

Copyright © 2013 Matthew Steven Godshall

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

THE MESSIAH AND THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:
THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS AS
GIVER OF THE SPIRIT IN LUKE-ACTS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Matthew Steven Godshall

December 2013

APPROVAL SHEET

THE MESSIAH AND THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT:
THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS AS
GIVER OF THE SPIRIT IN LUKE-ACTS

Matthew Steven Godshall

Read and Approved by:

Mark A. Seifrid (Chair)

John B. Polhill

Jonathan T. Pennington

Date _____

To Natalie,
You and me together . . .

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	ix
PREFACE	xv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Jesus and the Spirit	3
Thesis	6
History of Research.....	7
Conclusion	32
Method	33
2. THE GIVING OF THE SPIRIT AND THE UNIQUE IDENTITY OF YAHWEH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	40
Methodological Justification:	
The Relationship between Action and Identity	41
The Relationship between Yahweh’s Actions and His Incomparability	42
The Nature of Yahweh’s Incomparability	46
Summary	51
The Eschatological Act of Giving the Spirit: An Act of Israel’s Creator and Covenant God	52
The Giving of the Life-Breath at Creation	54
Ezekiel: The Giving of the Spirit as an Act of Re-Creation	57

Chapter	Page
Isaiah: The Outpouring of the Spirit as New Creation and New Exodus	69
Joel: The Outpouring of the Spirit as the Creation of a Nation of Prophets Living in a New Eden	85
Zechariah: The Outpouring of the Spirit of Grace	95
Summary: The Divine Identity of the Spirit-Giver	97
Explicit Links between the Giving of the Spirit and Yahweh’s Divine Identity	98
Ezekiel: “Then They Will Know that I Am Yahweh”	98
Joel: “And You Shall Know that I am Yahweh”	99
Yahweh Alone Is the Giver of His Spirit	100
Conclusion.....	102
3. THE IDENTITY OF ISRAEL’S GOD AND THE ESCHATOLOGICAL OUTPOURING OF THE SPIRIT IN EARLY JUDAISM	105
Introduction	105
The Divine Spirit in Early Judaism: A Brief Overview of Modern Scholarship Chapter	107
The Divine Identity and the Eschatological Act of Pouring Out the Spirit in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature	111
The Dead Sea Scrolls	111
Wisdom of Solomon	122
Joseph and Aseneth	126
Jubilees	130
Sibylline Oracles	132
2 Maccabees	133

Chapter	Page
Rabbinic Literature	133
Summary	138
The Eschatological Outpouring of the Spirit: An Act Unique to Israel's God	138
The Messiah	139
An Angel of the Lord	141
Joseph	143
Conclusion	146
4. ISRAEL'S GOD AND JESUS THE MESSIAH: THE SHARED IDENTITY OF THE SPIRIT- GIVER IN LUKE'S GOSPEL	149
Introduction	149
Argument	153
The "Coming One" Will Baptize with the Holy Spirit: Luke 3:16-17	158
The Lukan Co-Text of John's Prophecy.....	162
Luke 3 as Continuation and Culmination of Chapters 1-2	163
The "Theological" Co-Text of Chapters 1-2	167
For Whom Does John Prepare the Way?	171
The New-Exodus Framework of John's Ministry and Prophecy	180
Summary	183
John's Promise and the Prophets' Promise of the Outpouring of the Spirit	184
The Syntactical and Lexical Differences between Luke 3:16 and the OT Prophets	185
Luke 3:16 and Allusions to Israel and Ezekiel	186
Summary	193

Chapter	Page
The Father Will Give the Holy Spirit: Luke 11:13	194
The Co-Text of 11:13	195
The Identity of the Spirit-Giver	203
Jesus Promises to Send the Spirit: Luke 24:49	204
Luke 24:49 in Light of 3:16 and 11:13	207
Divine Identity Christology in Luke 24:36-53?	210
Conclusion	213
5. ISRAEL'S GOD AND JESUS THE MESSIAH: THE SHARED IDENTITY OF THE SPIRIT- GIVER IN ACTS	216
Introduction	216
The Language of Giving the Eschatological Spirit	217
Argument	218
The Shared Identity of the Spirit-Giver: Acts 2:1-40	219
The Continued Inclusion of Jesus within the Divine Identity of the Spirit-Giver: Acts 11:17 and 15:8	235
The Apostles and Disciples as Spirit-Givers?	240
Peter and John's Role in the Pentecost at Samaria	242
Peter and John as Agents through Whom God Gives the Spirit	246
Conclusion	249
6. CONCLUSION	252
Summary	253
Implications	255
BIBLIOGRAPHY	257

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentum
ANCT	Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology and Biblical Studies Series
ANETS	Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentum
<i>ASB</i>	<i>Austin Seminary Bulletin</i>
<i>AsSeign</i>	<i>Assemblées du Seigneur</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
AYBRL	The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BBTAT	Beitrag zur Beiblichen Theologie Des Alten Testaments.
BDAG	Walter Bauer, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilber Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3 rd edition.
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the NT</i>
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series

BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CEB	Common English Bible
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
<i>CTQ</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>EDNT</i>	Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (eds.), <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ETL	Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FAT	Forshungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>HBAI</i>	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>

IBC <i>Int</i>	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching <i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JES</i>	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JOTT</i>	<i>Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics</i>
<i>JPT</i>	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i>
JPTSup	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
L&N	Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains</i>
NA ²⁷	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , Nestle-Aland, 27 th edition
NAC	New American Commentary
NCB	New Century Bible
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint

<i>NIB</i>	<i>New Interpreter's Bible</i>
NIBC	New International Biblical Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIVAC	The NIV Application Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NSKAT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar, Altes Testament
NTOA	Novem Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	New Testament Theology
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OTP</i>	James H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentaries
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
PVGT	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
<i>RB</i>	<i>Révue biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>

RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>TDNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TDOT</i>	G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i>
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TrinJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
UCOP	University of Cambridge Oriental Publications
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

PREFACE

This work is the culmination of a long journey and could not have been accomplished were it not for the support of many people. My trek toward doctoral studies began as an M.A. student at Talbot Theological Seminary. I was privileged to sit under the teaching and mentorship of Dr. Clint Arnold, whose gracious encouragement and careful scholarship motivated and inspired me toward doctoral work. As a Th.M. student at Western Seminary, I was again privileged to sit under the instruction of godly teachers. Dr. James DeYoung, in particular, greatly influenced me through his passionate, humble, and challenging lectures and conversations. Dr. DeYoung's excitement for studying the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament was contagious, and I took as many courses in this topic as I could, developing my Th.M. thesis on Paul's use of the Old Testament in Ephesians 5. The final stage of the journey occurred at The Southern Baptist Theology Seminary. At Southern, I have again been blessed to sit under the teaching and influence of inspiring and challenging scholars such as Dr. Tom Schreiner, Dr. John Polhill, Dr. Jonathan Pennington, Dr. Jim Hamilton, and Dr. Peter Gentry. I am especially grateful for Dr. Mark Seifrid, whose scholarly work and passionate teaching both influenced and inspired me, and whose encouragement, assistance, and criticism has helped bring this dissertation into reality.

