

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE THEOLOGY

OF

ST. LUKE

by

T.J.H. PATERSON.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Divinity,  
Rhodes University, in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

## CONTENTS

Summary .....	1
Introduction .....	3
Chapter One: The Nativity Stories - Lk. 1-2..	5
Chapter Two: The Baptism, Temptation and Proclamation - Lk. 3.1-4.30.	17
Chapter Three: The Spirit and the Ministry of Jesus .....	31
Chapter Four: The Transfiguration, Ascension and Pentecost .....	41
Chapter Five: The Holy Spirit in the Ministry of the Church .....	61
Chapter Six: Conclusion .....	81
Bibliography: .....	89

SUMMARY:

The essay consists of five main chapters with an introduction and conclusion.

Introduction:

This defines the limits of the essay and explains the methodology employed.

1. The Nativity Stories - Lk. 1-2:

These chapters are examined particularly with reference to the Spirit as the agent of fulfilment of the old, and the inaugurator of the new. The main text examined is Lk. 1.35. The Spirit is shown to be also used in a skilful linking and differentiating of John the Baptist and Jesus.

2. The Baptism, Temptation and Proclamation:

Through a fairly detailed synoptic comparison, the peculiarly Lukan emphasis is brought to light. The Baptism is linked with 1.35 and the Transfiguration. Again both the Baptism and Temptation are shown to be seen in the light of the fulfilment of the Old Covenant. All the lines of fulfilment join together in the Spirit's descent on Jesus. The immediate result of this is the testing of his Messiahship, and the Proclamation in the synagogue of Nazareth. This proclamation is coupled with the Lukan rejection motif.

3. The Spirit in the Ministry of Jesus:

The Spirit is seen to be especially involved in Jesus' ministries of exorcism and healing, but also in his preaching and teaching. The position of Lk. 4.18-19 is seen to be of great importance. The main problem is the lack of specific reference to the Spirit. This is resolved in a similar fashion to the question of the Messianic Secret. The relation of the apostles to the Spirit is also discussed, since this is relevant to the ministry of the Church.

4. The Transfiguration, Ascension and Pentecost:

Firstly the relation between the Transfiguration and Ascension is examined. This points to the fundamental centrality

of the Ascension in Luke's theology. Pentecost is then seen as the fulfilling of the Ascension in the Church. Secondly, as a minor theme, the resurrection appearances are looked into, and the similarities with Johannine thought are noted. This raises the question of the historicity of the Lukan schematisation. In the examination of Pentecost itself the problem of the quotation from Joel, and also the relation of Pentecost to the founding of the Church and the Gentile mission are raised.

#### 5. The Spirit in the Ministry of the Church:

The Spirit is revealed to be active in two main areas: (1) the mission of the Church in evangelization - this is especially seen in the areas of preaching, miracles and the life of the Church; (2) the establishing and justification of the Gentile mission - this overriding concern is shown to obscure the other functions of the Spirit, especially in the realm of baptism and the Christian life of the individual. Thus Luke's historical sense is seen to be coupled with a theological desire to justify and bolster the Gentile mission.

#### 6. Conclusion:

This draws out the various conclusions within the essay. The question of 'salvation-history' is raised and a solution found in terms of Luke's use of the Spirit. In broad outline the schema of Conzelmann is accepted. The Lukan eschatology is mentioned in an attempt to find a solution to questions raised by the comparison of Luke with Paul and John. This comparison is only meant to place the main conclusions of the essay within the context of the wider New Testament.

INTRODUCTION:

The purpose of this introduction is to define the limits of this essay and to explain and justify the methodology employed.

In any essay of this nature, the main problem is to strike a balance between a mere outline of the subject, and an in-depth study of the various cross-currents involved.

Ideally this essay should be but one part of a total examination of the theology of St. Luke. In such a treatment the complex question of literary analysis and the use of sources would be a fitting starting point. All such questions have, of necessity, been excluded. Also the question of the historicity of the accounts has had to be left, although at points it may have indirect significance. The only exception to this is a necessary brief discussion of the Lukan schematization of the Resurrection, Ascension and Pentecost. The reason for avoiding these questions is quite simply one of space. Consequently results of such investigations have occasionally had to be rather uncritically accepted, or more often, not even mentioned.

The essay accepts the text of Luke and Acts as a whole and attempts to examine it in terms of Luke's theology of the Spirit. The main thesis revolves around Luke's use of the Spirit as a key to history, and attempts to examine the Spirit's role in God's dealings with man through the different stages of Luke's writing. Only such New Testament parallels which might help to illuminate Luke have been mentioned. The comparison of the Lukan, Pauline and Johannine doctrines of the Spirit has been left to the conclusion since the comparisons have only been used to

highlight the Lukan peculiarities.

Because of the limitations of this essay, it seems to raise more questions than it answers; but if it does this then at least something has been achieved.

The methodology used is that of straight progressive exegesis. A thematic treatment of the question is not employed, since this would be imposing a schema onto Luke. But this approach creates its own problems since in each section so much could be included of all the other sections. For this reason no one section can be said to be a total treatment of the topic under discussion, but it is hoped that as a whole the result may be satisfactory. It has, therefore, been necessary to include numerous cross-references within the essay.

A further reason for attacking the problem in this way is the basic difficulty the New Testament theologian is faced with, and this is that he has to extract a systematic doctrine from work that is not really concerned with his questions. It is therefore fitting that the treatment of a subject not the prime focus of Luke's attention, should at least acknowledge this in its methodology.

---

CHAPTER ONE: THE NATIVITY STORIES - LUKE 1-2

When Luke sat down to write his narrative (ἀρχή, 1.1) he must have been confronted with the same problem facing all writers, namely, where to begin. A careless first reading of Mark's gospel could give us the impression that the baptism of John, and Jesus' baptism by him are really the 'beginning' (ἀρχή) of the Gospel of Jesus Christ (Mk. 1.1). But Mark's immediate reference to the fulfilment of Mal. 3.1 and Is. 40.3 must lead us to see that, whereas this ἀρχή does recall the ἀρχή of Gen. 1.1, it is not an absolute beginning but the beginning of a new phase in God's dealings with man.<sup>1</sup> Luke and Matthew have enlarged on this, leaving the reader with no doubt as to the way in which the event of Jesus is the climax of the Old Testament. Matthew uses the devices of the refrain of 'just as it has been written through the prophet' (Mt. 2.56), and the prefixing of the Gospel with the genealogy of Jesus. Luke has a very similar stress on the fulfilment of prophecy, but his devices are rather different.

They are:

(1) the LXX style of Lk. 1-2.<sup>2</sup> Straight after the prologue one is plunged from the flowing cadences of the classical world into the circumlocutions of the Old Testament with ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις (1.5). Some have given this style and the general tenor of these chapters as a reason for neglecting them in their treatment of Lukan theology, but this is to

---

(1) For a discussion of the controversy over Luke's treatment of 'salvation-history', see passim, and the conclusion, p.87.  
(2) cf. H.J. Cadbury: Beginnings v, p.420.

miss the point altogether.<sup>3</sup> Luke uses this close juxtaposition to show the way in which the Old Testament is fulfilled in Jesus. More than this, the way in which he here raises many of his theological themes shows that he can only interpret Jesus in the light of the Old Testament. It is ironic that Marcion could have approved of Luke, although of course, only after editing. One can tentatively suggest that the modern scholars who ignore these chapters are tending to a Marcionite position.

(2) the typology of Lk. 1-2 must reveal to the reader that the whole Old Testament world is represented at the advent of its fulfilment.<sup>4</sup>

(3) contrary to Conzelmann,<sup>5</sup> there is the skilful way in which John and Jesus are linked and differentiated. (Here Luke differs radically from Matthew whose first mention of John is in 3.1. The connection between the two is not developed in Matthew, except that John is the 'voice crying in the wilderness' (3.3), as in Mark.) The relationship of the two as described in the birth narratives should be used in the exegesis of 3.19f.

(4) but above all the fulfilment theme is brought to a head by Luke by the emphasis on God's activity in the events.

This activity is represented both by angels and by the Spirit.<sup>6</sup>

---

(3) Unfortunately here one must especially criticize both Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, and Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 90 ff, and agree with P.S. Minear; Luke's Use of the Birth Stories, in L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn: Studies in Luke-Acts.

(4) It is impossible to deny that some of the typology must be from the hand of the editor/author, but it does not necessarily mean that all of the events did not actually happen, even if the tradition has moulded them, and perhaps, even altered their position in the story.

It is by God's action that the scriptures are fulfilled, and it is by signs given by God that Jesus is revealed as the Messiah.<sup>7</sup> It is here that Luke's treatment of the Holy Spirit is so revealing. A comparison with Matthew reveals that Matthew only mentions the Holy Spirit twice in the nativity stories, both times referring to the conception of Jesus by Mary (1.18, 20), whereas Luke has reference to the Spirit ten times in his nativity stories.<sup>8</sup> Later we will come to Luke's unique stress on the link between Jesus and the Spirit, but here it is fitting to notice two main sections of Luke's work where obvious reference is made to the work of the Spirit. These are: (1) the section Lk. 1-4, and (2) Acts 1-2. The one is the birth of Jesus and his endowment with the Spirit and the proclamation of his message (4.16ff.); the other is the birth of the Church, its endowment with the Spirit and its proclamation in Peter's speech.<sup>9</sup> It is to a fuller treatment of the first of these that the rest of chapters one and two are devoted.

- 
- (5) For the debate with Conzelmann at this point see Ch. 2, p.20.
  - (6) For angels see: Lk. 1.11,19,26,28,35, 2.9,15,21.  
For the Spirit see: 1.15,17,35,41,66,67,80, 2.25-6, and 2.40
  - (7) cf. 1.35 and 3.22, and Ch. 2, pp. 21f.
  - (8) cf. note 6 above.
  - (9) For the two-fold method of Luke, cf. C.H. Talbert: Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts, who points out this comparison (p. 18), although not in quite these terms since he is concerned with smaller sections of material, and therefore sees the parallel as strictly between Lk. 3.21,22 and Acts 1.14,24, 2.1-13. Talbert's book is most convincing, but it is a pity that his section on the theological themes is not nearly as impressive as that on the literary patterns.

The main theme of Lk. 1-2 is undoubtedly that of the Messiah. Jesus' earthly father is 'from the house of David' (1.27), and Jesus will be given 'the throne of David' (1.32).<sup>10</sup> The messianic importance of descent from David and of the city of David, (i.e. Jerusalem, Lk. 2.11 and 2 Km. 7.12-16) becomes one of the key points in Lukan theology.<sup>11</sup> In this regard Luke draws extensively from the theology of Isaiah, and especially on Is. 40 onwards.<sup>12</sup> Mary is clearly seen as a fulfilment of Is. 7.14.<sup>13</sup> Apart from these points, what distinguishes Jesus is the

- (10) For David see also 1.69, 2.4,11. In Matthew the only mention of David, in this regard, is in 1.1, 1.6,7 in the genealogy, and in connection with Joseph in 1.20.
- (11) Conzelmann, op.cit. part one, but especially p. 74. The whole of the gospel revolves around events in Jerusalem or points to a return to Jerusalem. Undoubtedly one of the main points of Acts is the transfer of the gospel from Jewish Jerusalem to Gentile Rome. See Ch. 5, p.72.
- (12) The following are some of the key words of Luke which come from Is. 40-42:

Lk. 2.25	προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ	:	παρακαλεῖτε	Is. 40.1
2.9,14,32	δοξα κυρίου	:	ἡ δόξα κυρίου	40.5
1.54,69	παῖς	:	παῖς	40.8, 42.1
(cf. Cullmann: <u>Christology of the New Testament</u> , pp.52-82)				
1.68, 2.38	ἀγγελοῦ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ	:	ἡ ἀγγελία τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ	41.15
Acts 2.21,38	ἐπικαλεῖται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου	:	ἐπὶ τῷ ἁέματι ἑσθὲν	42.4
Lk. 2.32, 3.6	πάντα σὰρξ	:	πάντα σὰρξ	40.5, 42.6
1.69,71,77	σωτήριον	:	σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ	40.5

These together with the theme of the Spirit and the idea of election from Is. 42.1 are just a few points of comparison.

- (13) Compare 1.27 τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαρίας and 1.31 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐσθὲν ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ ἐσθὲν υἱόν to Is. 7.14 ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν. From the comparison it is clear that the ἕσθων of Lk. 1.31 is the ἑμμανουήλ of Is. 7.14. Lk. 1.13 shows much the same formula with the compound of ἀγγελοῦ καὶ τῆς τέξεσθαι υἱόν, but here γαστρὶ is omitted.

activity of the Spirit which surrounds him at every stage of his earthly life. The first mention of Jesus and the Spirit is in Gabriel's foretelling of his conception (1.35). This is a key text and it reveals at least four important points:

(1) the agreement with Matthew about the divine conception. Despite the traces of earlier traditions which do not seem to have included this, the Spirit and Jesus are inextricably linked together. The conception of the Messiah is through the same *πνεῦμα* active in creation from the beginning (Gen. 1.1, Ps. 33.6, Prov. 8.22f),<sup>14</sup> and which has been active in the prophets and kings of Israel.<sup>15</sup>

(2) the Holy Spirit is identified with 'the power of the Most High' (*δύναμις ἁγίου πνεύματος*). This is an important link especially when we come to consider the miracles of Jesus (*δυνάμεις*).<sup>16</sup> Here the Spirit is thought of as the power which kings received at their anointing for superhuman deeds.<sup>17</sup> An

---

(14) C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, rightly points out that the conception is through the least personal of the divine hypostases and that the danger of an hieros gamos is avoided (p. 7); but his conclusion about the rôle of the Spirit in the Old Testament, that the Spirit 'appears to act creatively only in relation to the primal creation of the world and man, and in the redemption of the people of God' (p. 20) seems to be neglecting the connection of the Spirit with the king (1 Sam. 16.13) and the inspiration of the prophets by the Spirit. His conclusion that the 'genuinely biblical concept of the activity of the Spirit in the new creation was kept alive chiefly in Hellenistic rather than in Palestinian Judaism' (p. 23), seems to be a bit too sweeping in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ps. Sol. 17.42, which he mentions.

(15) For an excellent summary of the Spirit in the Old Testament, cf. G.W.H. Lampe, 'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke' Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Honour of R.H. Lightfoot, (ed) D.E. Nineham, pp. 160ff.

(16) cf. Ch. 3, p. 34.

example of a foretelling of this empowering is seen in Is.

11.2ff. A similar but rather different tradition comes into force in the fulfilment of Is. 61.1ff.<sup>18</sup>

(3) the prophecy of Gabriel that 'the Holy Spirit will overshadow (ἐπιβραβεύσει) you' must have made every Jew think of Ex. 40.35 (ἐπισκίασεν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ νεφέλη). This forms a connection between the Spirit as a sign to Christ as the cloud was to the βικυνή, which was both a localization of the 'glory of the Lord' (ἡ δόξα τοῦ κυρίου) and also of God's presence in the Torah, and points to Christ being this δόξα τοῦ κυρίου and the fulfilment and replacement of the Torah.<sup>19</sup> This interpretation of the verse becomes immediately apparent when it is compared with Lk. 9.34, where the νεφέλη obviously recalls the cloud of Ex. 40.35.<sup>20</sup>

(4) The saying concludes with a triumphant climax, 'he will be called the Son of God' (κληθήσεται υἱὸς Θεοῦ).<sup>21</sup> The διὸ καί implies that this assertion follows from the nature of the conception. From this one could conclude that Luke portrays Jesus' very existence as being dependent on the work of the Spirit, but he never goes so far as even to hint that Jesus is an embodiment of the Spirit. In the Old Testament the

---

(17) S. Mowinkel, He That Cometh, p. 56 wrote: 'The king is a divine being, possessing this superhuman quality because Yahweh has 'called' him and 'chosen him' to be the shepherd of His people, and has made him His son, has anointed him and endowed him with His spirit....He represents Yahweh before the people.' See also Ch. 2, pp.22ff.

(18) cf. Ch. 2, pp. 27ff.

(19) cf. Ch. 4, p. 56. For this as a theme in Pauline theology, cf. W.D. Davies: Paul and Rabbinic Judaism.

(20) cf. Ch. 4, pp. 41ff.

(21) For the difficulty in the rendering of this verse, cf. Creed, St. Luke, p. 20.

Son of God concept was based on election. Israel is υἱὸς  
πρωτότοκος μου (Ex. 4.22), not from a physical conception but due  
to election (Hos. 11.1).<sup>22</sup> Similarly the king is called υἱὸς  
τοῦ Θεοῦ (Ps. 2.7).<sup>23</sup> But here Luke goes beyond all these ideas  
by making God Himself instrumental in the conception. Further-  
more, in both of the passages which are pointed to in this verse  
(the baptism, Lk. 3.21f, and the transfiguration, 9.28-36) the  
activity and presence of the Spirit results in a proclamation  
and affirmation of Christ's Sonship.<sup>24</sup> Characteristically the  
Spirit's activity sums up the Old Testament, for Jesus is the  
Son of God in all of the Old Testament senses, but it also creates  
a new dimension, making the εἰς ἐμπαρογέννητός σου of Ps. 2.7  
(cf. the variant of Lk. 3.22) an actual reality and not just  
a truth of generation by adoption. Even while there is this  
new element in Jesus, it does not allow us to find the  
background of this sonship in Hellenism;<sup>25</sup> its roots are still  
firmly in Judaism.

