholarship.⁸¹

80. The observation of W.C. van Unnik is quite apropos: ‘Some generations ago it was usual in writing a biography of somebody to say in the subtitle, “in the framework of his time”. Today such a further indication has fallen into desuetude, but if we wish to come to a correct and fair appreciation of Acts we shall have to see Luke in the framework of his age. I am becoming more and more convinced that much critical study of Acts has been done at a distance from, or even without *living* contact with, Luke’s world. It is not sufficient to remind ourselves that he was not a historian in our sense, but in that of antiquity; but we shall have to walk with him along his roads, to see and hear with his eyes and those of his contemporaries’ (emphasis his), ‘Luke’s Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography’, in J. Kremer (ed.), *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 48; Paris-Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1979), pp. 37-60 (37).

81. Of course a few Evangelicals will continue their attempts to disregard the disciple-believer-witnesses in Luke’s first book, truncate the programmatic narrative

I suggest optimistically that scholars who deliberately unsubscribe to 'apostolic age' interpretive methodology and embrace a new paradigm, a new perspective on narrative connectedness and of experiential portrayal as shared by the narrative-rhetorical culture in which the New Testament was composed, will be among those who break new interpretive ground. As they make their work available to the Lord in a ministry useful to pragmatic Christian concerns, they should take their place as partners in progress of a new kind. As to scholarship germinating and becoming productive within the Pentecostal/Charismatic Renewal in the new Era of the Glimpse of God, biblical studies emanating from a new paradigm should be of practical assistance in motivating an increase in missionary zeal throughout world Christendom.

Paul's familiarity with Jesus material, his conversion and Spirit-reception, and his theological and pneumatological development, place him squarely in the Jerusalem/Petrine tradition narrated in Luke–Acts. The mysterious empowerment of disciple-believer-witnesses through reception of the gift of the Holy Spirit mediated by the heavenly Jesus, according to the examples and precedents afforded by Lukan characters and their ministry

force of Acts 1.8 with respect to Luke's chosen examples and precedents of Spirit-reception in his second book, still claiming in a ham-fisted, cavalry-style execution of 'apostolic age hermeneutics' that only the twelve male apostles received the Spirit as true believers so as to assist their ministry and that the promise of the Spirit to all others makes them become 'believers', not empowered witnesses, so Peter G. Bolt, 'Mission and Witness', in I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 191–14 (212). However, 'Acts 1.8 Reappropriated: Twelve Dispensational Male Apostles Go to the Remotest Part of the Earth, Rewriting the Prophetic Witness of Women, Sons and Daughters, and Other Disciple-Believers out of Joel's Prophecy', along with other prophetically truncating variants of Lukan cessationism, are unlikely to prove persuasive to the majority of future scholars, even though they conform to a palatable canon of neo-Calvinistic tastes. *On the other hand, future scholars who ask 'How do we know?' and 'Why do we believe?' should uncover the false paradigms of 'apostolic age hermeneutics', namely that Luke–Acts is devoid of pneumatological expectation for disciple-believer-witnesses regarding prayerful Spirit-reception, that a grid of narrative disconnectedness must be superimposed upon Luke–Acts in order to understand it, that reinterpretation, extraction from context, and dismissal of grid-filtered material is 'biblical', and that much of the experiential description in Luke–Acts is cognitively estranged both linguistically and conceptually from the letters of Paul.* These hidden persuaders and false paradigms are tied philosophically to a persistent sectarian interpretive method (sectarian vis-à-vis Luke and Paul) which I have attempted, however inadequately, to expose to greater scrutiny.

(including Paul) who are participating in prophetic fulfillment, appears directly connected to missionary zeal. If biblical scholars now training a further generation of missionaries and Gospel workers of all kinds will adopt interpretive methodology that can stand up to the logic of examination, contextually sensitive and culturally sensitive to biblical writers,⁸² and seek to be led by the Spirit, diligent not to hold the genuine canons of objective academic enterprise in unnecessary subservience to the great god of Tradition, they should be able to contribute evangelistically to the global missionary endeavor.

82. In this venture, I recommend serious consideration of Adele Berlin, 'A Search for a New Biblical Hermeneutics: Preliminary Observations', in Jerrold S. Cooper and Glenn M. Schwartz (eds.), *The Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-First Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), pp. 195-207.