As grateful as I am for these professors who have encouraged, critiqued, and inspired me, this journey would have been empty and, very likely, short-lived were it not for my family. My parents, Mark and Linda, and my in-laws, Luke and Donna, have generously supported and graciously encouraged this endeavor (in spite of the 2,200-mile distance from their grandkids). My siblings, Laura, Matt, Michael, Hallie, Andrew,

Kendall, Jake, Rose, Adam, and Emily, have entered into this journey and shown invaluable support and sacrifice to love me and my family during this endeavor. Our children, Isaiah, Alaythia, and Sophia, have been such a source of joy during both the good times and dark times of this past season. Though young, they have felt the weight of this journey and yet, consistently reminded me that my identity is not dependent on my successes or failures as a Ph.D. student. In his mercy, God has taught us that our only comfort in life and in death is that we belong to our faithful savior Jesus Christ. Lastly, and most significantly, is my wife, Natalie. Because of her support, encouragement, kind critique, and belief in the goal, I can truly say that this has been *our* journey. Together we have experienced God's trying, refining, overwhelming, gracious, and, at times, confusing providence in the hope of fulfilling the task he put before us. Natalie, this project would not have been accomplished without you, and its accomplishment is much sweeter because it has been with you. You and me together . . .

Matthew Godshall

Louisville, Kentucky

December 2013

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The question of Jesus' identity lies at the heart of Luke's two-volume work. Through the speeches of his characters, his own editorial comments, and his unique arrangement of the material, Luke provides an answer to the question, Who is Jesus?¹ This feature of Luke-Acts is rightly observed by Beverly Gaventa when she asserts, "By following the developing story, readers are being taught about the identity of Jesus."² This dissertation aims to carefully follow the developing narrative of Luke-Acts in order to uncover one particular aspect of the Lukan identity of Jesus.

New Testament (NT) scholars have recognized and articulated the complexities of Lukan Christology. For example, Eduard Schweizer's concession, "Lukas enthält keine eindeutige Lehre über Christus"³ is echoed by Stephen Wilson who

¹Concern for Jesus' identity is accentuated through the explicit questions in Luke's Gospel regarding Jesus' identity; cf., e.g., τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἀμαρτίας ἀφήσιν; (Luke 7:49); τίς δὲ ἐστὶν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; (9:9); σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (7:19); τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι; (9:18); and ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; (9:20). It is also underscored through the various speeches in Acts, most of which attempt to articulate a proper understanding of Jesus' identity to the respective audience (e.g., Acts 2:14-36; 3:12-26; 4:8-22; 5:27-32; 7:1-53; 8:26-37; 10:34-43; 13:13-52; 17:22-31; 22:1-21; 24:10-21; 26:12-32). Some speeches also attribute the crucifixion of Jesus to the failure of the Jewish leaders and people to recognize (ἀγνοέω) Jesus' true identity (e.g., Acts 2:22-24; 4:26-28; 13:27).

²Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Learning and Relearning the Identity of Jesus from Luke-Acts," in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 155. See, Larry Chouinard, "Gospel Christology: A Study of Methodology," in *New Testament Interpretation and Methods: A Sheffield Reader*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 81: "The Christology of a Gospel is not limited to one theme or title. The narrator unfolds his estimation of Jesus as the story unfolds. A christological investigation of the Synoptic Gospels must take seriously the rich and varied avenues through which a writer leads his readers into an awareness of the significance of Jesus."

³Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 253.

attributes this lack of clarity to the fact that Luke “was a somewhat indiscriminating collector of christological traditions who transmits a variety of traditional terms and concepts without reflecting upon them individually or in conjunction with each other.”⁴ Understandably, however, most NT scholars have not been content with describing Lukan Christology as ambiguous or contradictory, and, in turn, have attempted to provide models for synthesizing Luke’s diverse descriptions of Jesus. Ironically, however, both the quantity and diversity of these various syntheses only add weight to the conclusions of Schweizer and Wilson. Modern NT scholars have proposed the following controlling categories for explaining Luke’s Jesus: he is only human, divine, angelomorphic, preexistent, not preexistent, subordinate to God, adopted by God, equal with God, the Davidic Messiah, the Prophetic Messiah, a new Adam, and the list goes on.⁵

⁴S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles* (London: 1979), 80.

⁵The following works are representative of these categories. (1) Only Human: John Drury, “Luke, Gospel of,” in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. R. J. Loggins and J. L. Houlden (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 413; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 137; (2) Divine: Douglas H. Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke’s Christology*, SNTSMS 89 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); (3) Angelomorphic: Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); (4) Preexistent: Simon J. Gathercole, *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006); (5) Not Preexistent: François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research*, 2nd ed., rev. (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 136; James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 51; (6) Subordinate to God: Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960); Eric Franklin, *Christ The Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975); (7) Adopted by God: Christopher M. Tuckett, “The Christology of Luke-Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. Joseph Verheyden (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 155; (8) Equal with God: C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2006; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006); (9) The Davidic Messiah: Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Yuzuru Miura, *David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism*, WUNT 232 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); (10) The Prophetic Messiah: Paul Rederick Feiler, “Jesus the Prophet: The Lukan Portrayal of Jesus as the Prophet Like Moses” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986); P. M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 68; Luke Timothy Johnson, “The Christology of Luke-Acts,” in *Who Do You Say That I Am?* ed. Mark Allan Powell and David R. Bauer (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 49-65; (11) A New Adam: Craig A. Evans, “Jesus and the Spirit: On the Origin and Ministry of the Second Son of God,” in *Luke and Scripture*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 26-45.

The purpose of this dissertation is neither to resolve every perceived incongruity within Luke's narrative descriptions of Jesus nor to harmonize every title and event under one controlling category.⁶ Instead, I hope to contribute to this complex conversation by analyzing one particular Lukan motif in order to uncover its christological significance for the Lukan Jesus. This dissertation seeks to determine how Luke's development of the Spirit-giver motif helps to answer the question, Who is Jesus?

Jesus And The Spirit

Despite the various opinions regarding the Christology of Luke-Acts, almost all scholars agree that Jesus' relation to the Holy Spirit plays an identity-shaping role in the narrative. In particular, the Holy Spirit's descent upon Jesus (Luke 3:21-22) functions in the narrative to answer the question, Who is Jesus? This identity-shaping role is demonstrated by the immediate description of Jesus as God's son (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός; 3:22) and Jesus' own identification of himself as the Spirit-anointed Servant in Isaiah 61:1-2 (Luke 4:18-21). Furthermore, the programmatic function of this latter passage suggests that Luke intended for all of Jesus' earthly ministry to be defined by the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit.⁷ Joel Green rightly notes, "Jesus' operation under the anointing of the Spirit is one of the chief ways Luke presents Jesus, both in the Gospel and, in retrospect, in Acts."⁸

⁶The phrase "controlling Christology" is used throughout this paper to indicate the Christology that orders or regulates all that Luke writes about Jesus in Luke-Acts. As noted above, many scholars have sought to uncover this controlling Christology in Luke-Acts. One of the corollaries of this thesis is questioning this scholarly *Tendenz* to subsume all of Luke's descriptions of Jesus under one controlling category. For a helpful overview of the various "controlling Christologies" proposed by Lukan scholars, see Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose*, 3-24. He identifies eighteen "controlling Christologies." Cf. François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 123-224.

⁷In addition to the emphasis of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit in Luke 3:22 and 4:18, Luke also stresses the presence of the Spirit upon Jesus during his wilderness temptation. Luke describes Jesus as πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (4:1a), ἤγγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (4:1b) and as returning to Galilee ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος (4:14).