In this verse (Lk. 1.35), Luke establishes the link between  
the Spirit and Jesus, points to the activity of the Spirit  
in proclaiming his Sonship, and shows how he is the fulfil-  
ment of what the Spirit had previously proclaimed through the  
prophets in the Old Testament.

When one turns to the rest of the nativity stories, a rather  
different picture emerges. In the prophecy of John's  
birth there is no idea of divine conception, indeed the

---

(22) cf. Cullmann: op.cit. p. 273.

(23) cf. M. Hooker: Jesus and the Servant, p. 69, who claims  
that this idea of sonship 'is due to foreign influence on  
the kingly ritual'. This opinion does not seem to be  
prevalent.

(24) cf. Ch. 2, p. 23

opposite is the case, since the γενήσει of 1.13 and the συνέλαβεν of 1.24 imply natural conception. (This is also borne out by the Old Testament typological parallels of Hannah specifically (1 Km. 1), and to a lesser extent Sarah (Gen. 17.15ff), and Minoah (Jd. 13.2ff)). None-the-less, God is highly active in his birth. The atmosphere surrounding his birth is highly charged,<sup>26</sup> and his mission, 'to turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God' (1.16), requires the power of the Holy Spirit (1.15,17). He is a prophet and like other Old Testament prophets is 'filled with the Holy Spirit' (cf. 1.15). This particular phrase typified by the conjunction of some form of πνεύματι or πνεύματι and εὐαγγελισμῶν is a feature of Luke. Here, in the nativity stories, it occurs at 1.15,41,67. All of these references are overshadowed by

---

(25) cf. Cullmann: op.cit. p. 270ff. for a discussion of possible Hellenistic backgrounds.

(26) Luke is a superb user of atmosphere in his writing. There is not nearly the same aura of tension in the Matthean nativity stories, which have a strange feeling of unreality, which may be due to the use of the vision or dream as a means of divine revelation (Mt. 1.20, 2.12,13,19,22). In Matthew the angels are even further removed from reality by appearing κατ' ὄραμα, whereas in Luke the angels just appear (ἀφ' οὐρανόθεν, 1.11). Also in Luke the characters are made more real by their reaction to the divine messengers bursting in on them, as in 1.12 where Zacharias becomes disturbed (ἐταράχθη) and fear falls on him. This φόβος hangs over the whole scene like a cloud (1.12,65,13,30,50, 2.9,10). Wherever God and man come close together this φόβος is present and it becomes a mark of the Spirit's activity. It is notable in Acts 2.43 that it is regarded as one of the features of the young Church (ἐγένετο δὲ ἰδέειν φόβον καὶ σέβαστον). It is interesting to note the use of angels and the Spirit as a 'periphrastic description of God's initiative and action in the creation' (A. Richardson: An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, p. 103). The angels are as their name suggests the divine messengers and the Spirit is the divine power which wells up within man. Nowhere in this section, (but cf. Ch. 5, pp.72f) does the Spirit speak; he inspires men to speak.

the climactic 'And Jesus being filled with the Holy Spirit returned from the Jordan' (πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, 4.1). Later this is to become a feature of Acts as the Spirit of Jesus is poured out on his Church.<sup>27</sup> The exegesis of these three references in Lk. 1 is difficult, but the key seems to lie in what follows each:

in 1.16 we find: 'and many of the sons of Israel will he turn to the Lord their God'.

1.42 .....: 'and she exclaimed with a loud cry, "Blessed are you amongst women"'.  
.....

1.67 .....: 'and he prophesied saying, "Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel"'.  
.....

In each case the filling of the Spirit is qualified by what almost amounts to a purpose clause. In the latter two cases the filling of the Spirit is for the specific purpose of pronouncing a prophetic blessing. In the first case the task is also prophetic but of a more lasting and deeper nature and is further qualified by 1.17, where πνεῦμα is again identified with δυνάμεις and the connection between John and Elijah is introduced. Furthermore, all of these cases recall the Old Testament. There seem to be two main ways of describing the activity of the Spirit in the lives of men in the Old Testament:

(1) the Spirit comes 'on' people. In Num. 11.17-31 the Spirit which God has placed on Moses, he will place on them (ἐπιθήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς). In 11.26 the Spirit rests on them

---

(27) cf. Ch. 5, pp. 73-76.

(ἐπιπνεύσατο ἐπ' αὐτούς).<sup>28</sup> Further examples of this usage are: Num. 23.6 and 24.2, both in connection with Balaam's inspiration; Jd. 3.10 and Zach. 12.10. Another similar and common usage is that with ἤλατο ἐκ' αὐτῶν, cf. Jd. 14.6,19; 1 Km. 10.6,10, 11.6. In these cases the spirit is an exterior force which seems to remain outside of the person concerned, but compels him to prophesy or to do some marvellous deed.

(2) In some texts we find a more internalized meaning. Num. 27.18 reads: Joshua 'who had spirit in him' (ἐν αὐτῷ). The same phrase is used of Joseph in Gen. 41.38, where the context reveals the influence of the wisdom tradition and the text might almost lead to an equation of πνεῦμα with σοφία. ἐν αὐτῷ is used in Num. 14.24, but the context and meaning are very different. 2 Km. 23.2 is a very interesting example: 'The Spirit of the Lord was speaking in me (ἐν ἐμοί), and his word was on my tongue'. Not only is this a fascinating connection between πνεῦμα κυρίου and ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, but the revelation could be taken to have come internally, although the ἐν ἐμοί could be interpreted instrumentally as 'by me' or 'with my help'.

Nowhere in the Old Testament do we find quite the Lukan description of being 'filled with the Spirit' although it could easily be interpreted in the Old Testament way.<sup>29</sup>

---

(28) M. Noth: Numbers, p. 89f, regards this episode as 'unhistorical' but reflecting a very early struggle between prophetic groups represented by Eldad and Mehad and the elders. This is not immediately relevant but is a cautionary note as to some conclusions which have been drawn from this passage.

(29) As H.B. Swete: The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, p. 13, points out, the closest one gets to this Lukan idea is Ex. 28.3 and 35.31, but both of these have distinct wisdom connotations and reflect a very different understanding.

What really makes one have to treat these as events of an Old Testament nature is the purpose of the 'filling'.

In addition to these references explicitly to do with the Spirit, the relationship between John and Jesus is developed in other ways. One of these is the stylized literary structure. The whole is built up of couplets. 1.5-25 and 1.26-38 being the foretelling of the births of John and Jesus respectively. Then the section 1.39-56, the Visitation of Mary to Elizabeth, links the two mothers. 1.57-80 and 2.1-20 describe the births of the two children. The two sections 2.21-40 and 41-52 close the nativity stories. By this structure Luke clearly links John and Jesus, but also lays the stress on Jesus by the last two sections. Within this structure, three related verses are of special interest. The first, 1.80, ends the section narrating the birth of John. The second, 2.40, and the third, 2.52, end the stories of Jesus being presented in the temple and his teaching in the temple. 1.80 is very close to 2.40.<sup>30</sup> In fact, the similarity has resulted in A<sup>0</sup> λ φ sy<sup>PC</sup> adding the πνεύματι of 1.80 to 2.40, which would result in a rather strange phrase together with the πληρούμενον σοφίας. The question that must be asked is whether the addition of πληρούμενον.....ἐπ' αὐτό has any significance, and is 2.40 meant to be a contrast to 1.80? This is probable, but the contrast is not between πνεῦμα and σοφία, since the πνεύματι of 1.80 probably does not have direct reference to the Holy Spirit. The addition of καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό is especially significant, but it is strange that χάρις is used in 2.52 in

---

(30) Creed, op.cit. p. 27 and 46, refers to Jd. 13.24 and 1 Km. 2.26, which is closer to 2.52.

its secular Greek meaning of 'favour' (cf. Prov. 3.3 and 1 Km. 2.26). Both references to σοφία, in 2.40 and 2.52, show the influence of wisdom traditions which again show themselves in such instances as Jk. 11.29-32.

The really characteristic thing about the Spirit with reference to the Old Testament figures in the nativity stories, is that the Spirit causes activity which points to Christ. However, the frame of reference of this activity is still within the confines of the Old Testament. On the other hand, when used in connection with Jesus, the Spirit seems to have gone beyond the confines of the Old Testament and, with the conception of the υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, points beyond this event to the baptism, Transfiguration and the dwelling of God's glory on earth, and perhaps, even to Jesus' presence in the Church after Pentecost. But to say that these two rather different operations are not really of the same Spirit would be incorrect. There is no indication in Luke of even two 'operations of the Spirit'. Such systemization belongs to a later more refined way of thinking. It is the same Spirit, but it is the event of Christ which changes the picture.

It is by using the Spirit in this way that Luke is able to draw out the continuity between the dispensation of the Old Testament and that associated with the Person of Jesus, and at the same time show that the event of Christ is a new thing in history. This theme of the uniting of the Old and the New will be one which is revealed at every stage in our examination of the working of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER TWO: THE BAPTISM, TEMPTATION AND PROCLAMATION - LUKE 3.1 - 4.30

Having shown how the Spirit is operative in Lk. 1-2 and the way in which John and Jesus are at the same time linked and differentiated, we now move on to do the same for the actual preaching of John, the baptism of Jesus and the beginning of his ministry.

The question whether Mark had access to a birth narrative tradition is unanswerable and any deductions from its absence are dubious, but, none-the-less, in comparing Mark and Luke the striking difference in their presentations of John the Baptist is that, in Luke, he is not a complete stranger when he starts preaching in the desert. To analyse Luke's presentation of John, a quick survey of the three different traditions is given:

(1) In Mark John is quite definitely the Elijah-type prophetic forerunner (1.6, 4 Km. 1.8). He prepares the way for the Messiah by a call to repentance and a baptism for the forgiveness of sins (1.4).<sup>1</sup> His message revolves around ὁ ἰσχυρότερός (cf. Ps. Sol. 17.44), and moves to a climax in the prophecy of the baptism 'in the Holy Spirit' (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, 1.8), which is immediately followed by Jesus' baptism. There is a clear connection between the πνεύμα ἁγίου of 1.8 and the πνεύμα of 1.10.

---

(1) J. Dunn's attempt (Baptism in the Holy Spirit, p. 17) to limit the phrase ὡς ἔφεσεν ἁμαρτιῶν to the μετάνοια and to maintain that it is not really connected with the βαπτισμα is special pleading. As Jeremias hints (The Theology of the New Testament, Vol 1, p. 44f.) it is possible to argue that this purpose of John's baptism is a Christian interpretation, since elsewhere ἡ ἄφεσις is solely connected with Jesus,

(2) Although Q probably contained much, if not all of Mark at this point it is very difficult to define what came from Q and what from Mark in the sections where Mk and Q overlap in Luke.<sup>2</sup> For this reason it is advisable to start from those parts of Q which are not in Mark.<sup>3</sup> Here one finds John as an eschatological prophet foretelling the day of the Lord and the coming judgement and wrath.<sup>4</sup> The main image is that of fire,<sup>5</sup> and the axe and the threshing floor are also used. John is here not just a forerunner but the preparer of a remnant, and he has to prepare it for the coming wrath, which will come in the person of the Messiah. His is not a message of total doom, for all his images are really those of refining.<sup>6</sup> It is thus possible that the prophecy of baptism 'in the Holy Spirit and fire' (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ὕδατι, 3.16) is to be taken in this way.<sup>7</sup> Since the problem of this essay

- 
- (1) (cont.) except in the case of Lk. 3.3, which might have a similar interpretation; cf. Lk. 1.77, 5.24, 24.47; Acts 2.38, 5.31, 10.43; Mt. 26.28. It is interesting that Matthew omits the phrase, including the less difficult ἐβαπτίζοντο ... ἔξομολογούμενοι εἰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, Mt. 3.6 (Mk. 1.5)
  - (2) Lk. 3.3-4, 16b, 21b-22, 4.1-2, 14a, 16a, 24.
  - (3) Lk. 3.7-9, 16-17, 4.3-13.
  - (4) cf. Zeph. 1.15, 2.2; Mal. 3.2; Is. 13.9, 30.27.
  - (5) Lk. 3.9, 16, 17 and cf. Is. 66.24.
  - (6) cf. Dunn, op.cit. p. 9
  - (7) Dunn concludes that this is so since the Spirit assumes this kind of rôle in Qumran (I QS 3.7-9, 4.21; I QH 16.12) and in Is. 4.4 and 30.28, but it is destructive in Is. 11.15. Jeremias agrees with Dunn about the Spirit in this rôle (op.cit. p. 81). In this way Dunn can disagree with Manson and others (cf. Manson: Sayings of Jesus, p. 40f, and also Barrett, op.cit. p. 125f) that the original omitted reference to the Holy Spirit. Manson bases his argument on the nature of Q and the ignorance of John's disciples in Acts 19.1-6. As Jeremias (op.cit. p.82) correctly observes this ignorance is not necessarily of the Spirit in toto but only of its arrival.

is not what John actually said but the way in which Luke presents him, the question of the historicity of this saying is only indirectly relevant. In Lukan theology the problem is really one of the fulfilment of this prophecy.<sup>8</sup>

(3) In the material peculiar to Luke,<sup>9</sup> Luke imposes his typical outlook on John. 3.5f gives his message a universal content, which is altogether foreign to the other traditions (esp. *πᾶσα ἕρξ*). This same impression is given by 3.10-14, where John is questioned by *τελιῶναι* and *στρατιώμενοι*. This could be taken as Luke deliberately trying to involve Gentile readers (or those beyond the pale) in the narrative.<sup>10</sup> 3.15 has distinctive Johannine connotations (Jn. 1.20) and probably serves the twin purpose of revealing the expectancy of the crowd and showing quite clearly that John was not the Christ. Lk. 3.18 has caused problems since *εὐαγγελίζομαι* in Luke (besides 1.19 and 2.10) is used exclusively of the preaching of the gospel.<sup>11</sup> But Conzelmann is probably correct in maintaining that here the verb is used in a non-technical sense.<sup>12</sup> But together with *εὐαγγελίζων*, with its connotations of Is. 40.1, it none-the-less tends to place John's preaching in the sphere of Good News, while, at the same time, his preaching may not be associated with the Kingdom of God in the way Jesus' preaching

---

(8) cf. Ch. 4, p. 54.

(9) Lk. 3.5-6, 10-14, 15, 23-38, and most of Lk. 4.14-30.

(10) A further distinctive touch is added by the *τι εἰς ἠμεῖς ἠσπύσωμεν*, which reminds one of Acts 2.37. A parallel may be intended with Peter's answer of salvation through repentance and baptism in the Name of Jesus being compared to this 'interim ethic'. The form of the saying does show development and probably indicates Lukan authorship.

(11) eg. in Lk. 4.43, where it has the object *βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

(12) Conzelmann, op.cit. p. 23, n. 1.

couples it with his own person. (cf. Mt. 3.2.)

Conzelmann uses Lk. 16.16<sup>13</sup> as a key in his interpretation of Luke's gospel. He is probably right that in this case *μέχρι* is used inclusively, thus placing John outside of the kingdom, but the reasons for this are not linguistic, as he presumes, but the content of Lk. 7.28 and Acts 10.37.<sup>14</sup> There also is the Lukan placing of John's arrest prior to the baptism and the removal of references to John in the actual baptism (3.19-20). It is true that Luke has a tendency to tidy up his stories,<sup>15</sup> but the intention is quite clear in the omissions of reference to John in the baptism story. Luke did wish to distinguish between John and Jesus.

To sum up: on the one hand Jesus and John are connected by their related births, by John's function as a forerunner and by his preaching (*ἐγγύχλιζον*, 3.18); on the other hand they are separated by the divine conception, by the judgemental Old Testament style of John's prophecy and by the baptism of Jesus and 3.19-20. Further they are separated by the ministry of Jesus and his preparation for this in the desert.<sup>16</sup> In Jesus, the New has broken in and the Kingdom of God has come near. In one sense John's prophetic message heralds the end of the prophetic drought,<sup>17</sup> but this is only a foretaste of the

---

(13) *ibid.* p. 21f.

(14) Jeremias, *op.cit.* p.47.

(15) cf. Caird: St. Luke, p. 75

(16) An interesting suggestion made by Lampe (*op.cit.* p. 167) is that Luke sees John's ministry as a link between Jesus' conception and his baptism, i.e. between two major acts of the Spirit. He likens this bridge to the Resurrection narratives being a bridge between the Passion and Pentecost.

(17) cf. Ps. 74.9; Zech. 13.4; I Macc. 4.46.

bestowal of the Spirit on Jesus. It is really Jesus who is the eschatological prophet,<sup>18</sup> and it is this bestowal of the Spirit which is a necessary preliminary for the general fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies which foretold a general outpouring of the Spirit to inaugurate the age of the End, and which occurs at Pentecost.<sup>19</sup>

The Lukan version of the baptism has several interesting features. As Creed notes, the 'conjunction of the genitive absolute (describing Jesus' actual baptism) and the preceding clause is very awkward'.<sup>20</sup> The result is to move the emphasis from the baptism to the 'opening of heaven' and the descent of the Holy Spirit. The use of the aorist and then of a present participle almost certainly indicates that the baptism occurred before the descent of the Spirit, but it may just be to emphasize that the heavens opened while he was praying.<sup>21</sup> This 'opening of heaven'<sup>22</sup> has obvious apocalyptic connotations and symbolises the breaking of the barrier between the human and the Divine. The rending of the temple curtain makes a similar point (Lk. 23.45).<sup>23</sup> This opening of the heavens and the bestowal of the Spirit is, in a way, a pre-figuration of the final breaking of the barrier between God and man in the death of Christ and the general outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost.

