1. Introduction

Max Turner has recently penned two substantial monographs. The first volume, rather lengthy and technical, focuses specifically upon Lukan pneumatology.1 The second work, more concise and oriented toward the non-specialist, is wide-ranging in its scope.2 It discusses the shape of New Testament pneumatology more generally and addresses related questions of interest for the church today. Both books are what we have come to expect from Dr Turner. They are marked by an impressive knowledge of the secondary literature, careful analysis of competing viewpoints, and a logical and detailed presentation of his own case. The major thesis that emerges in both books is that all of the writings of the New Testament reflect a common understanding of the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy. To be sure, this theological foundation is picked up and developed in diverse ways by the various authors, but an essential unity can be traced throughout the New Testament. The Spirit, as the Spirit of prophecy, grants wisdom and revelation as well as prophetic
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speech and praise. The wisdom afforded by the Spirit comes with transforming and sanctifying power, and thus is essential for authentic faith and Christian existence. This essential core is reflected in the major contributions of Luke, John and Paul, all of whom portray the gift of the Spirit as a soteriological necessity and central to conversion. For this reason, Dr Turner rejects 'the classical Pentecostal two-stage view of Spirit-reception' in favor of 'a more broadly charismatic one-stage conversion-initiation paradigm'.

I would like to evaluate this thesis here. My goal is not to offer a detailed and comprehensive critique of these substantial works. Rather, I would like to point out what I believe to be key areas of weakness in the overall thesis, particularly as it relates to Luke–Acts. In this way I trust that the ongoing discussion concerning the work of the Spirit in the New Testament and today might, in some small way, be pushed forward.

I would like to preface my critique with a word of appreciation for Dr Turner's work. I first met Dr Turner at the University of Aberdeen in Scotland. I was a young PhD student; he had just arrived as a new member of the divinity faculty. I have vivid memories of our early discussions, sometimes quite animated and always stimulating. Our conversation did not end with my departure (and later his) from Aberdeen; rather, we have carried on the discussion both in various academic forums as well as through private correspondence. While we hold many points in common, our public dialogue has inevitably featured areas of disagreement. I have always viewed Dr Turner's proddings, critiques and queries as a blessing rather than a curse. It is precisely through this sort of dialogue that we grow to understand one another and the issues before us more clearly. I greatly appreciate Dr Turner as a friend, former instructor and gifted colleague. His writings have always served to
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