⁸Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, NTT (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 43. In Acts 10:38 Peter sums up the earthly ministry of Jesus as follows: Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ

The narrative significance of Jesus’ reception of the Holy Spirit has been appropriately developed by scholars.⁹ Although the specific conclusions regarding *how* the Spirit functions to identify Jesus are as diverse as the conclusion regarding the Lukan Jesus as a whole,¹⁰ they all—more or less—can be categorized under the heading of “Jesus’ humanity.”¹¹ That is, Jesus’ reception of the Holy Spirit functions in Luke-Acts to emphasize what a majority of scholars consider to be Luke’s primary contribution to NT Christology: a strong accentuation of Jesus’ humanity. The so-called “low Christology” of Luke-Acts presents a fully-human Jesus, dependent upon God, subordinate to God, and the agent of God’s judgment and restoration. The attention Luke gives to the Holy Spirit’s presence upon Jesus serves to corroborate this portrayal.¹² This significance was observed by Augustine around the beginning of the fifth century when he wrote, “Accepit quippe [Spiritum] ut homo”¹³ and by Helmut Flender in the middle of the twentieth century in his claim that “The statements about Jesus’ endowment with the

Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διήλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

⁹E.g., Robert Koch, *Geist Und Messias*, BBTAT (Wien: Verlag Herder, 1950); Max-Alain Chevallier, *L’Esprit et le Messie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1958); Aaron J. Kuecker, *The Spirit and the ‘Other’: Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*, LNTS 444 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011); Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997); Youngmo Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul*, PBM (Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2005).

¹⁰Jesus’ reception of the Holy Spirit identifies him as a prophet, the prophet like Moses, the Servant of Yahweh, the Messiah, the Davidic Messiah, the Son of God, the new Adam, the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit, eschatological Israel or various combinations.

¹¹Klaus Issler, “Jesus’s Example: Prototype of Dependent, Spirit-Filled Life,” in *Jesus in Trinitarian Perspective*, ed. Fred Sanders and Klaus Issler (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2007), 213.

¹²Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah*, 349, succinctly summarizes the scholarly consensus of subordinationist Christology in Luke-Acts: “The primary reason for such claims is Luke’s consistent portrayal of Jesus as the agent or instrument in the salvation-historical plan accomplished *by God*.”

¹³Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 15.46: “As you see, he received [the Spirit] as a man.”

Holy Spirit thus serve . . . [to] describe him as a man who like other men receives the Holy Spirit as a gift.”¹⁴

This connection between Jesus’ reception of the Holy Spirit and Luke’s emphasis on his humanity is further strengthened when one considers the story of Israel in the Old Testament (OT). In the OT “receiving” the Holy Spirit—whether promised or realized—is an experience particular to humanity: Yahweh and angels are never described as receiving the Holy Spirit. In view of the Spirit’s role in Israel’s story, one can invert Richard Bauckham’s formulation on Jesus’ *divine* identity¹⁵ to characterize Luke’s formulation of Jesus’ *humanity*: Luke includes Jesus in the unique identity of humanity by deliberately and comprehensively using a characteristic of human identity to characterize Jesus.¹⁶

This brief overview highlights the role that Jesus’ reception of the Holy Spirit has played in scholarly constructions of Lukan Christology. However, in Luke-Acts, the presence of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus is not the only way Luke relates Jesus to the Holy Spirit. For a sufficient understanding of Lukan Christology one must not only take into account Jesus as receiver of the Holy Spirit but *also* Jesus as the giver of the Holy Spirit. In fact, this latter motif functions as a important *Leitmotiv* in the narrative development of Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 3:15-18; 11:13; 24:49; Acts 1:1-11; 2:14-26; 5:31-32; 8:14-17; 10:44-48; 11:16-18; 15:8-9; 16:7; 19:1-6). And yet, despite its significance for Luke’s two-volume narrative, NT scholars, in general, have neglected to consider how this motif contributes to the narrative identity of Jesus. The primary question motivating this dissertation is, How does Jesus’ role as giver of the Holy Spirit contribute to his identity

¹⁴Helmut Flender, *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*, trans. Reginald H. Fuller and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 137.

¹⁵See below for a description of Bauckham’s hermeneutic of divine identity Christology.

¹⁶For further analysis of the relationship between Jesus’ identity and his reception of the Holy Spirit, see chap. 4, “Israel’s God and Israel’s Messiah: The Shared Identity of the Spirit-giver in Luke’s Gospel.”

in Luke-Acts? If his reception of the Holy Spirit functions to identify Jesus with humanity, with whom, or how does his giving (or pouring out) of the Holy Spirit identify him?

Thesis

In what follows, I argue that Luke's narration of the Spirit-giver motif has an identity-shaping function that complements Luke's depiction of Jesus as receiver of the Spirit. Specifically, Luke develops this motif in such a way as to identify Jesus with the God of Israel. For Luke, in pouring out the Holy Spirit Jesus' divine identity is revealed.¹⁷ My aim is not to reverse the scholarly trend and argue for a "high Christology" instead of a "low Christology" in Luke-Acts; nor am I suggesting that the human portrait, which Luke clearly paints, is to be *replaced* by a divine portrait. Rather, I am proposing that Luke narrates a Jesus who is both human *and* divine. Jesus is both receiver and giver of the Holy Spirit and both of these motifs need to be held together in order to correctly understand the Jesus Luke sought to present to his readers.

¹⁷As Augustine, *De Trinitate*, 15:46, also understood, "effudit [Spiritus] ut deus" (he poured out [the Spirit] as God). Augustine appears to have understood the identity-shaping function of Jesus' reception and giving the Spirit. For Augustine, it is most absurd (*absurdissimum*) to suggest that Jesus did not have the Holy Spirit until his baptism. Since John, the forerunner and servant of Jesus is said to have received the Spirit while in the womb of his mother, Augustine rhetorically asks, "What should be understood about the one whose conception was not fleshly but spiritual?" The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at his baptism was not his reception of the Spirit in the sense that he had not have it before, rather, it was, for Augustine, a means of revealing his human nature. He writes, "In eo etiam quod de illo scriptum est, quod acceperit a patre promissionem spiritus sancti et effuderit utraque natura monstrata est, et humana scilicet et diuina. Accepit quippe ut homo, effudit ut deus." ("Each nature, certainly both human and divine, was revealed in that which was also written about him, that he received and poured out the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father. You see, he received as man and poured out as God."). Cyril of Alexandria also concluded that the act of baptizing with the Spirit was a revelation of Jesus' divine identity. Commenting on John's promise in Luke 3:16, Cyril writes, "And this too is of great importance for the proof and demonstration that Jesus is God and Lord. For it is the sole and peculiar property of the Substance that transcends all, to be able to bestow on men the indwelling of the Holy Ghost." See Cyril of Alexandria, *A Commentary Upon the Gospel According to St. Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith (Oxford: University Press, 1859), 39.

History of Research

The following *Forschungsgeschichte* primarily highlights scholars who have written monographs on Lukan Christology or Lukan theology in general. A summary of each author's interpretation of Lukan Christology is provided while paying particular attention to the way Jesus' reception and/or giving of the Spirit has been employed within each christological framework.

Hans Conzelmann

At the beginning of the twentieth century, Luke's Gospel was considered "the stronghold of the liberal, humanitarian interpretations of Jesus."¹⁸ Luke's emphasis on history and Jesus' humanity led many to dismiss Luke as a theologian since Luke was more concerned with history than providing theological reflection. William Manson's description of Luke's Gospel in 1930 represents this scholarly characterization of Luke. Manson wrote, "Luke is less intellectual and less theological than Matthew."¹⁹ But with the publication of Henry J. Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts*²⁰ and Martin Dibelius' studies on Acts²¹ scholarly attention began to shift from Luke as a mere historian and collector of early traditions to Luke as an author whose personal theology is reflected in his unique editing and arranging of his sources.

¹⁸C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*, A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture 6 (London: Epworth, 1961), 22.

¹⁹William Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930), xxii.