---

(18) Jeremias, op.cit. pp. 76-80.

(19) cf. Ez. 37.14, 39.29, 47.3 and Is. 32.15ff.

(20) Creed, op.cit. p. 57.

(21) The emphasis in Luke on Jesus praying is well known, cf. Lk. 5.16, 6.12, 9.18, 28f, 11.1, etc.

(22) cf. Acts 7.56, 10.11, and Dunn, op.cit. p. 26.

(23) In Lk. 23.45 the same verb is used as in the Markan version of the baptism (1.10).

There is a shift of emphasis between Mark and the other synoptics in that Mark implies that the whole affair was subjective to Jesus (ἐίδεν and the voice is addressed to Jesus, ὅς ἐστι ὁ υἱὸς μου).<sup>24</sup> But in Matthew the heavens open (cf. καὶ ἰδοὺ which is repeated) and the ἐίδεν only refers to the descent of the Spirit. In Luke the objectivizing reaches its climax in the descent of the Spirit ἐωμωκεν καὶ ἐίδεν. The episode assumes the nature of a public proclamation. In Matthew the proclamation is made public by the third person of the voice (αὐτοῦ ἐλάλει ὁ υἱὸς μου).<sup>25</sup> In both Luke and Matthew the Spirit descends 'on' Jesus (ἐπ' αὐτόν), rather than 'to him' (εἰς αὐτόν) in Mark. Taylor almost goes so far as to use this to describe Mark as seeing Jesus constrained by an external power and not an internal impulse.<sup>26</sup> This seems to be going too far since a rigid distinction between ἐπὶ and εἰς cannot be made. In Luke this descent ἐπ' αὐτόν is not just a fleeting thing.<sup>27</sup>

---

(24) cf. Taylor: St. Mark, p. 160.

(25) For a discussion on the dove imagery cf. L. Keck, 'The Spirit and the Dove', NTS, XVII (1970), pp. 41-67. He concludes that no suitable evidence has ever been produced to link the Spirit and the Dove, and that the phrase should really be adverbial and 'one should understand it in a general way as a folk-comparison between the gentle flight of a dove and the way in which the Spirit came to Jesus' (p. 66f). The difficulty in this view is seen by his next remark that 'the early tradition here is not interested in portraying Jesus as one who was seized by the Spirit' (p. 67). It is very difficult to accept this even in Mark where immediately subsequent to the baptism τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐπέσχετο εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. The best solution seems to be to admit ignorance and to avoid fanciful speculation.

(26) Taylor, op.cit. p. 160

(27) It is possible that the ἐπὶ is preferred to εἰς because of Is. 61.1, πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ and also cf. Is. 42.1.

From this moment on Jesus is  $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\gamma\varsigma \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \xi\theta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$  (4.1). It is then, after the descent of the Spirit, that the voice proclaims Jesus' Sonship. (Dunn may well be correct in questioning this as an instance of the bath qol since this was associated with the period when the prophetic spirit had been quenched.<sup>28</sup>) The debate over the original wording of 3.22 leaves us with no conclusive answer, but what is important is the connection made between the Spirit and sonship.<sup>29</sup> Also, whatever one concludes about the original of 3.22, the interpretation offered by the identification of the Servant and Israel is important (cf. Is. 42.1). It is this which gives a possible clue to interpret the connection between John's baptism and Jesus' reception of the Spirit. John's baptism was for the formation of the eschatological community - the faithful remnant (which is a similar concept to the Servant of Isaiah<sup>30</sup>). It is in this way that Jesus is Israel and the prophecies of the outpouring of the Spirit on Israel become fulfilled in him (cf. Is. 61.1).

---

(28) Dunn, op.cit. p. 27.

(29) The important question here is whether one agrees with Jeremias (op.cit. p. 53ff.) that Ps. 2.7 is not referred to, and that this is an Hellenistic adaptation of variants of Is. 42.1, or with M. Hooker (Jesus and the Servant, p. 68-73) that the reference is not from Isaiah at all. Both arguments are a little shaky: Jeremias in that he does not sufficiently explain the change of  $\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma$  to  $\xi\theta\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$  and does not deal with the addition of  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  at all; Hooker in that she allows her argument to be swayed by her central thesis in refusing to allow the servant songs to be part of the very early tradition and to refer to Jesus as the 'true Israel'. The conclusion of Cullmann's (op.cit. p. 66) seems sound in finding the quote to be a version of Is. 42.1 with a possible reference to Ps. 2.7.

(30) The connection is through the concept of 'corporate personality'; cf. M. Hooker, op.cit. p. 43ff.

Luke seems almost to defer the real inauguration of the 'time of salvation' to the proclamation at Nazareth, placing the temptation story in sharp relief to the designation of sonship and the bestowal of the Spirit, and to Jesus' actual commencement of his ministry. A similar point is made by all three synoptics. In Mark, the Spirit is the background of the 'testing' (ἡπειράζομαι, 1.13), and the result of the bestowal of the Spirit and testing is the note of climactic fulfilment in 1.15: ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγγικαὶ ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. Matthew has slightly lost the dramatic nature of Mark by making John preach the same thing (Mt. 3.2) and by omitting the eschatological καιρὸς. A similar loss occurs in Luke where 4.14b-5 marks time for the climax in 4.18-19b.<sup>31</sup> This announcement, however, is Luke's way of saying ἡμεῖς ἠγγικαὶ ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς (cf. ἡμεῖς ἠγγικαὶ ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς in 4.21).

In Matthew and Luke, the Q version of the temptations could also be taken as reducing the eschatological nature of Mark where the 'wilderness' (ἐρημος, 1.13) is probably to be regarded as the 'home of evil powers'.<sup>32</sup> The 'wild beasts' are probably to serve a twofold purpose: on the one hand they emphasize the desolateness of the desert and the force of Satan,<sup>33</sup> but also, on the other hand, they are used as a Messianic sign following Is. 11.6-9. As Jeremias says: 'Paradise is restored, the time of salvation is

---

(31) Similarly with the theological comment of Luke in placing his genealogy after the baptism. As has been pointed out the Adam christology here expressed is a feature of Luke, who presents Jesus as the true man, in a universal sense, as well as the true Israel, cf. Creed, op.cit. p. 59.

(32) Taylor, op.cit. p. 163 and Jeremias, op.cit. p. 69

(33) This is summarily dismissed by Jeremias, ibid.

dawning'.<sup>34</sup>

Luke, characteristically, changes Mark's εὐθύς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτὸν ἐκρέαλλεν to πάλιν πνεύματος, which is reinforced by ἦγεντο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι. This change introduces a new element into the temptations, in that now the assault on Jesus' sonship can be seen as being defended and repulsed by the Spirit, not only by the Spirit operative through scripture, but internally in Jesus. The struggle is almost a direct conflict between the Spirit of God and that of the devil. There may be a parallel between Israel's sojourn in the desert after the crossing of the Red Sea and its entrance into the Promised Land, and Jesus' temptation, his baptism and the beginning of his ministry. As a Midrash on Dt. 6-8,<sup>35</sup> Jesus' victory over the devil realizes the promises of blessedness in the inheriting of the promised land of the New Covenant, ie. the Kingdom of God. In yet another way Jesus is the true Israel.

This testing (rather than tempting<sup>36</sup>) had been one of the features of the wisdom tradition (cf. Sir. 2.1ff), and in Qumran testing or sactification was one of the main features of the Spirit.<sup>37</sup> As Dunn points out there is an inner dynamic between the obedience (and thereby testing) of a

---

(34) *ibid.*

(35) cf. Manson, *op.cit.* p.43f.

(36) cf. C.K. Barrett, *op.cit.* p. 51.

(37) cf. n. 7 above.

son and the empowering of the Spirit: 'It is not surprising then that in the account of Jesus' temptations in the wilderness....., the two temptations which are explicitly aimed at his consciousness of sonship....are temptations to prove his sonship by means of miraculous power'.<sup>38</sup>

Traditionally much emphasis has been placed on the voice addressing Jesus at 3.22 combining the concepts of the Messiah and the Suffering Servant and explaining the temptations as a period when Jesus agonized in working out this new and difficult idea of Messiahship.<sup>39</sup> But however one exegetes 3.22, for Luke it is the Spirit which leads Jesus to his understanding of the suffering servant, and to the theology of Deutero-Isaiah. The Spirit's guiding power in Jesus leads him to the true way of obedience: not to the traditional interpretation of scripture, but to God's voice in it. Jeremias seems to be correct in stating that 'all three variants of the story (that is all three temptations) are concerned with one and the same temptation: the emergence of Jesus as a political Messiah'.<sup>40</sup> We add that it is the Spirit which leads Jesus to reject this temptation and to move to new truth which the Spirit had already expressed through prophecy in Deutero-Isaiah.

---

(38) Dunn: Jesus and the Spirit, p. 66.

(39) cf. C.K. Barrett, op.cit. p. 47.

(40) Jeremias, op.cit. p.71.

Even within Luke one can discern a change from the plainly political nature of the expectation in the birth narratives expressed in the Benedictus (1.68-79),<sup>41</sup> to the content of 4.18f, where Jesus clearly does not see himself as the 'horn of salvation' (1.69), but as he who announces forgiveness, sight and above all the 'acceptable year of the Lord'. The point of change is the baptism of Jesus. It is here that John and Jesus part company. In the last mention of contact between John and Jesus (7.18-23), the question of the fulfilment of Is. 61.1 and the Jewish expectation is raised quite explicitly and the answer to the question

ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is the miracles of Is. 61.1. Moreover, the answer of Jesus admits that this is no easy answer, for it contains the stumbling block (σκανδαλισθῆναι, 7.23, cf. 1 Cor. 1.23 and Gal. 5.11). This stumbling block is the new thing in Jesus' fulfilment of the past, and just as the Spirit is the agent of fulfilment, it is Jesus πᾶρτης πνεύματος who contains what is new.

The proclamation at Nazareth is a fulcrum in the gospel. It is the climax of the gospel to this point and it is the blueprint for the rest of the gospel.<sup>42</sup> The rest of the gospel narrates Jesus' fulfilling of his commissioning, and every action in his mission is in the power of the Spirit which is upon him.

In the actual quotation of Is. 61.1, several points deserve mention.<sup>43</sup> The Spirit is linked with anointing. This

---

(41) It seems to be almost definite that the Benedictus is inappropriate in its present setting and could perhaps fit better as the prophecy of Anna, being inserted after 2.38, cf. Leaney, op.cit. p. 24f.

provides a connection with the newly adapted concept of the Davidic king.<sup>44</sup> The purpose of the Spirit and the anointing is to 'preach' (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι) the good news. The message of Jesus is good news of total redemption through the power of the Spirit. It embraces healing of bodies (τυφλοῦς ἀνάβλεψεν)<sup>45</sup> and spiritual release and renewal (ἀιχμαλώτους ἀφέναι). The message of liberation is summed up in vs. 19 as the acceptable year of the Lord (κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν). This must refer to the year of Jubilee and here must take on an eschatological meaning. It is clear, if not from the Lukan text itself, then from the Markan verse of which this is an expansion (Mk. 1.15), that this is a description of the kingdom of God, and that Luke is clearly stating that the time of salvation has begun.<sup>46</sup> But more than this, the

- 
- (42) Peter's speech after Pentecost fulfills a similar function in Acts.
- (43) The Lukan quotation is not precisely that of the LXX. The omission of ἰδοὺ ἐπεμύνη τοὺς συνταξιμμένους τῆν καρδίαν and the change of καλεῖσαι to κηρύξαι are not important, but the omission of καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀναποδύσεως reflects Luke's awareness of the message of Jesus being good news.
- (44) cf. Acts 1.6 for how late the Jewish idea of the Davidic king lingered on, even amongst the disciples.
- (45) It is a mistake to spiritualize the meaning of this phrase as referring, then, only to spiritual insight, for this leaves the whole message of Jesus missing an essential part.
- (46) Lk. 4.22 indicates that the hearers of the speech were themselves not unaware of the implications of this event, for 'they were amazed at his words of grace'. Here the use of χάρις seems to be a bit stronger than the meaning given by Creed (op.cit. p. 67), but it is still not quite as developed as the Pauline usage or even that of Lk. 4.32 and Acts 20.24.

salvation is focused in the Person of Jesus. This is clear from vs. 20b: 'The eyes of all in the synagogue were gazing at him',<sup>47</sup> and by vs. 21.<sup>48</sup>

It has been noted that it is part of Luke's intention to place this proclamation at this point, and it is also part of his intention to couple this with the rejection of Jesus (4.28ff). This rejection is one of the main themes of Acts.<sup>49</sup> It starts off with the almost amused question which could be paraphrased: who do you think you are? (οὐχὶ οὐδὲν ἔγωγε Ἰωσήφ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ, 4.22). Jesus' answer really speaks of his exalted position. He is more than a rejected prophet (4.24).<sup>50</sup> He proclaims the 'acceptable year' (4.19), but is not acceptable (δουλεύς) himself. The references to Elijah and Elisha both imply that he is at least on equal terms with them and also that his hearers are as sinful as Israel in their time. As Leaney has pointed out,<sup>51</sup> the attempt to kill Jesus may be a deliberate parallel to the temptation of 4.9. But Jesus' escape reminds the reader that this is no ordinary man. He must fulfil his destiny;

---

(47) The use of ἀκούω in Luke is interesting and is definitely used only on occasions of great import, cf. Lk. 22.56, Acts 1.10, 3.4 (not quite as powerfully in 3.12), 6.15, 7.55, 10.4, 11.6. The connection between ἀκούω and the Holy Spirit is explicit in Acts 13.9 (cf. also 14.9 and 23.1).

(48) The close connection between seeing the Person of Jesus and hearing his message may be a skilful statement of the necessary connection between the Person of Jesus and his teaching.

(49) This is supremely shown in the movement from Jerusalem to Rome, and Paul's movement from the Jews to the Gentiles.

(50) cf. Lk. 7.16.

(51) A.R.C. Leaney: St. Luke, p. 120.

the guiding hand of the Lord is upon him.<sup>52</sup> He is the one who has the Spirit of the Lord upon him; he is the Lord's anointed.

---

(52) This is very similar to the theme of the 'hour' in John, which starts at Jn. 2.4, *ὁ ἥρα ἡμερῆς ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα*, and esp. Jn. 8.59, where the variant of *ἡ ὥρα* etc. is very close to Lk. 4.30.

CHAPTER THREE: THE SPIRIT AND THE MINISTRY OF JESUS.

In the previous chapter the main focus of interest was the rôle of the Spirit in the inauguration of the new age, that of Jesus. It was seen how Luke stresses the reception of the Spirit by the πλήρης πνεύματος of 4.1 and the similar 4.14. We must now examine how the δύναμις τοῦ πνεύματος is operative in Jesus' ministry. It was also seen that it is fairly certain that Luke has purposefully placed the quotation of Is. 61.1 in its present position linking the πνεῦμα κυρίου (4.18) with a policy statement of his mission. We must, therefore, also explore how the Spirit is operative in the fulfilling of this prophecy.

In Mark, Jesus goes immediately after the temptations into Galilee and starts preaching (1.14-15). This summary of Jesus' preaching is almost hurriedly followed by the calling of the disciples. This whole sequence has been expanded in Luke, both by an example of Jesus' proclamation of his mission, and by deferring the choosing of the first disciples (5.1-11) until after two miracle stories (4.31-37, 38-41) and a summary of the preaching (4.42-44). This first section of the ministry closes with the choosing of the twelve (6.17-49). This section can easily fall into three subdivisions each of a different nature. 4.31-44 could be grouped with the preceding sermon and rejection. 5.1-11 could be grouped with the other two miracle stories (5.12-16, 17-26). The call of Levi marks the beginning of the second part, introducing the conflict with the Pharisees. The two pericopes (6.1-5, 6-11) subsequent to the controversy over fasting (5.33-39) both follow on the same theme. The choosing of the twelve is then followed by the teaching

section.

In this whole section with its three subdivisions it may be possible to find most of Luke's distinctive stresses, remembering always that the whole falls under the umbrella of 4.18.

One of the first things to note is that 4.31-37 begins with a reference to teaching (καὶ ἦν διδάσκων, 4.31).<sup>1</sup> It thus forms a couplet with the preceding preaching. Throughout there is a

very close connection between preaching and teaching. Here 4.31 refers to teaching and the chapter ends with reference to preaching (4.43f.). The result of the teaching is that

'they were amazed' (ἐξεπλήρουντο) at it. The reason for this is the authority with which Jesus spoke.<sup>2</sup> But it is almost

as an example of this teaching that we are offered the story of an exorcism. This strangeness is taken up in Mk. 1.27

where teaching is again linked with authority (ἐκταξή καινή καὶ ἰσχυρία). Luke also changes this to εἰς ὃ λόγος αὐτοῦ, moving the ἰσχυρία into Mark's next phrase. The exorcism is a clear

example of the authority of Jesus which his hearers also felt to be expressed in his teaching. This authority is closely

linked with 'power',<sup>3</sup> which has already been seen to be connected with the Spirit (Lk. 1.35). It is fitting that the

Holy Spirit should be operative in Jesus' victory over the 'unclean demons'. It is thus through the ἰσχυρία and the

δύναμις of Jesus, and through the very nature of the spirits

(1) This teaching in the synagogues on the sabbath was also distinctive of Paul's ministry.