²⁰Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927). Darrell Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lukan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 27 characterizes Cadbury's work as "a seminal redaction-critical work before the rise of redaction criticism."

²¹Martin Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951). Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 4, acknowledges Dibelius as one who was interested in understanding Luke's own interpretation of his material.

The programmatic research of Hans Conzelmann brought Luke's work as a theologian to the forefront of Lukan studies. In 1954 he published *Die Mitte der Zeit*, in which he sought to complement form-criticism (*Formgeschichte*) and its attempt to uncover the pre-Synoptic form of the original *kerygma* by analyzing Luke's Gospel and Acts "in its present form" (*in seiner jetzigen Gestalt*).²² He observed that in the attempt to uncover the original form of Luke's materials scholars had neglected the literary framework into which Luke had incorporated the *kerygma*.²³ Conzelmann proposed that an analysis of this literary framework would allow one to uncover the theology of Luke himself. Thus, for Conzelmann, Luke was more than a receiver and transmitter of the *kerygma*; he was also its interpreter. He writes, "Modern research concerns itself essentially with the reliability of [Luke's] reporting, but if we are interested in the first place not in what is reported, but in the report as such, the problem takes a different form: what is Luke's conception of the meaning of his account."²⁴

For Conzelmann, Luke's theology differs from the other Gospel writers, particularly in his view of "salvation history" and eschatology (i.e., the problem of the delay of the Parousia). Although the latter provides the impetus for his writings, it is the former that provides the interpretive framework for Luke's reflection on the *kerygma* and the Parousia's delay. Conzelmann saw in the structure of Luke's work a *Heilsgeschichte* divided into three distinct but interrelated stages: (1) *Zeit Israels*; (2) *Zeit des Wirkens Jesu*; (3) *Zeit seit der Erhöhung des Herrn, auf Erden Zeit der Kirche*.²⁵ This three-stage *Heilsgeschichte* is foundational for a proper interpretation of the Gospel and Acts. Conzelmann, subsequently, interpreted Luke's Christology within this larger construct.²⁶

²²Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 1.

²³Ibid., 3.

²⁴Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 12.

²⁵Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 9.

He writes, “Die Lukanische Christologie ist dargestellt durch die Entfaltung der Stellung Christi in der Mitte der Heilsgeschichte.”²⁷

Although Luke does not explicitly reflect on the relation between the Father and Son (as, for example, John’s Gospel), Conzelmann perceives “a definite conception of it implied and assumed in Luke’s account, which we have to deduce from indirect references.”²⁸ From these “indirect references” (e.g., Acts 2:36), Conzelmann concludes that Luke presents Jesus’ relation to God in purely subordinistic terms. Thus, all the titles, deeds, and teachings of Jesus are interpreted by Conzelmann through the controlling category of “subordination.”²⁹ Conzelmann observes, “There is no mention of the co-operation of a preexistent ‘Son,’ for the idea of pre-existence is completely lacking—an aspect of Luke’s subordinationism. The plan of salvation is exclusively God’s plan, as Acts 2:7 makes plain, and Jesus’ function within it is that of an instrument.”³⁰ In addition, he argues, “We find a clear subordinationism, which derives from tradition and is in harmony with Luke’s view of history. Jesus is the instrument of God who alone determines the plan of salvation.”³¹

Conzelmann argues that Luke’s emphasis on the Spirit’s presence upon Jesus further highlighted this subordinationism. In his discussion of Luke 3:21-22, Conzelmann observes the close link between the Spirit’s descent and prayer. He writes, “In the passage we are considering the motif of the Spirit and that of prayer are linked together and both indicate the same two-fold relationship of Jesus to God and to the

²⁶Ibid., 10: “Ist auf diese Weise die Gestalt Jesu in einen großen Rahmen eingebaut.”

²⁷Ibid., 158: “Luke’s Christology is depicted through the unfolding of the position/status of Christ in the middle/center of salvation-history.”

²⁸Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 173.

²⁹Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, 159.

³⁰Ibid.

³¹Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 184.

world, *that of subordination and pre-eminence.*”³² However, it is not only Jesus’ reception of the Spirit that indicates his subordination to God; Jesus’ giving of the Spirit likewise demonstrates this subordinationism since even in this he is dependent upon God. “If the Son can baptize with the Spirit (Luke 3:16) or, to be more exact, can pour out the Spirit (Luke 24:49)—after his exaltation and not before—it is only because he has received the Spirit from the Father for this very purpose (Acts 2:33).”³³

In his attempt to uncover the theology of Luke, Conzelmann laid the foundation for the study of Lukan Christology. His interpretation of “salvation-history” in Luke-Acts, and the way in which Luke’s Christology fits into this schema continues to influence Lukan scholarship. He rightly noted the identity-shaping function Jesus’ reception of the Spirit plays in Luke-Acts and his proposal that the Spirit links Jesus with humanity (i.e., Israel and the Church) has been further developed by Lukan scholars, who, like Conzelmann, have connected this motif to the category of “subordinationist Christology.” In his development of Jesus’ subordination to the Father, Conzelmann attempted to align every title and action under this category, leading to the conclusion that if Luke’s Jesus is subordinate to God, there is no way that Luke can present him in any way as equal with God. Conzelmann’s interpretation of Jesus’ role as Spirit-giver is thus subsumed under this controlling category without allowing its significance for Luke’s Christology to either stand on its own or provide a unique contribution to Jesus’ identity.

Helmut Flender

In 1964 Helmut Flender completed his doctoral thesis at Friedrich-Alexander University of Erlangen-Nürnberg entitled, “Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des

³²Ibid., 180 (italics added). His notion of “pre-eminence” is that Jesus is unique among all humans since in his ministry the Spirit rested upon him alone.

³³Ibid., 174.

Lukas.” Flender built upon the redaction-critical work of Conzelmann and sought to understand the presuppositions of Luke’s thought, which guided his interpretation of the traditions he received.³⁴ For Flender, a dialectic exists in Lukan theology. Although Luke wrote within a post-apostolic context, he did not focus on Jesus as the one who is Proclaimed (as Paul did), but rather, as the Proclaimer. “This is because in some sense the old aeon still continues. The post-apostolic Church shares the basically changed situation brought about by the fact of Jesus, while at the same time it is still moving with Jesus towards the final renewal of the world.”³⁵ He connects Jesus’ relation to the Holy Spirit to what he sees as a two-stage Christology in Luke and Acts (i.e., the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord).³⁶ On the one hand, Luke’s statements about Jesus’ endowment with the Spirit (Luke 3:22; 4:18) “distinguish Jesus as one who stands in a specially close relationship to God with a unique commission. But they also describe him as a man who like other men receives the Holy Spirit as a gift.” But on the other hand, in pouring out the Spirit (Acts 2:33) Jesus’ position as exalted Lord is demonstrated.³⁷

Although Flender does not suggest that the act of pouring out the Spirit identifies Jesus as divine, he does see divine Christology in Luke’s use of the title *ὁ κύριος* with reference to Jesus. In fact, Flender offers a unique and helpful contribution to Lukan Christology (especially in the wake of Conzelmann’s influence) by holding together Luke’s earthly and heavenly descriptions of Jesus.³⁸ While Conzelmann, and others after him, attempted to subsume all of Luke’s Christological themes under the

³⁴Flender, *St. Luke*, 1, 6.

³⁵*Ibid.*, 163.

³⁶*Ibid.*, 41-56.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 137-38.

³⁸*Ibid.*, 52: “This theological pattern, with its equal emphasis on the earthly and heavenly life of Jesus, explains why Luke, as is well known, refers to Jesus as *ὁ κύριος*, thus exalting him to divine status, but at the same time lays special emphasis on his earthly character.”

category of “subordinationist,” Flender maintains a both/and approach to Luke’s divine and human descriptions of Jesus.

Eric Franklin

In his analysis of Luke’s theology, Franklin attempted to recover the significance of eschatology in Luke-Acts. Reacting to Conzelmann’s “salvation-historical” paradigm, which mistakenly replaced eschatology with salvation-history, Franklin argued that the delay of the parousia did not force Luke to reduce eschatology but to reinterpret it.³⁹ For Luke, the end was no longer “thought of as the event which guaranteed the claims made on behalf of Jesus. This for him was rather provided by the ascension.”⁴⁰ Thus, God’s eschatological activity was not reserved for a future, indefinite period of time, but through Jesus’ ascension and his position as Lord, God was bringing about the fulfillment of these eschatological promises.

As Conzelmann subordinated Luke’s Christology to his theology of salvation-history, Franklin subordinated Luke’s Christology to his eschatology. However, with Conzelmann, Franklin argues that Luke’s Christology is primarily subordinistic. One of Franklin’s key arguments in favor of this claim is Luke’s use of the OT to characterize Jesus. For example, regarding Luke’s emphasis on Jesus’ obedience to the Father he concludes the following:

It is this understanding of God, grounded completely in its Old Testament proclamation, that is ultimately responsible for the subordinationism and lack of metaphysical speculation which is rightly seen to characterize Luke’s Christology. . . . Once more, this is primarily because of the Old Testament influence. It was this source which determined his presentation of Jesus whom he saw as God’s final act for Israel, one with the instruments of the old covenant, and the fulfillment of their hopes. In him, Israel’s history reached its eschatological climax.⁴¹

³⁹Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 6.

⁴⁰Ibid., 6-7.

⁴¹Ibid., 76.

Thus, Luke was concerned with depicting Jesus “as the climax of God’s activity in Israel” and showing that in and through Jesus God was fulfilling the eschatological promises made to his people.⁴² Franklin developed the significance of the promise-fulfillment theme in Luke-Acts by demonstrating how Luke’s portrait of Jesus as Lord, Messiah, Suffering Servant and Prophet is shaped by the OT.⁴³

Franklin does not develop the motif of Jesus’ role as Spirit-giver and its contribution to Luke’s Christology other than to align it under the controlling category of “subordinationism.” In commenting on Jesus’ exaltation and the subsequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Acts 2 he writes, “Luke sees Jesus as wholly subordinate to the Father, given a share in the Father’s authority, but one which is derived from the Father. He is still the instrument of the Father and is still called his servant (Acts 3:26; 4:30).”⁴⁴

Max Turner

Turner has produced one of the most influential and comprehensive monographs on Lukan pneumatology.⁴⁵ In addition, he has also contributed significantly to the study of Lukan Christology by developing the significance of Jesus’ role as the Spirit-giver in Acts, cogently arguing that Jesus’ relation to the Spirit in Acts entails a strong “divine Christology.”⁴⁶ His argument can be summarized in five points. First, according to the “pre-Lukan tradition” of Acts 2:33 Jesus receives the Spirit in the sense

⁴²Ibid., 7.

⁴³Ibid., 69.

⁴⁴Ibid., 54.

⁴⁵Max Turner, *Power from on High*, JPTSup 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

⁴⁶Max Turner, “Jesus and the Spirit in Lukan Perspective,” *TynB* 32 (1981): 1-42; idem, “The Spirit of Christ and Christology,” in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*, ed. Harold Rowdon (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1982), 168-90; idem, “The Spirit of Christ and ‘Divine’ Christology,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 413-36; idem, *Power from on High*, 267-317.

that he now has the power to administer the Spirit. Second, from Luke's perspective this means that "Jesus has somehow achieved that 'lordship' in respect to the gift of the Spirit . . . which Joel predicates of *God*."⁴⁷ Third, Jesus' relation to the Spirit in Acts is unparalleled by anything said in Judaism with respect to the Messiah and the Spirit. Fourth, the claim made in Acts 2:33 within the context of Judaism would have been understood as a claim to divinity.⁴⁸ In addition, Turner suggests that Luke's description of Jesus' relation to the Holy Spirit parallels that of John and Paul which further supports the argument of a divine Christology in Acts.⁴⁹

Turner has provided the most comprehensive analysis of Jesus' role as Spirit-giver and its contribution to Lukan Christology, and any future work on this motif is dependent upon the foundation he has provided. One weakness in Turner's approach, however, is the disconnect between Jesus as Spirit-giver in Acts and Jesus as the one who will baptize with the Spirit in Luke 3:15-17. For Turner, "to baptize with the Holy Spirit" does not mean "to pour out" or "to give" the Holy Spirit, thus John the Baptist did not announce a Messiah who would "give" or "pour out" the Holy Spirit. He writes,

Judaism was probably not able to conceive of any messianic figure *bestowing* the eschatological Spirit on Israel, and it is unlikely that John the Baptist himself . . . took the very radical step of asserting it. It is intrinsically much more likely that his words about the Stronger One 'baptizing' Israel with Spirit and fire refer to the effect *on* Israel of the advent of her messiah mightily endowed with the Spirit, than that they anticipate his giving the Spirit *to* Israel.⁵⁰

In other words, John did not look forward to a Messiah who would pour out the Spirit upon Israel, he rather looked forward to a Messiah whose actions would lead to the promised, eschatological Spirit being bestowed upon the people. The difficulty with this disconnect is that in Luke's development of this motif, he explicitly links John's

⁴⁷ Ibid., 414 (italics original).

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 414-16.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 180; idem, "The Spirit of Christ and 'Divine' Christology," 419-20.

prophecy with the out pouring of the Spirit at Pentecost (e.g., Acts 1:4-8; 11:14-18). Thus, Luke interprets “he will baptize with the Holy Spirit” as synonymous with Jesus sending the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49) or pouring out the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33; 11:16).

Darrell Bock

Bock provides a redaction-critical study of Luke’s use of the OT and the way in which it shapes his portrait of Jesus.⁵¹ Through his analysis of Luke’s alteration or insertion of new material within traditional pericopae, and his arrangement of the individual units into a flowing narrative, Bock proposes that Luke presents “a shift of emphasis as he develops his OT christological portrait.”⁵² Namely, Luke employs the OT to progress his presentation of Jesus from the foundational picture of a regal Messiah-Servant to the climactic declaration that Jesus is Lord.⁵³ Thus Bock sees an intentional development of the Lukan portrait of Jesus. Luke begins with the fundamental description of Jesus as Messiah-Servant (Luke 1-2; 3:22; 4:17-19; 9:35), under which the descriptions of Jesus as prophet are subsumed (Luke 4:17-30; 7:22; 13:34-35). The descent of the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:21-22) upon Jesus confirms this image of Messiah-Servant and also empowers Jesus for his Messianic task.

Yet as the Gospel progresses Luke begins “to challenge the reader clearly and specifically to expand his concept of Jesus as Messiah beyond the picture of either an earthly deliverer or the Davidic heir through the use of the OT.”⁵⁴ This challenge begins with Jesus’ identification of himself as David’s κύριος (Luke 20:41-44; Ps 110:1) and as ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου of Daniel 7:13-14 (Luke 21:27); a challenge heightened through the

⁵¹Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, JSNTSup 12 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987). This monograph is an updated version of his Ph.D. thesis: Darrell Bock, “Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern” (Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1982).