(2) Here Luke appears to have changed Mark to ἐν ἰσχυρίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. This may well be a prelude to the stress on the λόγος in Acts (cf. Ch. 5, p.64 and Leaney, op.cit. p. 120).

(3) The distinction between the two terms (ἰσχυρία and δύναμις) is not clear (cf. also 9.1, 10.19 and Barrett, op.cit. p.78f).

that we see the Spirit at work in Jesus.<sup>4</sup> This work is further revealed by the *θαύματος φόβος* which is a mark of the Spirit in the nativity stories as well as in Acts.<sup>5</sup>

The distinctive feature of the exorcisms is their christological significance.<sup>6</sup> Here the evil demon acknowledges Jesus as the 'Holy One of God' (4.34, 41).<sup>7</sup> It is this acclamation by the evil powers which seems to be the starting point of the 'messianic secret'. This may be a rather indirect way in which the Spirit bears witness to Jesus. This witness is similar to that of the baptism (3.22) and the transfiguration (9.35). The same suppression of a similar profession occurs in Peter's confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mk. 8.30), although this is partially obscured by Luke.<sup>8</sup>

The question of Jesus' authority comes to a head in the dispute over the authority of his exorcisms (11.14-23). Although *ἔξουσία* is not specifically mentioned it is clearly implied. In 4.36 Jesus commands *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει*; in 11.20 we find 'I cast out demons *ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ*'. A very similar question is put to Jesus in 20.2. Here Jesus' answer may, on the one hand seem to be an evasion, and on the other, he could be claiming his authority to be derived from John's baptism. The sonship of Jesus and his authority are especially linked in John's gospel (5.27, 10.18, 17.2). Undoubtedly the idea of anointing

---

(4) cf. 5.17 καὶ δύνανται κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰαθεῖν αὐτῶν  
6.19 οὗτοι δύνανται παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξέρχεται καὶ ἰαθεῖν πάντας  
and also 8.46.

(5) cf. Ch. 1, p.12 n.26, and Ch. 5, p.67.

(6) Barrett, op.cit. p. 57.

(7) cf. Peter's acclamation in Jn. 6.69 and also Acts 3.14.

(8) cf. Ch. 4, pp. 42f.

which is coupled with the cluster of concepts focused on the baptism, is connected with the conferring of authority on the king.<sup>9</sup> In the case of 11.20 the Matthean version clearly links the Spirit with the power of exorcism and thereby to Jesus' *ἡγεμονία*. The Lukan account presents difficulties, since one would naturally think that Luke would not have missed an opportunity to include a reference to the Spirit. The question remains undecided as to the history of this saying.<sup>10</sup> Whatever the case, it seems clear that one of the areas of activity of the Spirit is in Jesus' ministry of exorcism.

As has already been mentioned, the healing miracles are also connected through *ἰσχύς* to the work of the Spirit. The work of healing is also connected with the preaching of the kingdom.<sup>11</sup> The healings (and the exorcisms, 11.20) are marks of the presence of the kingdom of God, that is of God's rule over all evil powers, which oppress men. Thus, just as it was the descent of the Spirit on Jesus which marked the inauguration of the new age, so it is the activity of the Spirit through Jesus which marks the presence of the kingdom in his works. In coupling 4.43 with the preceding miracles, Luke is stressing that the manifestation of the kingdom is through both preaching and the miracles of exorcism and healing. In this regard the prelude to the sermon on the

---

(9) Jeremias seems to have slightly over-emphasised the importance of Jesus' baptism by John (op.cit. p. 59), cf. Dunn: Jesus and the Spirit, p. 64.

(10) cf. *ibid.* p. 44ff. Lampe (op.cit. p.172) thinks it possible that Luke is using this as an allusion to Ex. 8.19 to strengthen his Moses typology. Nineham, however, (op.cit. p.44) thinks that this may be part of Luke's elaborate parallel with Deut. and, therefore, may refer to Dt. 9.10.

(11) 8.1-2, 9.2, 9.11, 10.9.

plain is interesting (6.17-19). Here people come to be healed, but Jesus uses the opportunity to teach, thus showing that he has come to heal on a much deeper level than just the physical. The nature of Jesus' teaching is also such that it can only be obeyed within the kingdom; it is clearly the basis for the life of the community around Jesus, the true eschatological community.

This brings us to the connection between the apostles and the Spirit. There does not seem to be any connection between the calling of the first disciples and of Levi with the Spirit, but before formally choosing the twelve Jesus goes 'to a mountain to pray' (6.12). The connection between prayer and the Spirit has already been mentioned in connection with 3.21.<sup>12</sup> The placing of the choosing of the disciples and the teaching section so close together must be of significance, showing how the eschatological community is to live. The first beatitude in both Luke and Matthew actually mentions the kingdom of God.

Later these same apostles are given 'power and authority over all demons and to heal sicknesses and he sent them to proclaim the kingdom and to heal the sick' (9.1f.). The disciples are given exactly those marks of the Spirit which Jesus has. They are to fulfil the same mission as Jesus. In this instance the return of the disciples from their mission is merely reported. In the case of the mission of the seventy (two) (10.1-12) there is no reference to the giving of power or authority, but otherwise the same features occur. The

---

(12) cf. Ch. 2, p. 21, n. 21.

reference to the kingdom is made more explicit by the repeated ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ (10.9-11).<sup>13</sup> On the return from this mission, however, they report μετὰ χαρᾶς that 'the demons are subject to your name' (10.17).<sup>14</sup> Jesus then exclaims that 'he was seeing Satan falling as lightening from heaven' (10.18). Clearly something of tremendous importance is signified by this. Vs. 19 marks this section as of a similar apocalyptic nature as the longer ending of Mark. Bultmann thought that vss. 18 and 19 were not originally connected,<sup>15</sup> but his attempts at explaining this passage bring us no closer to a satisfactory solution. The treatment by Conzelmann is likewise unsatisfactory.<sup>16</sup> He sees the logion's conclusion as a denial that this fall of Satan is the end of the struggle. This may be so, but it still does not explain 10.18 in the context of the mission of the seventy.

One very interesting feature of both missions is that neither of the reports give any details of the missions; their results are skimmed over. The reason for this is probably that in the evangelists' eyes the events of the missions are completely overshadowed by the events of Jesus, and while Jesus' ministry was continuing there is no place for narrating the events of the apostles' ministry. The presence of Acts makes these missions of more importance in Luke since they are to be seen as prefigurements of the ministry of the Church. The

---

(13) The problem of the mission of the seventy remains unsolved, but it is probably to be seen as dependent on the seventy elders of Num. 11.4-32, who received the Spirit of the Lord through Moses (cf. Leaney, op.cit. p. 176). If this is so we have another indirect reference to the Spirit.

(14) For the power of the name of Jesus in Acts, cf. Ch.5, pp.67f.

(15) R. Bultmann: The History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 158.

(16) Conzelmann, op.cit. p. 107.

description of the ministry is right and proper in the context of Acts, but not in that of the gospel. The rôle of the Spirit in this is interesting. Although the disciples are given *δύναμις καὶ ἐξουσία* for their mission, this is not described as the giving of the Spirit until Pentecost. The apostles are designated as Jesus' representatives - as apostles - in the fullest sense in 10.16. However, this saying is probably only to be taken to be fully fulfilled in Pentecost. During the ministry of Jesus, the Spirit-possession of the apostles is clearly different to that of Jesus. Despite the missions, the activity of the Spirit is portrayed as being limited to the person of Jesus. In Acts this is also true, but the person of Jesus is made present to all believers through the Spirit.

In the section Lk. 7.18-35, Jesus is questioned as to whether he is the one who is to come or 'should we await another?' (7.20). In answer to this question he replies in terms of Is. 35.5, which is similar to 61.1, thus verifying that the miracles of healing are signs of the fulfilment of the messianic time. This fulfilment is brought to focus in the consciousness sayings 'the kingdom of God has come/come near' (*ἤγγικεν*). This is a problem which falls beyond the scope of this study, but certain solutions must be mentioned since the whole question has a special bearing on how one is to interpret the Spirit's activity at Pentecost.

Almost traditionally the debate centres around the meaning of *ἤγγικεν* and *ἐφθάσεν* and the even more problematic *ἔρχεται*.<sup>17</sup> The debate about whether the New Testament writers maintain a

---

(17) cf. esp. Kümmel: Promise and Fulfilment.

distinction between ἤδη ἰκένον and ἐφ' ἄρχεται seems to be inconclusive on the linguistic grounds.<sup>18</sup> But in the end the linguistic arguments seem to be of little importance, since the whole question of the nature of the kingdom of God is determined by the total framework of New Testament thought. Never (even in Luke) is the thought of a final consummation abandoned. All attempts to avoid these references do violence to the text. But at the same time, the presence of the kingdom in some form cannot be denied. The modern consensus in scholarship seems to be that the kingdom, both in the gospels and in Acts, has a dual nature. At one level it has come in Jesus, and at another it is still to come.<sup>19</sup> This 'raises immediately the question of how we are to understand this tension in the teaching of Jesus'.<sup>20</sup> One alternative is that of Conzelmann, who maintains that Luke has made the kingdom into a kind of metaphysical entity especially by de-historicizing the End.<sup>21</sup> He then sees the kingdom which is present as 'the image' of the real kingdom, which will only be realized at the End. This solution seems to be unsatisfactory in that Luke never thinks in terms of this kind of platonic dualism, which must lead to a form of docetism, which will in the end spill over into the person of Christ. The answer to the problem is surely in the blatant juxtaposition of the two truths, that the kingdom has come, and is yet still to come. Conzelmann is correct that Luke uses the Spirit to explain

---

(18) *ibid.* p. 23ff. finds grounds for a slight difference in meaning.

(19) cf. N. Perrin: The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, p. 159.

(20) *ibid.*

(21) Conzelmann, *op.cit.* p. 113.

this difficulty, although Luke may not have been the first to do so.<sup>22</sup> It may well be that Luke's use of the Spirit is to mark the presence of the kingdom and the manner of its presence. In Jesus' ministry the kingdom is manifested through and in Jesus. This is represented by the Spirit at his baptism (cf. Is. 61.1). In Acts the kingdom is manifested through the disciples. This is subsequent to Pentecost. But one is still left with the awkward question of this present kingdom's relationship with the future kingdom. This problem may rest on a slight misunderstanding. If the kingdom of God is no other than his rule,<sup>23</sup> then the tension is not nearly so acute, since the Spirit marks God's rule. If this is so, the main tension becomes the tension of mission and is not of a metaphysical nature. This same question must be returned to in the conclusion of this essay.

The absence of accounts of the apostolic ministry in the gospels is a similar problem as the lack of specific reference to the Spirit in the gospels. This is what we might call the Spirit's shyness. It is Barrett's conclusion that this aspect of the Spirit can be explained in an analogous way to the problem of the messianic secret. Jesus was not just a pneumatic wonder worker. The Spirit's function is to empower and to reveal Jesus in his true nature. The evangelists are concerned with the true understanding of Jesus and not with the Spirit's behind-the-scenes work. In fact, the apparent absence of the Spirit shows just how much the Spirit is transparent to Jesus. After Jesus' baptism the Spirit is

---

(22) *ibid.* p. 136. Conzelmann rejects the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit as such a solution, cf. Ch. 6, pp. 82f.

(23) Perrin, *op.cit.* p. 163.

so intimately connected with him that it is impossible to say that this is done by the Spirit and that by Jesus. This same closeness of operation is revealed in the Lukan resurrection narratives where the Risen Jesus apparently does the Spirit's work, and in Acts where the Spirit is quite definitely the Spirit of the Risen Lord.

It was said above, that the Spirit marks God's rule. This is true but it must always be borne in mind that the Spirit and Jesus are inseparable and it is really the conjunction of the Spirit and Jesus which marks the redemptive work of God and the presence of his kingdom.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE TRANSFIGURATION, ASCENSION AND  
PENTECOST.

Each event in this chapter really deserves to be dealt with separately and at much greater length, but they are here placed together to draw out the full extent of their inter-connection in Luke's thought.

It has already been noted how several motifs present in Lk. 1.35 and the baptism of Jesus point on to the Transfiguration.<sup>1</sup> To recap briefly, these were:

- (1) The imagery from Ex. 40.35. In Lk. 1.35 there is ἐπιαικάζει; in 9.28-36 there is δόξα (9.31,32), ἀκμή (vs. 33), νεφέλη and ἐπιαικάζει (vs. 34).
- (2) In the baptism the voice (φωνή) speaks from heaven (3.22); in 9.35 the voice (φωνή) speaks from the cloud.
- (3) In 1.35, 3.22 and 9.35 there is mention of sonship.

In the transfiguration story a further related Old Testament episode is introduced - the giving of the law at Sinai. The mountain and the glory of the presence of God almost necessarily refer to Sinai. These themes all converging on this one event show that it is part of the revealing of Jesus as the New Torah, the new Tent of Meeting, the new point of focus in God's relationship with man. It is part of the witness to the fulfilment of the Old in the New, as is seen by the presence of Moses and Elijah. Their speaking to Jesus is symbolic of the Old Covenant preparing the way for the event of Jesus. It also works in reverse for the readers of the gospel that they, knowing the facts of Jesus, can now look back into the Old Testament to find what Moses and

---

(1) cf. Ch. 1, pp. 10f.

Elijah were saying to Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

In all the synoptics the Transfiguration divides the gospel bringing the general ministry of Jesus to a close, and marking the beginning of his turning to the Passion in Jerusalem. In Mark it is closely connected with the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi, and can be taken as a divine confirmation of the suffering nature of Jesus' Messianism. The whole setting in Mark is the impending suffering of the Son of Man, and the need for the disciples to understand that this will be part of their discipleship (Mk. 8.34). The Transfiguration is a confirmation to Jesus of the rightness of his rebuke to Peter (8.33), and also a divine word to the disciple to accept this rebuke (ἀποστείλας αὐτὸν, 9.7 recalling Dt. 18.15). In Mark a connection is made with the Parousia through 9.1 and the immediate sequel to the Transfiguration - the questioning over the return of Elijah (9.9-13).

In Luke the setting is slightly different. Firstly, the actual place is obscure. Luke appears to have removed the reference to Caesarea Philippi preferring Bethsaida (Lk. 9.10), which may come from Mk. 8.22, and he omits the whole section Mk. 6.45-8.26.<sup>3</sup> Luke has connected the feeding of the five thousand (Lk. 9.10-17) with his version of Peter's confession giving the feeding a christological setting. He retains the Markan connection of the confession with suffering but omits totally the idea of the Messianic secret. Thus, Peter is not rebuked as in Mk. 9.33, but is only instructed to

---

(2) For Moses and Elijah representing the whole Old Testament, and for the conflation of their identities in Judaism, cf. Richardson, op.cit. p. 183.

(3) For a discussion of the 'great omission', cf. Conzelmann, op.cit. pp. 52-5.

to tell no-one (Lk. 9.21). Two factors probably have led Luke to this omission. The first may have been an attempt to shield Peter, preparing him for his rôle in Acts as the head of the Church. The second may be that Luke never understood the Markan difficulty about the Messiahship. This argument is very flimsy since Luke definitely understands the disciples' misconception about the nature of the kingdom (cf. Acts 1.6 and below). Anyhow, we may agree with Conzelmann that for Luke 'suffering is part of the very idea of Messiahship'.<sup>4</sup> Luke, by changing Mk. 9.1 to prevent the Matthean interpretation and by omitting the questioning about the coming of Elijah, tends to remove connections the Transfiguration might have had with the Parousia, and by other changes connects it with Gethsemane (in Luke the Mount of Olives) and the Ascension. The former connection does not immediately concern us beyond the fact that Luke makes the latter two events occur at the same place and all of them at night.<sup>5</sup> There are certain distinctive features of Luke's account which deserve mention. Luke stresses the Moses typology by mentioning the shining of Jesus' face, recalling Ex. 34.29. Matthew 17.2 has an even stronger connection with Moses, making a similar alteration to Mark. Luke is the only evangelist specifically to mention the glory ( $\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha$ , 9.31,2), and characteristically this glory is revealed in the changing of his face while he is praying. (Lk. 9.31-2 forms a connection with John's gospel through Jn. 1.14.) Further Moses and Elijah speak to Jesus about his exodus

---

(4) *ibid.* p. 196.

(5) *ibid.* p. 59.

(ἐγὼ ἐξοδῶν αὐτοῦ , 9.31). This does not just refer to his departure from the earth, but to his whole mighty act of redemption. In 9.51 a similar meaning seems to be given to his ἀναλήμψις . This provides a sure connection with both Moses' Assumption and with the Ascension.<sup>6</sup> It is probably correct to see the Transfiguration as an indication of the centrality of the Ascension, which is the climax of Jesus' life and the vindication of all his suffering.<sup>7</sup>

J.G. Davies has shown how the Transfiguration and the Ascension are connected.<sup>8</sup> All that is now possible is to summarize his findings. He notes the following parallels:

(1) Lk. 9.28 has ἀπέβη instead of ἀναφέρεται in Mark and Matthew. He shows how ἀναβαίνω is characteristic of the ascension typology.<sup>9</sup>

(2) The two men (ἄνδρες δύο , 9.30) appear again in Acts 1.10. (They are also at the scene of the Resurrection, Lk. 24.4.)

(3) Davies sees the exodus of Lk. 9.31 completely fulfilled in Acts 1.11. (ἀναλημψίς... εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν ).

(4) The cloud is present in both cases (9.34, Acts 1.19).