⁵²Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy*, 262.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Ibid., 148-49.

conflation of these images in Luke 22:69.⁵⁵ In light of this christological progression in Luke's Gospel, Bock concludes, "The definitions of these two [titles] centered in concepts that point to a messianic figure who is more than an esteemed regal fulfillment figure. It will be interesting to see whether this expansion of the portrait of Jesus continues in Acts."⁵⁶

For Bock, the expansion of the portrait continues in Acts where Luke further unveils the identity of Jesus as *κύριος*. Through the use of Joel 3, Psalm 16, and Psalm 110 in Peter's Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:14-41), Luke advances his portrait of Jesus, which reaches its climax as he reveals the full significance of Jesus as *κύριος*.⁵⁷ Specifically, Luke presents Jesus as *κύριος* in the same way that Yahweh is *κύριος*. Bock argues,

By the time Peter gets through the citation of Ps 110 and speaks of Jesus as Lord and messiah it is clear that Jesus is *κύριος* in the same way that God is, because he sits at God's side doing his work. Peter is saying implicitly: and now you can see that in light of Joel 3, Ps 16, and especially Ps 110, the *κύριος* on whom the reader or listener is to call is Jesus. Jesus shares God's presence, God's task, God's authority, and therefore he can share God's name. He sits in God's presence in heaven as no-one else can do. Jesus and God are so united in their purpose that the Lord God calls men to respond to the Lord, Jesus Christ (2:36, 39).⁵⁸

Luke employs the OT in such a way as to demonstrate that Jesus is more-than-Messiah. Through his sharing of the name *κύριος*,⁵⁹ his exaltation to the right hand of God, and his pouring out of the Holy Spirit Jesus in fact has a status equal with God.⁶⁰

⁵⁵Ibid., 149.

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷Bock's study continues through Acts 13, but the focus here will be on Acts 2.

⁵⁸Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy*, 185.

⁵⁹Although *κύριος* is generally understood to be a title in Luke-Acts, it is also the translation in the LXX of the divine name Yahweh. In Joel 3:1 (LXX), which is quoted in Acts 2:21, *κύριος* is used in this way.

⁶⁰Ibid.

Bock's analysis of the way Luke employs the OT to shape his depiction of Jesus is a significant contribution to Lukan Christology. First, he is right to stress the unfolding or developing portrait of Jesus in Luke-Acts. Luke's Christology does not come to us as a systematic treatise or in propositional statements, but rather, through a narrative. Therefore, attention to the way Luke arranges his material to tell the story is essential for grasping the image of Jesus Luke intends his readers to receive. Second, in his attempt to carefully follow Luke's use of the OT to shape the identity of Jesus he does not collapse all of Luke's Christology into one controlling category. He rather sees a Christology in Luke-Acts that is both "low" and "high." Jesus is the expected Messiah, but he is also more than the expected Messiah.

Despite these strengths, there are some weaknesses in Bock's analysis. Though not intending to do so, this developmental approach to Luke's Christology could imply that after the resurrection Jesus became something he was not before the resurrection.⁶¹ The argument that the christological picture of Jesus in Luke-Acts progresses from that of "Messiah-Servant" to "divine Lord" suggests that as Messiah-Servant Jesus was not the divine Lord or that as the divine Lord Jesus is not the Messiah-Servant. Although Bock rightly stresses the way Luke uses the title/name *κύριος* to identify Jesus with the God of Israel in Acts 2-5, he does not emphasize the significance of Luke's use of *κύριος* in Luke 1-2, which likely has the same function. In light of this use of *κύριος* in Luke 1-2, there is not a development of Jesus as the Messiah-Servant (Luke 1-19) who then becomes the divine Lord (Luke 20-Acts 13) but rather an unfolding

⁶¹This is a common description of Luke's Christology. Cf. Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 222. Bovon summarizes the development of Lukan Christology from the Gospel to Acts with the following statement: "The flesh becomes Word: Jesus, the messenger, becomes the message." Many appeal to Acts 2:36 to claim that Jesus became *κύριος* only after the resurrection and exaltation: *ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε*. Yet scholars do not claim that Jesus became *Χριστός* only after the resurrection and exaltation and thus the evolutionary interpretation of Acts 2:36 is doubtful. For an exegetical analysis that interprets Acts 2:36 in light of the entire Lukan narrative, see C. Kavin Rowe, "Acts 2.36 and the Continuity of Lukan Christology," *NTS* 53 (2007): 37-56.

narrative of the divine Lord who is the Messiah-Servant. Furthermore, this use of *κύριος* parallels the motif of Jesus' relation to the Holy Spirit. Jesus is not the Spirit-receiver (Luke 3:21-22) who becomes the Spirit-giver (Acts 2:33) but rather he is the Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16-17) who is also the Spirit-receiver.

Paul Frederick Feiler

In his dissertation on Lukan Christology, Feiler seeks to determine whether and how Luke portrays Jesus as the prophet like Moses (Deut 18:15).⁶² The only explicit identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses is found in Acts 3:22-23, but the concept is not limited to this isolated incident. In fact, "Luke develops a Mosaic prophetic portrayal of Jesus in the Gospel despite the absence of the title."⁶³ For evidence, Feiler points to the way Luke defines Jesus as a prophet through merging a number of prophetic conceptions, paralleling descriptions of Jesus with description of Moses in Acts 7:17-53,⁶⁴ and placing Mosaic motifs at programmatic points in the narrative.⁶⁵ Whereas Mark Strauss (see below) has attempted to show how the Davidic-Messiah theme is the controlling christological category in Luke-Acts under which the prophetic theme is subsumed, Feiler shows how the prophet-like-Moses theme is the controlling christological category under which the Davidic theme is subsumed.⁶⁶

Feiler argues that Acts 3:22-23 is the climax of the prophet-like-Moses motif in the Gospel and also functions programmatically for the subsequent narrative in Acts.

⁶²Feiler, "Jesus the Prophet," 288.

⁶³Ibid., 290.

⁶⁴Ibid., 291. Feiler states, "Jesus is a prophet mighty in word and deed, who comes to deliver a message of salvation, but is rejected by his own people."

⁶⁵Ibid. These motifs occur at the beginning of Jesus' mission (the temptation); the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem (transfiguration) and after the resurrection (Cleopas' words on the Emmaus road).

⁶⁶Ibid., 208-35.

First, this description of Jesus as the prophet like Moses, to whom the people must listen, “introduces the theme of the ‘soteriological imperative,’ a theme that recurs throughout Acts.”⁶⁷ Second, this passage “serves as a bridge between Jesus’ warnings about Jewish unbelief and the realization of these warnings in Acts.”⁶⁸

Feiler does not explicitly link Jesus’ role as Spirit-giver to his prophet-like-Moses identity. However, Jesus’ baptism with the Spirit does play an identity shaping role in his Christology. In light of the way Luke builds toward the quotation of Isaiah 61:1-2 in Luke 4:18, Feiler argues that “the presence of the Spirit to Jesus in the baptism scene helps establish his prophetic identity at the beginning of his ministry.”⁶⁹

Douglas Buckwalter

In his monograph on Lukan Christology, Buckwalter aims to “push open a few doors in the study of Luke-Acts and NT christology” by relating Christology to Luke’s overall purpose in writing and by determining how Luke’s purpose shapes his Christological portrait.⁷⁰ One of Buckwalter’s unique contributions to the discussion of Lukan Christology is the method he proposes for determining a unifying Christology in Luke-Acts. He suggests that a unifying Christology should,

(1) coincide with Luke’s purpose in writing, (2) plausibly explain his redactional motives and the unique literary features of Luke-Acts, (3) resolve the stated ostensible christological tension between the Lukan expressions of Jesus’ Lordship and subordination, and, above all, (4) explain the character and purpose of his diverse christologies.⁷¹

These four requirements provide the basic outline to Buckwalter’s work and, after addressing each requirement, he is able to make a conclusion about the purpose of

⁶⁷Ibid., 290.

⁶⁸Ibid.

⁶⁹Ibid., 132.

⁷⁰Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke’s Christology*, 30.

⁷¹Ibid, 31.

Christology in Luke-Acts. Luke writes, according to Buckwalter, “to show his readers how Jesus’ life stands as the ethical model for Christian living and how the early church has imaged his likeness in their own life and witness.”⁷² Buckwalter parallels Luke’s humiliation-exaltation Christology and its corollary, Christian discipleship, with the Christ hymn in Philippians 2.⁷³ This parallel is demonstrated in two ways. “First, as with the body of the hymn in Philippians 2:6-11, Luke similarly structures the two volumes according to the states of Jesus’ humiliation and exaltation. Second, as with Paul’s preface to the hymn in Philippians 2:5, Luke shapes the content of both volumes according to the idea of discipleship: living as the master lived.”⁷⁴

More could be said about Buckwalter’s comprehensive analysis of Lukan Christology and its relation to Philippians 2, but the rest of this summary will address his emphasis on the contribution the theme of Jesus as giver of the Spirit makes to Lukan Christology. His is the first monograph to specifically address how this motif functions to shape the identity of Jesus in Luke-Acts. Buckwalter first observes its significance in his chapters dealing with Luke’s revisions of Mark. Although Luke incorporates Mark’s tradition of John the Baptist’s announcement of the Messiah who will baptize with the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:15-17; Mark 1:4-8), he also expands on this prophecy in a way that reveals his own Christology.⁷⁵ The significance of this expansion is climactically revealed in Acts 2 where Luke begins to describe Jesus’ relation to the church in ways that parallel the OT’s description of Yahweh’s relation to his people. This parallel is demonstrated through the ascription of the divine name to Jesus, Jesus’ personal manifestations, and Jesus’ relation to the Holy Spirit. This latter point is demonstrated in two ways. First,

⁷²Ibid., 281.

⁷³Ibid., 231-74.

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵The other “revisions” Buckwalter addresses are the resurrection and salvation history.

the work of Jesus in giving the Holy Spirit: “The OT clearly states that the Spirit is always closely associated with Yahweh and exclusively given by him. But according to Acts 2, Luke identifies Jesus instead of the Father as the means of salvation . . . and the Giver of the Spirit (2:33).”⁷⁶ Second, the role of Holy Spirit in manifesting the presence of Jesus resembles the way the Holy Spirit manifested the presence of Yahweh in the OT.⁷⁷

Buckwalter has clearly gone against the grain of Lukan scholarship by demonstrating how the motif of Jesus as Spirit-giver contributes to a high Lukan Christology. First, he helpfully identifies parallels between Jesus’ relationship to the Spirit in Acts and Yahweh’s relationship to the Spirit in the OT. Second, like Bock and Flender, Buckwalter does not collapse every christological motif into one controlling category; he rightly interprets Luke as having both a low and high Christology.

However, despite the great strengths of this volume, there are some weaknesses with Buckwalter’s approach. First, Buckwalter’s interpretation of John the Baptist’s prophecy (Luke 3:15-18) overemphasizes Luke’s redaction of Mark and underemphasizes the narrative co-text in which it occurs. Second, Buckwalter does not demonstrate why Jesus’ role as Spirit-giver is unique in its potential for identifying him with God and not just as another subordinistic agent acting on behalf of God (e.g., a prophet).⁷⁸ Third, Buckwalter does not fully develop the relation of Yahweh to the Holy Spirit as revealed in the OT and Second Temple literature nor does he address the relation of the Messiah to the Holy Spirit in this literature. In order to support the claim that Jesus’ role as Spirit-giver includes him in the unique, divine identity and that this relation to the Holy Spirit moves beyond that anticipated of the Messiah in Jewish literature, a

⁷⁶Ibid., 279-80.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 280.

⁷⁸Tuckett, “Christology,” 155-56, criticizes Buckwalter on this point.

study of the *act* of giving the Spirit in both OT and Second Temple literature is needed. Buckwalter provides a compelling picture of Lukan Christology and its relation to his literary purpose and his work points to the need for further research focusing explicitly on the *narrative* development of Jesus' role as Spirit-giver and its intertextual relationship to Yahweh's identity as the Spirit-giver in the OT.

Mark L. Strauss

Strauss explores the significance of the function of Davidic messianism for Luke's "christological purpose."⁷⁹ He proposes that the theme of Jesus as the coming king from the line of David is the key christological category for Lukan Christology.⁸⁰ To develop his thesis he demonstrates that Luke introduces Davidic messianism into christological sections that are both introductory and programmatic for his two-volume work (e.g., Luke 1-2; Acts 2:14-41; 13:13-52). Furthermore, this programmatic function of Davidic messianism does not contradict the portrait of Jesus as a prophet, a theme which many scholars have argued is the dominant christological category in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 4:16-30; Acts 3:17-26).⁸¹ For Strauss, Luke's christological presentation parallels the correspondence in Isaiah between the coming Davidic king of Isaiah 9 and 11 and the prophet-herald of Isaiah 61.⁸² In light of the parallels he draws between the portrait of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts and Isaiah, Strauss concludes: "Luke links the Jesus event particularly to the Isaianic portrait of eschatological salvation, where the messianic deliverer is at the same time prophet, servant and king."⁸³

⁷⁹Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah*, 34. Strauss distinguishes "Luke's Christology" from his "christological purpose" in Luke-Acts. The former is Luke's total conception of who Jesus is, while the latter is "the particular message concerning Jesus [Luke] wishes to pass on to his readers."

⁸⁰Ibid., 9.

⁸¹Cf. Johnson, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," 49-65.

⁸²Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah*, 199-262.

⁸³Ibid., 343.

The Spirit's descent upon Jesus plays a significant role in Luke's Davidic Christology. In view of Luke 4:18-19, Strauss interprets the descent of the Spirit as a messianic anointing and empowering for ministry. He argues, "As the Spirit of Yahweh came upon David (ἐπὶ Δαυὶδ) to empower him from the moment of his anointing (1 Sam 16:13), and as the Davidic messiah was prophesied in Isaiah 11:2 to be the bearer of the Spirit, so Jesus at his baptism is anointed by the Spirit and commissioned for his messianic task."⁸⁴ Conversely, the giving of the Holy Spirit does not play as prominent a role in Strauss' Davidic Christology. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit simply confirms Jesus' exaltation to the right-hand of the Father and authenticates him as the promised Davidic Messiah. Commenting on Acts 2:33, Strauss states, "Peter offers the outpouring of the Spirit as indirect proof of the exaltation and so links his christological conclusion to the Pentecost event. The Spirit-inspired *glossalia* which the hearers are experiencing is the result of Jesus' exaltation to the right hand of God."⁸⁵

In addition to these references, Strauss also provides two brief comments regarding the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the identity of Jesus. In his conclusion, he, on the one hand, criticizes Buckwalter's claim that the act of giving the Spirit implies a divine Christology in Luke-Acts; but, on the other hand, Strauss tentatively proposes that, "Jesus' status as Lord of the Spirit, mediator of salvation and judge of the world all suggest a very high Christology, perhaps even implying divine status."⁸⁶ In light of this "tentative" proposal, Strauss acknowledges the need for further work to be done in the area of divine Christology in Luke-Acts

Strauss offers a compelling argument for Davidic Christology as the primary christological category in Luke-Acts. His synthesis is able to account for many of the

⁸⁴Ibid., 203.