These are the more important similarities between the two events. A wider comparison can be made between the whole of Lk. 9 and Acts 1.<sup>10</sup>

---

(6) C.F. Evans (The Central Section of St. Luke, Studies in the Gospels, (ed) D. Nineham, p. 51) sees this as the beginning of a midrash on Deuteronomy.

(7) *ibid.* p. 59.

(8) J.G. Davies: He Ascended into Heaven, p. 40f.

(9) Here Davies is a little negligent in that he does not mention that Luke does not actually use this verb in the actual Ascension accounts. Also cf. Lk. 5.19, 19.28, where ἀναβαίνω is used where it is not in Mt/Mk, but for no real reason (also 18.10, 19.4).

(10) *ibid.* p. 186.

Accepting the Transfiguration as a prefiguration of the Ascension and as an indication of the centrality of the Ascension in Luke's thought, we turn to a brief but important examination of the resurrection appearances. It is almost a commonplace that in comparison with Paul, Luke's theology is almost wholly lacking in any soteriology.<sup>11</sup> The Passion forms a necessary preliminary to the Resurrection and the Ascension. Once these events have occurred the Passion tends to recede into the background under the importance of the Lordship of Christ. It is notable that not only is no mention made of the Spirit in the Passion narratives but there are no hints to his presence at all. The only possible exception seems to be Jesus' prayer at the Mount of Olives in Lk. 22.40-6, where the ministering of an angel must surely come close to the comforting work of the Spirit expressed in the Johannine designation *παρακλητος*. The absence of the Spirit in this period may be due to the atonement being essentially the work of the Second Person of the Trinity, and perhaps also to the avoidance of any kind of docetism which reference to the Spirit in Jesus at this stage could possibly foster.

It is not within the scope of this essay to enter into the complexities of the different resurrection narratives. Only several important points which are relevant can be mentioned. It is obvious from several facts that Luke has placed his mark on the traditions. The two men (*ἀνδρες δύο*, 24.4) appear again. The command to go into Galilee (Mk. 16.7) is changed to a reminder of the prophecy of the necessity for the Son of Man's suffering and his resurrection (Lk. 24.6-7). This has the effect of limiting the Resurrection appearances to Jerusalem. The time-sequence in ch. 24 also

implies that the Ascension occurred at night (like the Transfiguration) on the eve of the Resurrection. The teaching about the necessity for suffering seems to be one of the most important points Luke wishes to establish. It occurs here, 24.7, at 24.26 and is implied in 24.44-6. Characteristically, Luke balances the victory note of the Resurrection with a rejection in 24.11 (cf. 4.16-30). It is this disbelief which is now overcome by many proofs (ἐν πολλαῖς τεκμηρίοις, Acts 1.3). The two disciples on the way to Emmaus were still hoping for the redemption of Israel, that Jesus would be the ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὴν Ἰσραὴλ (a hope which refers back to 1.68). Luke seems to be reflecting genuine history when he portrays the disciples clinging to this hope. He has, however, by changing Mark's version of the confession at Caesarea Philippi, lost the Markan way of dealing with this problem. This same hope is expressed by the disciples in Acts 1.6. In the case of 24.26, the necessity for the Passion is brought to the mind of the disciples by Jesus himself, however not by reference to his own words, but by interpreting (διερμηνεύω) the prophets and the whole scriptures (vs. 27). This interpretation is described in vs. 32 as Jesus opening the scriptures (διήνοιγεν ὑμῖν τὰς γραφάς). This opening of the scriptures must have a close connection with the Johannine prophecies of the Spirit of truth (τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, 14.17, 15.26), which 'will lead you into all truth' (16.13). This revelation is continued further into what is obviously a Eucharistic setting (vs. 31), and 'their eyes were opened, and they recognized him', which leads to the classic phrase of Eucharistic doctrine: 'how he was made known to them in the breaking of bread' (vs. 35). The

---

(11) cf. Haenchen, op.cit. p. 92.

similar 'opening of their minds to understand the scriptures' in vs. 45 is followed by the command to proclaim 'repentance for the forgiveness of sins for all people in his name' (vs. 47). In John this command is preceded by the 'Johannine Pentecost' (Jn. 20.22). This ambiguity over the Johannine functions of the Spirit and the Lukan Risen Christ is, perhaps, seen in Acts 1.2. Here *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* can either be taken with the preceding *ἐνταλάμενος* τῆς ἀποστόλης or with the αὐς *ἐξελέξατο*. Does the commanding (*ἐνταλάμενος*) refer to the period of Jesus' ministry or to the teaching period of the Risen Christ? The latter seems to be more likely since the whole context of the verse is defined by *ἄλλοι εἰς ἡμέρας... ἐκλήθησαν*. Moreover, this verse is in contrast with what is obviously the ministry of Jesus in vs. 1. It also seems more likely that the *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* is to be taken with the *ἐνταλάμενος* than with the αὐς *ἐξελέξατο*, since the αὐς *ἐξελέξατο* forms a complete clause on its own, and although *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* could qualify it it is more likely that it goes with the participle it follows.<sup>12</sup> If this is the case then Luke is saying that the Holy Spirit was operative in the teaching of Christ prior to his Ascension and after his Resurrection. Not only does this give further evidence for regarding the Ascension as a theological comment on the Resurrection, but it inclines us to favour the Johannine version of Pentecost. It may be that Luke is purposefully conflating the ideas of the Risen Christ and the Spirit of Christ to assure the Church that, in the possession of the Spirit, the Risen Christ is in their midst.

---

(12) cf. Dunn: Baptism in the Holy Spirit, p. 46, who agrees that *διὰ πνεύματος* is to be taken with *ἐνταλάμενος*, and contra Haenchen, op.cit. p. 139, who adopts the other view.

One of the problems of Luke's resurrection stories is their obvious tendency to be influenced by other stories. This is clearly seen by the large number of variant readings of one kind and another. However these are resolved, there is no way of removing the difficulty of finding things in Luke ascribed to the Risen Lord, which in John are prophetically ascribed to the Spirit. Not only this, the difficulty is inherent in Luke, for all the contact with the disciples seems to occur on Easter Day and it is on Easter Day that they are instructed to 'wait in the city until you are clothed with power from on high' (vs. 49). Yet, in contradiction to this, it is forty days after Easter that the disciples are still waiting for the kingdom (Acts 1.6), and the prophecy of Pentecost and the command to witness all occur at the Ascension rather than on Easter Day. It is remarkable that Lk. 24 has so many points in common with John,<sup>13</sup> whilst the Acts accounts seem to contradict Lk. 24 at points, although the formal similarities leave no possibility of regarding Lk. 24 and Acts 1 as completely different traditions, or as referring to different events.<sup>14</sup>

It seems fairly certain that Luke has separated the Resurrection and the Ascension for theological reasons. John seems to imply that the Ascension occurs between the appearance to Mary ('Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father', 20.17) and the appearance to Thomas (20.27).

Davies regards Jn. 7.39 as evidence that the Ascension must have occurred before Jn. 20.22,<sup>15</sup> but the glorification of

---

(13) If the Emmaus story is omitted in Luke, and the appearance to Mary Magdalene in John, Lk. 24.12,36-49 corresponds to Jn. 20.3-10,19-22. The two verses Lk. 24.12,40 may be included in the text depending on how one resolves

Jesus in John is so connected with the actual crucifixion that it is dubious to argue that in John the Ascension is referred to here as glorification. Probably, in fact, the Ascension motif in John is so tied up with the Resurrection that it is impossible to separate them. The best answer to the Lukan problem is to regard Luke as recounting the Ascension twice<sup>16</sup> to make the point that it serves the dual function of being the triumphal conclusion of the gospel, and then is also the necessary preliminary for the beginning of the Church's life at Pentecost.<sup>17</sup>

The actual story of the Ascension is highly typological, recalling the Elijah story (4 Km. 2.11). Davies also notes that I Kings 19.8 provides parallels with Luke's treatment of the Ascension.<sup>18</sup> It is this typology which is the real answer to Luke's treatment of John the Baptist.<sup>19</sup> Just as Elijah went up into heaven imparting his spirit in double measure (δυναμις, 4 Km. 2.9) to Elisha, so it is that Jesus ascends into heaven and his Spirit is poured out on his disciples. But more than this, the Ascension is the culmination

---

(13) (cont.) the problem of Lukan-Johannine interdependence, cf. Leaney, op.cit. pp. 28ff, who goes against such scholars as Creed, op.cit. p. 294, who see D as the original version.

(14) For a tabulation of these similarities, cf. Davies, op.cit. p. 187.

(15) *ibid.* p. 50.

(16) cf. the variant reading on Lk. 24.51, with  $\chi^*$  D omitting *καὶ ἀνεβήκατο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*.

(17) cf. Dunn, op.cit. p. 45.

(18) Davies, op.cit. p. 52ff.

(19) cf. Ch's. 1-2.

of the vindication of the rejected Son of Man. He is now Lord, he is in heaven and Stephen sees him seated at the right hand of God (Acts 7.55). He is the ruler of the heavenly places and it is his Lordship which is made central by the Ascension. This Lordship is logically prior to Pentecost, since the Spirit now operates from the perspective of victory. Now the Spirit can be said to have been given absolutely to Jesus by the Father and thus poured out to the people who have been saved by Jesus and who believe in him.<sup>20</sup> Previous to the Resurrection the Spirit appears to be in command of Jesus, but the rôles are reversed at the Ascension. Davies shows how the Transfiguration depicts Jesus entering the cloud but not remaining there; in the Ascension, however, he remains in the cloud of the divine presence. Jesus has finished his mission.<sup>21</sup>

The Ascension in Luke is crucial in understanding both his attitude to the Passion and the Parousia. It has already been mentioned that the stress in Luke is on the reign of Christ and not how he became the ruler. Similarly, what is important for the disciples is to be saved by the Lord who has the victory and the power to save (cf. Acts 2.21,40,47, 4.12 etc).<sup>22</sup> Also what salvation is, is determined by the manner in which Jesus is Lord in the present age. The Ascension almost comes as a direct answer to Acts 1.6: 'Are you now establishing the kingdom of Israel?'. The future fulfilment of this is confirmed, but also placed completely beyond the knowledge of man (1.7). The Jewish hope is placed in direct contact with the Holy Spirit (1.8) and with the Ascension (1.9).

---

(20) This is the understanding expressed by Peter in Acts 2.32-5.

(21) *ibid.* p. 63f.

(22) cf. Ch. 5, pp.77f.

For Luke the Parousia is not unimportant, but it is not something which needs to be dealt with at length since the final Lordship which the Son of Man will exercise is clearly revealed in the Ascension and is present in the Church through the Spirit. The Ascension is also Dan. 7.13 in reverse, and depicts to the disciples the manner of Jesus' return.<sup>23</sup>

This is the Lukan understanding of the Ascension. It fulfills the purpose of Jesus' whole life and ministry and is the basis for the Church's mission. It is the platform for the mission to the whole world (Lk. 24.48) and it is prior to Pentecost since Pentecost realizes the Ascension in the Church and its witness.<sup>24</sup>

In the gospels there is a paucity of possible references to a foreseeing or foretelling of Pentecost. Lk. 11.13 is almost certainly a Lukan attempt to overcome this. There are references to the Spirit as appearing as a helper in time of persecution. Mt. 10.19-20 should probably refer to the mission of the Church as in Mk. 13.11, thus removing any necessity for the gift of the Spirit to be part of the mission of the disciples.<sup>25</sup> Although they are given *ἐξουσία*, this is derivative in an extreme way from Jesus. Mk. 13.11 is the basic text in this regard, but it is likely that Luke preserves the original of this saying in Lk. 21.15.<sup>26</sup> The scarcity of these references was part of the problem of the previous chapter. In the present context this problem serves to highlight the newness of the event of Pentecost.

---

(23) cf. Haenchen, op.cit. p. 151.

(24) cf. Dunn, op.cit. p. 44.

(25) cf. Barrett, op.cit. p. 130.

(26) *ibid.* p. 131.



Jesus prepared the disciples for it during the Resurrection appearances (Acts 1.5) by recalling John's prophecy recorded in Mk. 1.8.<sup>27</sup>

In Luke the gift of the Spirit is inseparably linked with the witness of the disciples to Jesus. The clothing in power of Lk. 24.49 is for the express purpose of being witnesses (*μάρτυρες*, vs. 48), and also for the proclamation of repentance. This same connection is made in Acts 1.8. In both of these texts a universal note is struck. The witness is to begin in Jerusalem, but to go to the end of the earth. This mission charge seems to have been a fundamental of all traditions.<sup>28</sup> In Matthew it takes the form of a command to make disciples of all nations and to baptize them and to teach them (Mt. 28.19-20). Mt. 28.18b reads: 'all authority in heaven and earth has been given to me'. This is the same truth that Luke expresses in his Ascension story. It is because of the authority of Christ over all things that the mission can proceed. Further, it is because Jesus is present with his disciples to the end of the age (Mt. 28.20) that the disciples can be comforted, reassured and empowered for their task. This, in Luke, is expressed by Pentecost. Jesus is with his Church always controlling, directing and empowering its mission, which is really just an extension of his own mission to the world.

---

(27) For the absence of *καὶ ὑπὲρ* see below, p. 54.

(28) In Mark it is present in the longer ending (Mk. 16.15-16). In John the mission charge is part of his Pentecost (Jn. 20.21).

Although there is for Luke an inseparable connection between the Ascension and Pentecost, there is one thing yet needed to prepare the disciples for this epochal event. The twelve have to be reconstituted. The mention of the eleven in Acts 1.13 may be to acquaint a reader with the apostolic circle if he had not read the gospel, but more likely Luke is stressing the unity of the Church in obeying the command of its Lord. He also sets the scene for the filling of Judas' place. Luke shows the disciples waiting in prayer for the Lord's promise to be fulfilled. This verse as a whole is a warning that even though the Spirit had not come the Church still somehow shows that it is not uninfluenced by him.<sup>29</sup> There is a powerful contrast between this verse and 2.46, in that after Pentecost, apart from anything else, the prayer is in the temple, whereas here they are still under cover in the upper room (τὸ ὑπερῷον, 1.13).

In the section 1.15-26 the activity of the Spirit in reconstituting the faithful remnant of Israel is revealed through Peter's leading the congregation to be obedient to the Spirit's direction through the scriptures (1.16). This indirect leading is also shown in the actual choosing of Matthias by lot (1.26) after prayer (1.24). This method of election still remains something of an enigma. The election was probably by the straight casting of lots (cf. I Chron. 26.14) rather than by election, which may be indicated by the *βουκαεψυγιεθι*. Haenchen is probably correct that this is used since by it 'the human factor is excluded'.<sup>30</sup> It also has the effect of

---

(29) The exegesis of this verse is complicated by its appearing to be an example of a Lukan 'summary'. cf. H.J. Cadbury, Beginnings, V, pp 392-402

(30) Haenchen, op.cit. p. 162.

contrasting the method of obtaining direction from God before and after Pentecost.

In the actual account of Pentecost it is not clear whether the 'all' (πάντες, 2.1) were the apostles or the whole 120 brethren (1.15). The argument for the 120 being all filled with the Spirit is not as convincing as Haenchen makes out,<sup>31</sup> since Luke ends the previous section with the twelve, and has been at great pains to stress their importance. If now the Spirit is to fall on all the brethren, it is a little difficult to know why he has interposed the section 1.15-26 between the Ascension and Pentecost. Further, the twelve apostles are mentioned at the end of this section and lend their presence and authority to Peter's preaching (2.14). On whom the Spirit actually descended remains uncertain, for these arguments are not able to do anything more than render the case for the 120 uncertain. The piling up of metaphors to describe the descent of the Spirit is in strange contrast to the baptism of Jesus, but in both the essential ἐκ τοῦ ὑψιστοῦ is mentioned. The sound like a mighty, rushing wind describes both the force of the Spirit and its freedom (Jn. 3.8). The breath/wind (πνοή) may well be an intentional usage recalling the breath of life in Gen. 2.7 (cf. also Jn. 20.22). Both of these metaphors reveal the ambiguity in the Hebrew ruach. Then 'tongues like fire' appear and descend on those present localizing the descent of the Spirit. Fire signifies the presence of God (cf. Ex. 3.2 and Enoch 14.9,10,15). Dunn may be correct in seeing the fire of the prophecy of John the Baptist in Lk. 3.16 as taken up in Jesus' death.<sup>32</sup> This

---

(31) *ibid.* p. 167

(32) Dunn, *op.cit.* p. 42. Barrett, *op.cit.* p. 125 takes the more traditional view seeing the 'tongues of fire' as the fulfilment.

seems to be indicated by Lk. 12.49f. This Lukan insertion may well be an attempt to iron out this difficulty, because Acts definitely seems to reflect the Markan version of Lk. 3.16.<sup>33</sup> But the fire here also has a sense of purification as does the metaphor of the wind. 2.4a is a summary of what has happened, showing that these images are descriptions of a deeper reality lying behind them, although Luke characteristically regards the whole episode as an objective reality.<sup>34</sup> The same verb is used as in the nativity stories (ἐπιλήβεται), but the context shows that this event is not to be regarded as of the same nature as its precursors.

Much scholarly ink has been spent on the next happening - the speaking in tongues. It is clearly a sign that something all-important has happened. That this phenomenon is directed by the Spirit deserves more attention than it has been given (2.4c). The important thing is not to try to understand or to rationalize it, but to see it as a sign that the Spirit has so entered into the disciples that his control springs out of the very wells of their existence. Truly, they now have a new heart within them. From now on the preaching and the deeds of the Church are governed by the Spirit.

There is no real reason for rejecting the Ἰουδαίων of 2.5.<sup>35</sup> The omission in X may be an attempt to universalize Pentecost even further. The reversal of the curse of Babel (Gen. 11.1-9) is a most likely inference,<sup>36</sup> but it seems unlikely that Luke is interested in stressing whether the hearers of the 'speak-

---

(33) cf. Acts 11.16 and 19.1-7.

(34) cf. Beginnings, IV, p. 17.

(35) contra K. Lake, Beginnings V, p. 113f.

(36) contra Haenchen, op.cit. p. 174.

ing in tongues' were Jews of the dispersion or Gentiles.<sup>37</sup> It is true that the conversion of even some of such a polyglot crowd would spread the gospel to the ends of the earth, but the actual miracle is the breaking down of barriers by the Spirit in the proclaiming of the Gospel. It is through the Spirit that men everywhere, no matter what their culture or language, can hear the witness of the Church to Jesus. Yet again, Luke introduces his rejection motif (2.13) and Jesus as a 'two-edged sword' (Heb. 4.12 and Eph. 6.17). This prepares the way for a major concern in Acts, the passing of salvation out of the hands of the Jews into the Church. Whereas the point of conflict was first the Person of Jesus (Lk. 4.29), and then the resurrection of Jesus (Lk. 24.11), now it is the presence of Jesus in his Spirit in the Church (Acts 2.13).

One aspect of the Spirit's activity foretold in the Old Testament has not been sufficiently elaborated. Both in Lk. 1.35 and the Transfiguration, and again in the Ascension, there was reason to refer to the cloud overshadowing the Torah, and declaring the presence of God to the Jews in the desert. This typology gives us very good reason for regarding Jesus as the New Torah, being in a sense overshadowed by the Spirit.<sup>38</sup> Bearing this in mind and turning to the prophecies of both Ezekiel and Jeremiah, where the implanting of the law in men's hearts is part of the promise for Israel's time of blessedness, it is probable that Pentecost is regarded as the fulfilment of these prophecies. This is almost made a certainty by Luke's placing of the event at Pentecost, or the feast of Weeks,

---

(37) W. Knox: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 83, reveals the tension which exists between the ἑσθλα (2.5) and all the different languages, but Haenchen is stretching the

which had become the feast of the giving of the law to Moses on Mount Sinai.<sup>39</sup>

Just as the Ascension was an answer to the Jewish hope of a kingdom, so is Pentecost. Pentecost is the fulfilling of the 'promise' (ἐπαγγελία, Lk. 24.49, Acts 1.4, 2.33). To the Jews the promise must refer to the promise to Abraham, that is God's Covenant with Abraham (Gen. 17.1-10). Paul sees this promise fulfilled in Jesus and the reception of the benefits of the promise through the Spirit (Gal. 3.14). As has been mentioned, it is difficult to find a precise promise of the giving of the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus, but the whole of scripture in its movement towards the promised redemption of God's people comes to its fulfilment in the appropriation of redemption through the gift of the Spirit.<sup>40</sup> The conviction that Pentecost is regarded as the fulfilment of all that has been promised is strengthened by Peter identifying it as marking the beginning of the 'last days' (2.17). This addition to the Joel prophecy alters the whole perspective of eschatology. Here we must go against Haenchen,<sup>41</sup> who believes that the original was not ἐν ταῖς ἑσχαταῖς ἡμετέρας<sup>4</sup> but B's μετὰ ταῦτα, being similar to the LXX of Joel 2.28. This does not seem to be at all likely on textual grounds, but it is

---

(37) (cont.) evidence when he insists that Pentecost does not have elements in it which prefigure the breakthrough to the Gentiles. cf. Ch. 5, pp. 76f.

(38) cf. Knox, op.cit. p. 81f.

(39) cf. Dunn, op.cit. p. 48f. for a justification of this point.

(40) ibid. p. 47.

(41) Haenchen, op.cit. p. 179.

impossible to really assess Haenchen's argument, not having access to the article referred to. If the Church is really in the last days, then Conzelmann is correct in regarding salvation as being in the past and having to be appropriated in the present.<sup>42</sup> That the Church is in the last days, and that salvation has already occurred, does not remove the necessity for an end of the period of the last days.<sup>43</sup>

The Joel prophecy provides a serious problem since it is not fulfilled as Peter seems to indicate. At Pentecost the 'sun does not turn into darkness' or the 'moon into blood', yet the Spirit is poured out on 'all flesh' who have 'called upon the name of the Lord and been saved'. It remains a problem for us as to how Luke could have thought of this whole prophecy as being appropriate. Could it perhaps be that Luke got a little carried away by the all too perfect 'I will pour out my Spirit' (2.17,18), and included the more apocalyptic 2.19-20 to conclude the quotation with another motif of Acts: 'and everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved' (2.21)? The only other solution appears to be to separate the quotation into that which is fulfilled and that which is not, and refer the latter to the future.<sup>44</sup> The difficulty with this is that it is an artificial distinction foreign to the text and removes too much text from the  $\tau\omega\sigma\tau\acute{o}$  of 2.16.

---

(42) cf. Ch. 6, p. 83.

(43) For Luke's eschatology, cf. Ch. 6, pp. 81-84.

(44) This leads to the unsatisfactory rejection of the apocalyptic element as 'stage effects'. This is the solution favoured by Dunn, *op.cit.* p. 47.

It has already been pointed out that there is probably an intentional parallel between Peter's speech and Jesus' proclamation at Nazareth. However, the prophecy from Joel is probably not meant as a parallel to Is. 61.1, except perhaps for the promise of salvation which is here in 2.21,40 (with a reference to Joel again in 2.39), and in 2.47. Just as Jesus' mission began with a speech, so does the witness of the Church. A major difference between the two is that the witness of the Church is to the victory of Jesus and what Luke stresses is not rejection but the rapid growth of the infant Church (2.41,47). The new age of the expansion of Christ's rule has begun. The Joel prophecy is dramatic enough to comment on this change in the dynamic of history, even though it may be dramatic in the wrong way.

As has been mentioned,<sup>45</sup> Jesus' baptism is in a way parallel to Pentecost. As the Old Testament prophecies of the outpouring of the Spirit are fulfilled in him, so, through him, they become fulfilled in the community established by him. This outpouring marks the beginning of the Church. In Acts this is made especially clear by the election of Matthias preceding Pentecost, and by the difference of the preaching and Church life prior<sup>to</sup> and after Pentecost. It is possible to say that the foundation of the Church is the proclamation of Jesus' Lordship.<sup>46</sup> It is this proclamation which is the direct result of the descent of the Spirit, and so it is the Spirit which brings the Church into being.

---

(45) cf. Ch. 2, p. 21.

(46) eg. H. Kung: The Church, p. 80: 'With this affirmation of faith (in Jesus' Lordship) a new community is born.'

These early chapters of Acts mark the transition from Jesus as the fulfilment of prophecy, to the Church receiving this same fulfilment through Jesus. Pentecost marks the event of the realization of this fulfilment in the life of the Church. For Luke in a very real sense all is now fulfilled, and what remains is to narrate the activity of the Spirit in the mission of the Church, and how the fulfilment of all things in Jesus and the Church is realized in the world.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE MINISTRY OF  
THE CHURCH.

We have already noticed the centrality of the mission command of the Lord to his disciples (Lk. 24.48, Acts 1.8) and its connection with the Holy Spirit.<sup>1</sup> We have now to expand on just how Luke portrays the Holy Spirit as the *δύναμις* enabling the disciples to be *μάρτυρες*. As we have seen, the event of Pentecost is itself a witness both to the apostles and the Jews. Peter can say in answer to questions evoked by the pouring out of the Spirit that, 'this is that which was written by the prophet Joel' (2.16), and he can use this as the springboard for the rest of his sermon. Later Peter can link the witness of the disciples with the witness of the Spirit (5.32).<sup>2</sup> Part of the problem in dealing with this witness of the Spirit is that in many ways the Spirit seems to operate in the background. In this way there are many parallels with the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus. For example the witness of the Spirit to the reign of Jesus at Pentecost does not seem to have been a regular or essential part of the primitive preaching (*κήρυγμα*). Reference to the Spirit as a witness in this sense only occurs in the *μαρτύριον* of 2.16, 2.33 and 5.32. When Peter is questioned 'In what power or in what name did you do this?' (4.7), he, 'filled with the Spirit' (4.8), did not reply: 'In the power of the Spirit and in the name of Jesus'. His reply was solely in terms of the vindication of Jesus, 'He whom you crucified...God has raised from the dead' (4.10). In a similar way to

---

(1) Ch. 4, p. 52.

(2) cf. p. 64 below.

chapter three we must again try to explain this shyness of the Spirit and how the Spirit is actually present in every part of the Church's life placing Jesus in the forefront and centre of the Church.

To do this the activity of the Spirit is to be dealt with under the following heads, which at points are not mutually exclusive:

- (a) The preaching of the Church.
- (b) The signs and wonders done in the Church.
- (c) The Spirit and the Name of Jesus.
- (d) The Fulfilment theme.
- (e) The Spirit in the life of the Church.
- (f) The Spirit as the director of the Church's mission.
- (g) The Spirit and baptism.
- (h) Glossolalia.
- (i) Conclusion.

(a) In every sermon,<sup>3</sup> with the exception of Paul's sermon at Lystra (14.15-17), the central part or climax is Jesus as Christ or Lord.<sup>4</sup> These references show how Luke regards the

- 
- (3) 2.14-36, 38-40: Peter at Pentecost.  
3.12-26: Peter in Solomon's portico.  
4.8-12 : Peter before the Sanhedrin as a result of the healing of the lame man.  
5.29-32: Peter before the Sanhedrin because of disobedience over ceasing to preach.  
7.1-53 : Stephen before the Sanhedrin.  
10.34-43: Peter to Cornelius and his household.  
13.16-41: Paul at Antioch of Pisidia.  
17.22-31: Paul at Athens. (This is a possible exception, at least the Resurrection is mentioned.)
  - (4) cf. 5.42, 8.5, 8.25, 9.20, 11.20, 15.35, 36, 16.6, 17, 3, 31, 18.5, etc.

activity of the Church to be solely the spread of the gospel of Jesus, which is the same as the word of the Lord. Acts can, indeed, be regarded as the history of the word of the Lord, and how it is accepted and rejected. Acts ends with Paul 'preaching the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ' (28.31). This is significant. From this it is an easy step to see that Luke regarded preaching to be the essential constitutive element of the Church. This preaching is linked with the Spirit by Pentecost. The Church is founded by the Spirit's descent on the disciples, and after Pentecost this event is manifested through preaching. This connection between the Spirit and preaching is made quite explicit in the prayer of the Church during persecution in Jerusalem (4.29). What is essential to the Church is that their Lord should 'give to (his) servant that they may speak (his) word with all boldness' (*μετὰ παρρησίας ἰσχύος*). They also ask for the Lord 'to stretch out your hand to heal and to do signs and wonders through the name of your holy servant Jesus' (4.30). The answer to both of these requests is almost a second Pentecost. 'They were all filled with the Holy Spirit', and this results in their speaking the word of God with boldness.<sup>5</sup> Clearly, the confidence and the preaching are the result of the power of the Spirit. *παρρησία* and *παρρησία λόγων* are favourite words of Luke and can be seen to be part of the fulfilment of the prophecy that the Spirit will be given to the disciples in times of persecution (Lk. 12.12 and also 11.13). The *παρρησία* of Peter and John before the Sanhedrin (4.13) is an example of this. *παρρησία λόγων* is used to des-

---

(5) cf. 4.8 where Peter is 'filled with the Holy Spirit' when he preaches; also, Apollos is *γεμνῶν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* in 18.25.

cribe Paul's preaching at Damascus (9.27,28); it is linked with the word of God in 13.46; in 18.26 and 19.8 it is linked with testimony in the synagogues; and in 26.26 Paul stands before Agrippa. There is also the boldness/openness of Paul's preaching in Rome (28.31).

That the Spirit is responsible for the inspiration of the preaching about Jesus is further evidence that the Spirit's main function is the revealing of Jesus as the Christ.

The nature of the preaching of the Church is that it seems almost to liberate the Word, which then acts of its own accord. In this way the Church is very conscious that its mission is the work of the Spirit, that is, it is God's action, not their own. Perhaps the most obvious example of this attitude is 4.29f. It is also revealed in 14.3, where the 'Lord witnesses to the Word of his grace'. This freedom of the word is seen in the results of the preaching. The reaction of the hearers is always to the word preached and only secondly to the preachers. In 2.37 it is the word heard which cuts them to the heart. It is after this that they turn to Peter for the answer to 'What shall we do?'. This is also true of 5.33 and 6.54. The disciples remain witnesses to the word and never become the centre of attraction, except as the focus of rejection. We can see that even though the Spirit has been given to the Church it remains the Spirit of the Lord and is only the Church's possession while it is obedient to the Lord. This is quite clear from 5.29 and 5.32. The Spirit's separation from the Church is revealed in the story of Ananias and Sapphira. The Church is to regard the Spirit with awe since it is not its possession but is the agent of

Jesus' Lordship. The result of Ananias' and Sapphira's deaths is φόβος 'in the whole Church'.<sup>6</sup>

The Spirit is also connected with the preaching in the conversion which follows on the preaching. In Peter's reply to his questioners he utters a command and a promise.<sup>7</sup> Although Luke does not work it out, it is clear that here a twofold operation of the Spirit is presented. For it is the working of the Spirit in the preaching which brings the convert to the necessary action so that he can receive the Spirit of Promise.

The importance of preaching can also be seen from the theme of the spreading of the word.<sup>8</sup> These references often occur in a concluding sentence of a summary nature, eg. the summary of 9.31. Here the Spirit is linked with 'comfort' or 'exhortation' (παράκλησις). The phrase λόγος παρακλήσεως occurs also in 13.15. In Lk. 2.25 reference is made to the παράκλησις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, which probably is an allusion to Is. 40.1 and 49.13. The usage of the word in Acts has obviously close connections with the Johannine use of παράκλητος. In the case of 9.31 the genitive may be either subjective or objective.<sup>9</sup> In either case it may be that here we have a further connection of preaching (this time within the Church) and the Spirit.

(b) The σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα have been shown to be given by the Spirit as part of the witness of the Church.<sup>10</sup> The 'signs

---

(6) cf. also (b) p. 67 below.

(7) cf. (g) pp.77f. below.

(8) The λόγος τοῦ κυρίου is a technical phrase in Acts corresponding to the Markan εὐαγγέλιον.

(9) cf. Bruce: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 209.

and wonders' (together with *ἑνέργειαι*) are part of what Peter regarded as evidence for Jesus' Messiahship (2.22). They are an essential part of the Church's life.<sup>11</sup> The healing miracles are also regarded as signs,<sup>12</sup> which are even recognized to be such by outsiders to the Church. In the case of 14.3, the signs can be seen to be given directly from God and as such are never the possession of the Church (cf. also 4.30).

As the word *τίμας* indicates, a difficulty exists in that the wonders can very easily be just wonders with no real significance. People can just be amazed (*ἐξίστασθαι*) in the way that Simon attempted to amaze the Samaritans (8.9). In this section Luke has probably welded two independent traditions.<sup>13</sup> The result is to link Simon's seeking after a way to cause wonder, and the Holy Spirit. His rebuke and his repentance show clearly how the Spirit cannot be reduced to the level of a wonder-maker. It is interesting how Philip's preaching and doing of wonders brings many to faith, but in the case of Simon, Luke specifically links Simon's belief and baptism with the signs and miracles. Simon obviously fell into the trap of trying to use these wonders for his own self-glorification. Luke may have slightly obscured this by saying that Simon desired the power to confer the Spirit, and it may be one of Luke's adaptations of the traditions in the process of editing. This same misunderstanding of the nature of the miracles, their reduction to Hellenistic magic, is seen in

---

(10) The conjunction of *ἐν πίστει καὶ ἐνέργειαι* is a favourite expression of Luke, and occurs elsewhere only at Mk. 13.22, Rom. 15.19, II Cor. 12.12, II Thes. 2.9 and Heb. 2.4.

(11) cf. 2.43, 4.30, 5.12, 6.8, 7.36, 14.3, 15.12.

(12) 4.16, 22, 8.6, 13.

(13) cf. Haenchen, op.cit. p. 307.

Paul's conflict with Elymas (13.6ff) and the sons of Sceva (19.11ff.).

The result of the miracles is always to induce awe ( φόβος or θάμπος), which is directed not so much at the miracle as at the hand of God at work and at the Lordship of Jesus. In the case of Peter's healing of the lame man (3.1-10), the healing is done specifically in the name of Jesus of Nazareth and the result is that 'they were all filled with fear and astonishment' (3.10).<sup>14</sup> In this case (and presumably in many other cases not narrated by Luke) this reaction gives Peter an opportunity for preaching Jesus as the agent of the miracle.

Apart from this use of the miracles, namely to witness to Jesus rather than to the agent, Luke does not really distinguish in any way between the professional wonder-workers and the apostles. This together with his use of 'tongues' has led some to believe that he presents the work of the Spirit in a rather deficient way.<sup>15</sup> While this is true in some respects, it is already emerging that it is doing Luke an injustice to refer to his treatment of the Spirit in this manner.

(c) The Spirit and the Name of Jesus have already been mentioned as linked in the Sanhedrin's question to Peter, 'In what power or in what name did you do this?' (4.7).

It is not true that the use of the Name of Jesus replaces the Spirit. The connection is deeper than this. Peter's answer would have been correct if he had replied in terms of the

---

(14) φόβος as a general characteristic of the Church, see 2.43, 5.11, 9.31; and as a result of a miracle, 5.5, 19.17.

(15) eg. G.W.H. Lampe: The Seal of the Spirit, p. 50, refers to a 'rather undeveloped 'ruach' conception of the Spirit.'

Spirit, but this answer could be of no avail to those who had not come to terms with Jesus himself. They would fail to see that the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus, and can only be approached through the acceptance of him. But more than this, it is impossible for the Spirit to be invoked in the way the Name is, since it is Jesus' victory over evil and his Lordship which are being claimed. The miracle is totally dependent on this. But the presence of the Spirit in the Church means that where the name of Jesus is invoked (or magnified, 19.17), there the Spirit is operative, since both are modes of expressing Jesus' presence in his Church. The connection becomes even stronger when the Ascension is taken to signify the absence of the Lord and Pentecost as his presence being manifested by the Holy Spirit in a different form. The presence of the Lord in his Name must be related, then, to the Spirit. The ambivalence in Luke is due to his not being concerned with such systematic issues as we are bound to raise. This relationship must be raised again when we turn to the question of baptism.

(d) The theme of fulfilment has been an almost constant refrain throughout this essay. In Acts, the proof from scripture is part of the *κῆρυγμα* and is basic to the Church's proclamation.<sup>16</sup> The inspiration of the Spirit in the formation of the scriptures is reflected in 1.16 and 28.25, and is taken for granted everywhere where reference is made to the Old Testament. That the activity of the Church is in accordance with the voice of the Old Testament is proof that it is the same Spirit at work, which then looked forward to Christ and now is active in the manifestation of his rule on earth. The Spirit is also operative in the interpretation of these scriptures. In Stephen's speech (7.1-53), his lengthy

interpretation of the Old Testament history is the work of the Spirit. He is not only 'filled with the Spirit' (6.5), but his preaching is so effective that 'they were not strong enough to withstand the wisdom and the Spirit with which he spoke' (6.10). The climax of his sermon before the Sanhedrin is his accusation that they have not listened to the Spirit and that they 'oppose the Holy Spirit' (7.51). It is by the Spirit that Stephen can understand the Spirit's own voice in scripture and also have the power to obey the law as revealed by the Spirit (7.53).

A similar interpretation of scripture occurs in the case of Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch. The change from the 'angel of the Lord' (8.26) to the Spirit (8.29) probably has no significance,<sup>17</sup> but the connection between the Spirit (8.29) and the reading of Is. 53.7-8 probably does. Just as in Lk. 24.27 where the Risen Lord opens the scriptures revealing himself, here the Spirit in Philip 'preached Jesus to him' (8.35). The Spirit's presence in the whole episode seems to be made clear by the Ezekiel type disappearance and transportation of Philip (8.39).

At Antioch of Pisidia Paul is asked if he has a 'word of comfort/exhortation( παρακλήσεις ) for the people' (13.15). This word turns out to be the interpretation of the scriptures showing Jesus as their fulfilment (13.23), and he uses many proof texts to establish his point (13.33-41). Indeed this pattern seems to have been the substance of Paul's missionary

---

(16) cf. C.H. Dodd: The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, (New Edition, 1944), p. 21f.

(17) For a discussion on angels and the Spirit, p. 73 below.

work in the synagogues of the Dispersion. (There is also the case of Apollos 'being able in the scriptures' (18.24).) It is the Jews' rejection of the Spirit's voice in the scriptures that forces Paul to turn to the Gentiles (13.47f).

(e) The Spirit is clearly at work in the very life of the Church, forming a new community which itself is a witness to Jesus. The immediate result of Pentecost is the sharing of all possessions (2.44f.). This breakdown of human barriers is a continuation of the breakdown of the language barrier in the glossolalia of Pentecost. It is a clear sign of God's rule.<sup>18</sup> This unity of the Church continues into its worship. 'They continue zealous with one accord (ὁμοθυμαδόν) in the temple' (2.46). And the first evidence of distinctive Christian worship is presented in the 'breaking bread in every house'. In 2.47 the praise of God 'finds favour (χάρις) before the whole people.' The whole life of the Church, its sharing of possessions, its worship and general demeanor, result in the Lord 'adding daily those being saved' (2.47). The φόβος of every soul (2.43) which the Spirit creates, is used to further the gospel.

In another summary of the Church's life (4.32-37) the witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus (4.33), is linked to the unity of 'heart and soul' (4.32) among the whole multitude of believers. This unity of 'heart and soul' is supremely expressed in the word *κατανομία*. Actually its only occurrence in Acts is in 2.42. Here it does not refer to the sharing of possession, which is mentioned in 2.44, but to the much wider unity which was the result of the common sharing of the

---

(18) This communalism has a clear parallel in the Qumran community, and may well have been regarded as a necessary part of the 'last days'.

Holy Spirit. Probably both possible interpretations of II Cor. 13.14, the fellowship with the Holy Spirit, and the fellowship caused by the Holy Spirit, are incorporated into 2.42 (cf. also Phil. 2.1).<sup>19</sup>

Apart from these early references to the Church, Luke does not speak much of the Church, revealing that his main concern is not the establishment of an organization, or even a body of believers, but the spread of the gospel from which the Church is a natural corollary.

In Chapter Three we noted Luke's stress on prayer and its connection with the Spirit. The same is true in Acts. The prayers of the Church are part of its life. They are included in the summary statement of 2.42; they are an essential part of the Apostolic office along with 'the ministry of the Word' (6.4); the Church as a body prays for strength (4.23-31). At almost every occasion when guidance is needed the Church prays and answer is given to it. Prayer is obviously part of the Spirit's work in the Church. The Spirit is the form of Jesus' presence in the Church and this presence is supremely manifested in prayer.

Yet another phrase seems to be occasionally used to indicate the presence of the Spirit. This is the phrase 'the hand of the Lord' (ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ κυρίου).<sup>20</sup> This phrase was used in Lk. 1.66 as a fairly clear parallel with the phrase 'filled with the Spirit'. This same usage recurs in Acts 11.21.

---

(19) For a detailed discussion see L.S. Thornton: The Common Life in the Body of Christ, Ch. 3, pp. 66ff.

(20) cf. 4.28,30, 11.21, 13.11.

(f) The Spirit does occasionally appear in person in Acts as the director of the mission giving orders to the apostles. The case of Philip (8.29) has been mentioned. Peter is addressed by the Spirit (10.19); the Spirit speaks directly in the commissioning of Barnabas and Saul (13.2); the Spirit appears to be active in the Apostolic decree of 15.28; Paul is prevented by the Spirit from speaking the word in Asia (16.6-7). Paul's mission is directed by the Spirit. He passes through Macedonia 'in the Spirit' (19.21). This guidance of the Spirit is especially linked with his compulsion to go to Jerusalem (20.22), and the Holy Spirit 'witnesses in every city saying that chains and afflictions await me' (20.23). (21.4b is probably secondary, since it seems impossible that the disciples of Tyre should prophesy falsely or that Paul would have continued to Jerusalem if the Spirit withdrew the orders of 20.22f, especially in the light of 21.11.<sup>21</sup> The *διὰ τὸν πνεύματος* may refer to an ecstatic form of early prophecy. This appears as a problem in the criteria for a true prophet in the Didache (11-13)).

All these texts show the Spirit as being the director of the mission. This is especially true of Paul's journey to Jerusalem. The divine compulsion of this journey is similar to that of Jesus. Neither is received by the Jews. Paul narrowly escapes being killed and after the final rejection of the gospel by the Jews he goes to Rome, the centre of the Gentile world. The Spirit is thus in a special way linked with the Gentile mission.

The direction of the Church is not, however, solely by the

---

(21) cf. Haenchen, op.cit. p. 603.

Spirit. Angels appear from time to time, and even the Lord speaks to Paul (23.11). It is clear that Luke was not systematic in his treatment. He uses angels mainly in visions, for, after all, one cannot see the Spirit, but there seems to be little to distinguish the two in function. Knox<sup>22</sup> makes a point of stressing the frequency of the appearances of angels in the first half of Acts (the only instance in the second half being 27.23), but any conclusions from this are difficult since we just do not know how much Luke was dependent on sources. The first half of Acts is thought of as having a more Aramaic background and relates mainly events of the Jerusalem Church. This may well be part of the explanation.

Having mentioned the Spirit driving Paul to Jerusalem and the final rejection of the gospel by the Jews, we must now turn to the Spirit's rôle in the establishing of the Gentile mission. The first stage in this is the breakthrough to the Samaritans. There has been a lot of speculation about the seeming inability of Philip to bestow the Spirit on those who had come to believe through his preaching (8.12). The question is not the inability of Philip's baptism to confer the gift of the Spirit,<sup>23</sup> but the necessity for the barrier between the Jews and the Samaritans to be fully and officially bridged by the representatives of the Jerusalem Church. It is this fellowship which is essential for the gift of the Spirit.<sup>24</sup> It seems to be unnecessary to see this incident as

---

(22) Knox, op.cit. p. 94.

(23) cf. Beginnings, IV, p. 92.

(24) cf. Lampe, op.cit. p. 69f.

evidence for the separation of baptism and confirmation. The separation of baptism and the gift of the Spirit is abnormal, and is only because the Spirit was withheld until the Samaritans had properly been included into the Church. The next major event is the inclusion of Gentiles into the Church. The setting of this event in Acts is of considerable importance. The preaching to Samaria by Philip is probably to be seen as the result of the persecution of the Church in Jerusalem. It is probable that the dispersion of the disciples which resulted in the founding of the Church in Antioch (11.19f.) dates from this time, but Luke has deferred this evidence of a Gentile mission until he has justified the mission itself. In so doing he created a difficulty with 9.31, which is probably so placed as a comment on Saul's conversion, but is unrealistic, since evidence of further persecution occurs in 12.1-5. Saul's conversion is a necessary prelude to the story of Chapter 10, since he is to be the real apostle to the Gentiles. Peter is then seen on his pastoral/episcopal rounds (9.32-43), and the scene has been set.

The whole story gives the impression of being stage-managed. Cornelius is instructed 'in a dream' by an angel (10.3). Peter has a similar vision in an ecstasy (10.10) while he is praying (10.9). The 'heaven opening' (τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεώχθη) is distinctive of special revelations.<sup>25</sup> A voice (φωνή) addresses Peter (10.13). Later Peter is addressed by the Spirit (10.19). There may be some significance that Peter is not addressed by the angel, but it is impossible to make very much of this. The result of this management by God is

---

(25) cf. p. 21 above.

to bring Peter and Cornelius together.<sup>26</sup> Peter's first reaction to the meeting is to understand that God has no favourites (οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης ὁ Θεός, 10.34). He then goes on to preach Jesus whom 'God anointed with the Holy Spirit and power' (10.38). It is while he is still speaking that the 'Holy Spirit fell on those who were hearing the word' (10.44). In so forcing the pace, the objections of 'those from the circumcision' (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς) are overruled, and the Gentiles are formally received into the Church by baptism (10.48). It is the similarity of the apostles' experience of the Spirit and that of the Gentiles which forces them to accept the conclusion of Peter in 10.34. In both Peter's reports in Jerusalem about this event the ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς of 10.47 is echoed: 11.15 has ὡσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ and 15.8 has καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν. There is also the εἴην ἰσχυρῶν of 11.17. Here the 'how were we able to prevent God?', reveals just how much Peter saw the episode as an act of God.

We see again that it is only in exceptional circumstances that baptism and the reception of the Spirit are separated, and it is the Church's immediate reaction to join the two together again. In this case the Church's act of water baptism follows close behind God's act of pouring out the Spirit.

Besides the Cornelius event there is only one other specific mention in Acts to baptism in the Spirit. This is the baptism of John the Baptist's disciples at Ephesus (19.1-7). Here

---

(26) It is not clear how the question of food-laws raised in Peter's dream is related to the question of fellowship. There is some evidence that there were two issues, but they are clearly very closely related. Dibelius: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (SCM 1973), pp. 109-122 makes too much of the difference.

the baptism in water and the gift of the Spirit are only separated by the laying on of hands (19.6). Although it is not made obvious by Luke, this inclusion into the Church of the Baptist sect may have had considerable importance in the Church, and Luke's specific mention of the Spirit may be an indication of the importance of the event.<sup>27</sup>

The relation between Pentecost itself and the 'Gentile Pentecost' needs to be explored. Pentecost seems to say all that the Cornelius story says. As has been pointed out there is a tension in the Pentecost account between the gift of the Spirit being exclusively for the Jews (κατὰ κοινὴν Ἰουδαίαν, 2.5) and for all nations (2.9ff.).<sup>28</sup> Some have tried to stress that Pentecost is for the Jews only and the Gentile mission was dependent on this second outpouring.<sup>29</sup> In this way an attempt is made to schematize the command to the apostles that they should 'begin from Jerusalem' (Lk. 24.47). It is true that in Acts, Jerusalem is always the centre of the spread of the gospel, until Jerusalem finally rejects the work and the centre is transferred to Rome, but it would seem that the universalization of the gospel and the breaking of barriers is completely enacted and set forth in the Church and to the Church in the event of Pentecost. The following work of the Spirit in spreading the gospel to Samaria, to the Gentiles and finally to Rome is really just leading the Church to a fuller understanding of Pentecost. Thus, the Cornelius episode is not really a Gentile Pentecost, but an event to force the Church to accept all the implications of Pentecost. The

---

(27) see (g)pp.77ff below.

(28) cf. Ch. 4, pp. 55f above.

(29) This is substantially the position of Haenchen, op.cit. p. 175.

event is the same as that of Pentecost, in that the same Spirit is poured out, but it is lacking the same epochal significance as Pentecost. This is perhaps also to be seen in the absence of the more spectacular phenomena of Pentecost.

This rôle of the Spirit in the direction of the Church is so important for Luke that he seems to have, in comparison to Paul, underestimated the rôle of the Spirit in the life of the individual. This question will be part of the next section and the discussion on baptism.

(g) Luke's understanding of baptism seems really to be quite simple. It is part of the whole process of becoming a Christian. This process is described in detail by Peter in 2.38, which is undoubtedly meant to establish the normal pattern of Christian conversion-initiation.<sup>30</sup> From the interconnectedness of the command to repentance, baptism and the promise of the gift of the Spirit, one can only conclude that this is really one event, the parts of which are dependant on each other for their validity. Baptism would not be baptism apart from repentance and the promise is conditional upon fulfilment of the command. In this way the fulfilment of the promise is a clear indication of the efficacy of the repentance and the baptism. As Dunn points out, these three parts of the one process (repentance, baptism, and the gift of the Spirit) correspond to the acts of the person, of the Church and of God respectively.<sup>31</sup> Baptism was a necessary expression of repentance and faith and probably involved 'calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus' (2.21). Here again, the name of

---

(30) cf. Dunn: Baptism in the Holy Spirit, p. 90.

(31) *ibid.* p. 91.

the Lord Jesus and the Spirit are closely linked. It is the invocation of the name which grants salvation and the forgiveness of sins and these are all made an actuality in the life of the individual by the gift of the Spirit.

Several times already the Spirit has been seen to be in a sense independent of the Church. At no time does the Church regard the Spirit as its possession. It can only be instrumental in imparting the Spirit, since the Spirit is the Spirit of Promise and God is the ultimately faithful one. It is a misunderstanding of this that leads some to think of baptism as being a kind of magic action which necessarily imparts the Spirit. The connection of the Spirit and baptism rests solely on God's promise and not on baptism itself. The distinction is fine but all-important.

We have mentioned that Luke almost systematically neglects to mention the reception of the Spirit in baptism.<sup>32</sup> In several of these cases there is indirect evidence of such a reception. The Ethiopian Eunuch goes on his way 'rejoicing' (χαίρων, 8.39); Paul's preaching indicates the Spirit (9.20); the jailor was 'overjoyed' (ἠγαλλιάσατο, 16.34). The cases where the Spirit is mentioned with baptism are the Samaritan episode (8.12-17), the Cornelius story (10.44-8), and at the baptism of the disciples of John at Ephesus (19.3-5). All of these have great significance for Luke. It seems reasonable to conclude, with Lampe, that Luke's conception of the Spirit has been profoundly influenced by his 'paramount interest in the Gentile mission'.<sup>33</sup> Further, by so doing he has obscured

---

(32) cf. Acts. 2.41, 9.18, 16.15,33, 18.8.

(33) Lampe, op.cit. p. 50, also M.D. Goulder: Type and History in Acts, p. 76f, who argues this exactly.

the Pauline insight into the rôle of the Spirit in the life of the individual. Again we find evidence for Luke's theological interests having been slightly at variance with his sources. Moreover, the theological interest is revealed to be deeply historical. The emphasis on the Spirit in Luke is linked with the historical advance of the Church and although he presumes it, this is at the expense of the Spirit's operation of including individuals into the Church. But as we have seen, the action of the Spirit in the Church is so wide and diffuse that this conclusion by itself would be inaccurate.

(h) As we have shown when dealing with the 'signs and wonders',<sup>34</sup> Luke does tend to view the Holy Spirit in one aspect of its operation almost as the proper answer to magic. It could be that this attitude is also present in the question of speaking in tongues. This does not occur at all frequently, although it may well be presumed in a similar way to the baptism in the Spirit. It occurs at Pentecost (2.4), in connection with the Gentiles (10.46), and with the Ephesian disciples (19.6). In all three cases it is clear that the tongues are regarded as definitive proof of the presence of the Spirit. As has been argued above, these three cases have special significance to Luke and he wishes to establish without doubt the presence of the Spirit in these events. Whether or not this is to be regarded as a general phenomenon cannot be concluded with certainty. In the latter two instances cited, no astonishment is shown to the tongues. This must indicate that the phenomenon was not at all uncommon. In the case of the baptism in the Spirit of the

---

(34) (b) pp. 66f. above.

Samaritans one wonders what the evidence of the reception of the Spirit could have been which so struck Simon. It is peculiar that, after the fuss made of tongues at Pentecost, so little attention is paid to it later.

(i) In this chapter two main characteristics of the Spirit's activity have been revealed. The first is the activity of the Spirit in inspiring preaching and other activity of witnessing to Jesus Christ. The other is the Spirit as a motif marking special events in the Church's expansion, specifically into the Gentile world.

The first of these is precisely the function of the Spirit in Jesus' ministry, although it is even less mentioned in the gospel than in Acts. The second occurs in the gospel only to mark the significance of Jesus' conception and baptism. In Acts the Spirit appears to be decisive as the agent in the establishing of the Gentile mission, specifically at Pentecost itself, in the inclusion of the Samaritans, the conversion of Cornelius and the subsequent Council of Jerusalem, at Ephesus, and lastly in Paul's journey towards his arrest and eventual journey to Rome. This can be no mere chance. Luke must be using the Spirit to justify the Gentile Church.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION.

The whole question of eschatology has been the major question in New Testament scholarship this century. This is, perhaps, why Luke became the 'storm centre'<sup>1</sup> of the New Testament world, for it is his historical approach that raises the question in the clearest possible form. One whole approach to Luke-Acts has been that it was written to reinterpret the faith when the Church was undergoing a crisis because of the delay of the Parousia.<sup>2</sup> For this school, Luke's work becomes a massive reinterpretation of the earlier more apocalyptic expectation. This debate centres around several Lukan alterations of Mark, which are taken to signify that Luke has moved the Parousia into the dim-distant future (or perhaps, even out of history all together<sup>3</sup>) and even emptied it of all its significance.<sup>4</sup> The evidence from the gospel is coupled with the historical nature of Acts, which portrays the Church active in a manner which is not overwhelmed by an expectation of the end, and references to the second coming of Christ are not of much significance.<sup>5</sup> This whole approach has several difficulties. Firstly, it usually argues from the assumption of a late date of Acts, i.e. the turn of the first century or later.<sup>6</sup> This is a

- 
- (1) W.C. Van Unnick: 'Luke-Acts, A Storm Centre in Contemporary Scholarship', Studies in Luke-Acts (ed) Keck and Martyn.
  - (2) Conzelmann, op.cit. p. 131: 'The main motif in the recasting to which Luke subjects his source, proves to be the delay of the Parousia..'
  - (3) *ibid.* p. 132.
  - (4) In a sense this may be true, as we try to show, because of the shift of emphasis from the Parousia to the Ascension.
  - (5) cf. 1.11; it might be implied by the Son of Man vision of Stephen (7.56); Jesus as the judge occurs in 10.42 without reference to the second coming; 17.31 is the only place where the second coming is a key point in preaching.

possibility, but the most likely date remains some time in the period 62-70 A.D.<sup>7</sup> Secondly, the reinterpretation theory tends to ignore the evidence that even Jesus had begun to expect and foretell a distinction between his death and Resurrection and his second coming. Even if this period was expected to be fairly short, at least the principle had been established.<sup>8</sup> While it is not possible to get too involved in this debate, it is important to place the difficulty of Luke's eschatology in perspective, since we have to come to some conclusions as to how the Spirit might play a rôle in such a revised eschatology.

In Paul's epistles there does seem to have been an undoubted development in his eschatological thought. From the expectation of an imminent end in I and II Thessolonians, we find the more developed system of Romans, and, perhaps, even that of Ephesians.<sup>9</sup> This evidence must be linked with that of I Cor. 15. For our purposes here, Paul's adaptation of the expectation of the imminent end can be best seen in his use of ἀπαρχή,<sup>10</sup> and especially of ἀπαρίσσειν.<sup>11</sup> The thought behind both of these words is the bringing of some of the benefits of the final age (the *ἀγωναία*) into the present

- 
- (6) cf. L.E. Wilshire: 'Was Canonical Luke Written in the C2', NTS Vol. 20, 1974. The extreme case is J.C. O'Neill: The Theology of the Acts. R.P.C. Hanson: Acts, p. 47f. argues for a date before 90.
- (7) cf. E. Ellis: The Gospel of St. Luke, pp. 55-60, and also J.A.T. Robinson: Redating the New Testament.
- (8) cf. O. Cullmann: Salvation in History, pp. 237ff.
- (9) cf. C.H. Dodd: New Testament Studies, pp. 109-118 for a study of the development of eschatological thought in Paul.
- (10) Rom. 8.23, 11.16, 16.5, I Cor. 15.20,23, 16.15, II Thes. 2.13.
- (11) II Cor. 1.22, 5.5, Eph. 1.14.

life of the Church and the individual.<sup>12</sup> In this way the Spirit forms an essential link between the present and the End. Could the Holy Spirit in Luke be said to fulfil a similar function? The event of Pentecost must form some kind of link between the Ascension of Christ and his coming again. As has been said, the Ascension is the Parousia in reverse. Yet, at Pentecost there is no reference to the Parousia. Everything points backwards to the fulfilment of the prophecies fulfilled in Christ or forwards to the mission of the Church, but not to the final fulfilment. Nor in the historical rôle of the Spirit in Acts is there any hint that the Spirit is preparing the Church or the world for the End. The End will come, of this there is no doubt, but it will come without warning and very suddenly.<sup>13</sup> If this is so, does the Spirit make the Church live in the past, rather than in expectation of the future? This seems to be implied by Conzelmann.<sup>14</sup> If the time of Salvation is the period of Jesus, and the Spirit is the Church's link with that past time, then the Spirit is effectively pointing the Church backwards to a realization of the past. As Marshall points out this division in Luke's thought is not the whole truth.<sup>15</sup> It is true only in two ways. Firstly the Spirit is always acting in the fulfilment of the Old Testament and reinterpreting it. Secondly, the Spirit is active in the manifestation of the victory and the rule of Jesus in the Church. This rule is

---

(12) cf. A. Richardson, op.cit. p. 115.

(13) cf. Lk. 21.34-6.

(14) This is seen by I.H. Marshall: Luke: Historian and Theologian, p. 79.

(15) *ibid.* p. 88-102.

dependent on Jesus' manifestation of his sovereignty while physically present. In the Church it is dependent on Jesus' Ascension. This Ascension, even though it is an event of the past, is ever present in the Church through the activity of the Spirit. In this way Jesus and the 'time of salvation' are not past events, but ever contemporaneous with the Church. The salvation preached is historically rooted in the event of Jesus' life and especially in his Resurrection and Ascension. Luke's theological schema reinforces the centrality of these events. They are all that matters in the last analysis. If Jesus is indeed Lord, then the final manifestation of that Lordship is a mere formality. Further, to live in the expectant hope of this revelation is all too easily an escape from facing the implications of his Lordship in the present. The obedience to Jesus' Lordship in the present should not rest upon the fact of the Parousia but on the Resurrection and Ascension. Thus, the Spirit's function in Luke cannot be directly associated with an expectation of the end; it is totally concerned with the revealing of Jesus' Lordship in the present and in the directing of the Church in its attempts to be the instrument of Jesus' Lordship in the world.

Theologically one can say that Luke has in one sense conflated the Ascension and the Parousia, not as events per se, but in his understanding that they both have much the same significance, and if the Ascension is properly understood there is no difficulty about the Parousia.

Going back then, to Paul, are we to see the Spirit in the Church in Luke as the ἀπαβίωσιν τῆς κληρονομίας? We have already shown how the individual reference of this expression has been obscured by Luke. In Lukan theology the idea of the κληρο-

*opía* is only present in Stephen's speech in the Old Testament sense (7.5), and in Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders (20.32), where a possible future reference is nearly excluded. The conclusion seems to be that Luke is not concerned about this aspect of the Spirit. But there is a sense in which the Spirit in Luke can be seen to have a similar function, and this is through the understanding of Luke's that the end has come into the present through the Spirit at Pentecost, but the nature of this is not dependent on the end, but upon the last ultimately meaningful event, which is the Ascension.

Is Luke a retrogression from Paul? This is probably not a suitable question. Paul does not have the same historical emphasis as Luke, and in this sphere Luke has advanced beyond Paul. Luke has solved the problem of the Gentile mission and the rejection of the Jews in a neater way than Paul as a Jew ever could have done. Luke is not obliged to limit the Gentile mission to an interim period until the 'fullness of the Gentiles' is brought in (Rom. 11.25). The rejection of the Jews as a nation is absolute. Luke ceases to think in national terms altogether. But on the other hand, Luke has lost the richness of the function of the Spirit in salvation and in the life of both the individual and the Church, which one finds in Paul. Can we judge between the two? Luke and Paul were writing to answer different needs and theological problems, and it is now left to us to assimilate the depth of both, that we might appreciate the totality of the biblical witness to the Grace of God.

What then of John's doctrine of the Spirit? Here again the Spirit becomes the presence of Jesus in the Church (Jn. 14.16,18). In Jn. 20.22 the Spirit is firmly linked both with the

individual through the breathing on the disciples, and with the mission of the Church through the subsequent saying. The Spirit is also the Spirit of truth (14.17), which leads into all truth (16.13). Bearing in mind that in John the truth is Jesus himself (14.6), or comes forth from him (1.17), one can see that the Spirit is the director of the Church interpreting the Old Testament to reveal Jesus as Christ as well as interpreting Jesus himself to the disciples. In all these ways John's doctrine seems to be a concise and skilful theological commentary on Luke.

There is one further aspect of the Johannine doctrine. This is the Spirit as the judge of the world (16.8f.). This may be in Luke in the fire at Pentecost or in the preaching of the Church, but at this point John has developed quite far from Luke. In both Luke and John there does not seem to be any explicit reference to a connection of the Spirit with a future consummation. Again the stress seems to be on the glorification of Jesus at his resurrection rather than in the Parousia. In John we find that which seems to have been missing in Luke: the rôle of the Spirit in the life of the individual in the Church. This is supremely shown by the Johannine dualism between *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ*, and his doctrine of rebirth expressed so clearly in Jn. 3. The individual reference is also maintained in Jn. 20.22, where the intimacy of breathing is to be contrasted with the impersonal nature of Acts 2.

John has, then, developed historically beyond Luke and has retained, in a different form, the Pauline connection of the individual with the Spirit. But both Luke and John omit the Pauline connection of the Spirit with the final inherit-

ance, since this has become so much part of the Resurrection message.

Much stress has been placed in Lukan studies on criticism of Conzelmann's treatment of Luke's 'salvation-history'.

Various alternative schema's have been suggested to overcome what have become generally accepted criticisms of Conzelmann's conclusion.<sup>16</sup> Few of these reconstructions take adequate account of the rôle of the Spirit in Luke's thought. The main divisions in the Lukan history are all marked by the Spirit. They are Jesus' conception, his baptism, and then Pentecost. There can be no denying that there are three phases in the Lukan history: the age of prophecy is the first, which has its fulfilment in the age of Jesus, which is the second; both of these ages merge and are focused into the final age, that of the Church. Whether or not the age of Jesus begins at his conception or his baptism is not quite clear, but the baptism would be more likely. This difficulty should warn us that by thinking in this rigid manner we may well be forcing distinctions onto the text which are foreign to it. Sometimes, if not all the time, Luke is more concerned to set forth the connection between the eras of salvation-history than to separate them. The age of the Church definitely should begin at Pentecost, but again a difficulty exists over the Resurrection and the period between the Resurrection and Pentecost.

These broad outlines form the basic pattern of Luke's history. Within it he again uses the Spirit to mark distinctions within the eras, drawing out the full implications of

---

(16) e.g. that of H. Flender: St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History.

God's activity in that age.

One of the glorious qualities of the New Testament is that, while it opens up more and more as we come to understand it, we can never claim to have solved its problems. All the time it is impossible to reduce it to an academic problem, as it forces us to meet its challenge of faith. We can never put it aside, and therefore it always remains speaking to us. From Luke we learn that we have not come to terms with the Ascension of Jesus and his absolute claims to Lordship, nor have we prayed to God: 'Give your servants boldness to preach your word, and stretch out your hand to heal and to do signs and wonders through the name of your holy servant Jesus' (Acts 4.29f.). If we were to really do this, the consequent outpouring of the Spirit would result in a new phase in God's dealings with man. This is the promise of the Spirit that remains for ever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- BARRETT, C.K. : The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition, (SPCK, 1947).
- BRUCE, F.F. : The Acts of the Apostles, (Tyndale, 1952).
- BULTMANN, R. : The History of the Synoptic Tradition, (Blackwell, 1972).
- CAIRD, G.B. : St. Luke, (Penguin, 1963).
- CREED, J.M. : The Gospel According to St. Luke, (Macmillan, 1942).
- CONZELMANN, H. : The Theology of St. Luke, (Faber, 1969).
- CULLMANN, O. : The Christology of the New Testament, (SCM, 1963).  
Salvation in History, (SCM, 1967).
- DAVIES, J.G. : He Ascended into Heaven, (Association Press, 1958).
- DIBELIUS, M. : Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, (SCM, 1973).
- DODD, C.H. : The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, (Hodder and Stoughton, 1944).  
New Testament Studies, (Manchester, 1954).
- DUNN, J.D.G. : Baptism in the Holy Spirit, (SCM, 1970).  
Jesus and the Spirit, (SCM, 1975).
- ELLIS, E.E. : The Gospel of St. Luke, (Oliphants, 1974).
- EVANS, C.F. : 'The Central Section of St. Luke',  
Studies in the Gospels, (ed) Nineham, D.E.  
Resurrection and the New Testament  
(SCM, 1970).
- FLEMINGTON, W.F. : The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism, (SPCK, 1964).
- FLENDER, H. : St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History, (SPCK, 1967).
- FRANKLIN, E. : 'The Ascension and the Eschatology of Luke-Acts', SJT 23, 1970.

- HAENCHEN, E. : The Acts of the Apostles,  
(Blackwell, 1971).
- HANSON, R.P.C. : The Acts of the Apostles,  
(Oxford, 1967).
- HLIERS, R.H. : 'The Problem of the Delay of the  
Parousia in Luke-Acts', NTS 20, 1974.
- HOOKE, M. : Jesus and the Servant, (SPCK, 1959).
- JEREMIAS, J. : New Testament Theology, Vol I,  
(SCM, 1971).
- JACKSON, F. and LAKE, K. : Beginnings of Christianity, Vols. 1-5,  
(Macmillan, 1929).
- KECK, L.E. : 'The Spirit and the Dove', NTS 17, 1970.
- KECK, L.E. and MARTYN, J. : Studies in Luke-Acts, (SPCK, 1968).
- KNOX, W. : The Acts of the Apostles,  
(Cambridge, 1948).
- KUMMEL, W.G. : Promise and Fulfilment, (SCM, 1961).
- LAMPE, G.W.H. : 'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of  
St. Luke', Studies in the Gospels  
(ed) Nineham, D.E.  
The Seal of the Spirit, (SPCK, 1967).
- LEANEY, A.R.C. : The Gospel of St. Luke, (A and C  
Black, 1971).  
'The Resurrection Narratives in  
Lk. 24.12-53', NTS 2, 1955-6.
- MANSON, T.W. : The Sayings of Jesus, (SCM, 1950).
- MARSHALL, I.H. : Luke: Historian and Theologian,  
(Paternoster, 1970).
- MUNCK, J. : Paul and the Salvation of Mankind,  
(John Knox, 1959).
- NINEHAM, D.E. (ed) : Studies in the Gospels, (Blackwell,  
1955).
- OLIVER, H.H. : 'The Lukan Birth Stories and the  
Purpose of Luke-Acts', NTS 10
- O'NEILL, J.C. : The Theology of the Acts, (SPCK, 1970).

- PERKIN, N. : The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus, (SCM, 1963).
- RICHARDSON, A. : An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, (SCM, 1958).
- ROBINSON, J.A.T. : Redating the New Testament, (SCM, 1976).
- SWETE, H.B. : The Holy Spirit in the New Testament, (Macmillan, 1910).
- TALBERT, C.H. : Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts, (Society of Biblical Literature, 1974).
- TAYLOR, J.V. : The Go-Between God, (SCM, 1972).
- TAYLOR, V. : Behind the Third Gospel, (Oxford, 1926).  
St. Mark, (Macmillan, 1952).
- THORNTON, L.S. : The Common Life in the Body of Christ, (Dacre, 1941).
- VAN UNNICK, W.C. : 'Luke-Acts, A Storm Centre in Contemporary Scholarship', Studies in Luke-Acts, (ed) Keck, L.E. and Martyn, J. 'The "Book of Acts" the Confirmation of the Gospel, Nov.Test. IV, 1960.
- VAN STENPVOORT, P.A. : 'The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts', NTS 5 1958.
- WILSHIRE, L.E. : 'Was Canonical Luke Written in the G2', NTS 20, 1974.
- WILSON, S.G. : 'Lukan Eschatology', NTS 16, 1970.  
The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts, (Cambridge, 1973).