⁸⁵Ibid., 141.

⁸⁶Ibid., 351. Strauss calls for further research in the area of divine Christology in Luke-Acts.

christological motifs employed by Luke to describe Jesus and the parallels he finds between Luke and Isaiah helpfully demonstrate the intersect between the categories of Prophetic and Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts. However, his ambiguity toward the existence of divine Christology demonstrates one of the difficulties that exists with establishing a controlling Christology for Luke-Acts. As with Franklin and Conzelmann before him, Strauss attempts to force all of Luke's Christological categories under one controlling theme and as a result he does not attempt to interpret the theme of Jesus as giver of the Holy Spirit as having a unique function in shaping Luke's portrait of Jesus.

Joel Green

In his succinct volume on the theology of Luke's Gospel, Green provides an insightful summary of the significance of the Holy Spirit to Luke's presentation of Jesus. "Jesus' operation under the anointing of the Spirit is one of the chief ways Luke presents Jesus, both in the Gospel and, in retrospect, in Acts."⁸⁷ Green suggests that the conception of Jesus by the Spirit (Luke 1:32-35) and his anointing with the Spirit (Luke 3:21-22; 4:16-21) identify Jesus as the Son of God.⁸⁸ However, Green does not develop the contribution Jesus' role as Spirit-giver makes to his identity in Luke's Gospel. Although noting the appearance of this theme throughout the Gospel (Luke 3:16; 11:13; 24:49), his emphasis is on the solidarity between Jesus and his followers in receiving the Holy Spirit.⁸⁹

Jacob Jervell

Jervell's volume on the theology of Acts is published in the same series as Green's. Jervell connects Luke's Christology with his emphasis on history; however, he

⁸⁷Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 43.

⁸⁸Ibid., 44.

⁸⁹Ibid., 46.

does argue (contra Conzelmann) that “the driving force of Luke’s Christology is not some notion of a constitutive salvation-history with Jesus as the decisive ‘mid-point of time.’”⁹⁰ Rather, Luke’s Christology “has to be seen as the climax of God’s activity in Israel and, through Israel, with ‘the rest of mankind’ (Acts 15:14ff).”⁹¹ Due to Luke’s intention of connecting Jesus to the larger story of God’s dealings with his people, Jervell sees an emphasis in Luke’s Christology on Jesus’ subordination to God. This is evidenced clearly in Luke’s ascription of the cause of Jesus’ resurrection to God (e.g., Acts 2:22, 32; 3:26; 13:33, 34; 17:31) whereas the other NT authors imply that Jesus rose by his own power (e.g., 1 Thess 4:14; Mark 8:31; 9:9, 31; 10:34; 16:6; John 20:9).⁹² In addition, Luke describes the exalted Christ as “a remarkably passive figure and it is hard to see that he has any real function.”⁹³ Jesus’ function is limited to sitting a God’s right hand, pouring out the Spirit and his future involvement in the judgment of the world.⁹⁴ Thus, for Jervell, Jesus’ role in pouring out the Spirit does not help to shape his identity, but simply confirms Luke’s overall description of Jesus’ status as one who is subordinate to God.

And yet, in his discussion of the Holy Spirit in Acts, Jervell comments, “It is decisive for Luke that the Spirit is God’s Spirit.”⁹⁵ It is clear that, for Jervell, the Holy Spirit is “God’s Spirit” (ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, Acts 2:17 [LXX Joel 3:1]; ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου, Luke 24:49); however, Luke also describes the Holy Spirit as

⁹⁰Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*, NTT (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 34.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Ibid., 32. He writes, “The difference in vocabulary shows that the Lucan Christology has a tone of subordination: God is at the centre and Jesus is managed by his Father.”

⁹³Ibid., 33.

⁹⁴Ibid.

⁹⁵Ibid., 43.

τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Acts 16:7).⁹⁶ Indeed, the two references in Acts to the Holy Spirit as [τὸ] πνεῦμα κυρίου (Acts 5:9; 8:39) may also be interpreted as references to τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ. Although Jervell is correct to stress Luke’s emphasis on the Spirit as “God’s Spirit,” this makes the fact that Luke can also refer to the Holy Spirit as “the Spirit of Jesus [the Lord]” all the more significant. In describing Jesus’ relation to the Holy Spirit, Luke does so in ways that parallel his own description (as well as descriptions in the OT) of Yahweh’s relation to the Holy Spirit.

Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis

Fletcher-Louis uses Luke-Acts as a test case for applying his theory of “angelomorphic”⁹⁷ categories for the development of Christology in the early church. Although acknowledging the existence of a low Christological perspective in Luke-Acts, Fletcher-Louis also recognizes that there is more going on than merely a subordinationist Christology.⁹⁸ In addition to this low Christology, he sees a “conspicuously high Christology”⁹⁹ existing in the narratives after Jesus’ resurrection. This high Christology is evident in the way Luke presents Jesus as being and doing for the church what Yahweh alone was and did for Israel. This is prominent in the way Luke uses the title κύριος for

⁹⁶For a helpful analysis which examines the christological significance of this phrase, see G. Stählin, “Τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apostelgeschichte 16:7),” in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honor of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 229-52.

⁹⁷Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 27. The term “angelomorphic” was originally coined by Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. J. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 117-46. Fletcher-Louis offers the following definition: “wherever there are signs that an individual or community possesses specifically angelic characteristics or status, though for whom identity cannot be reduced to that of an angel” (15).

⁹⁸Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 20-21. He points to the following passages and themes as evidence for a low Christology: the genealogy that stretches back to Adam (Luke 3:23-38), the various trials that Jesus undergoes in the beginning of the Gospel (Luke 4:1-12), the emphasis Jesus places on the importance of social justice and engagement with the marginalized (e.g., Luke 9:51-56; 14:13), Jesus’ table fellowship with the outcasts of society (e.g., Luke 5:29-31; 7:36-50; 10:38-42), the portrait of Jesus as a prophet, and the lack of explicit indications of Jesus’ divinity.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 21.

Jesus, even applying the title to Jesus where in the OT it translates the Tetragrammaton (e.g., Acts 2:21 citing Joel 3:5).¹⁰⁰ There are additional parallels between the risen Jesus and Yahweh in the OT: the worship Jesus receives (Luke 24:52), the prayers made to him (Acts 7:59-60; Acts 1:24), the invoking of his name in baptism (Acts 2:38; 10:48; 19:4; 22:16), and the portrayal of Jesus dispensing the Spirit (Acts 2:33).

However, Fletcher-Louis does not limit the existence of this “transcendent material” to Acts; he also finds it in Luke’s Gospel. He writes, “This very high view of the risen Jesus is also pertinent for an understanding of the earthly Jesus, since Luke is particularly interested to portray a line of essential continuity in the identity of Jesus between the two volumes.”¹⁰¹ Thus the Lukan portrait of the Son of Man, Jesus’ claim to forgive sins (Luke 5:17-26), the stilling of the storm (Luke 8:22-25), and the transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36) all point to a more-than-human figure in the Gospel.

In view of this tension between a human and divine portrait of Jesus (i.e., a low and high Christology), Fletcher-Louis considers the relevance of angelomorphic categories for Lukan Christology. Although not reducing Jesus’ identity to that of an angel, he argues that Luke employs “angelomorphic” categories to narrate this more-than-human character of Jesus. That is, angelic categories (as presented in the OT and Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period) provide the primary conceptual resource that Luke draws from in order to articulate the divinity of Jesus.

Although I do not find Fletcher-Louis’ angelomorphic category persuasive for explaining how Luke (or the other NT authors) presents Jesus as more-than-human, his monograph does make a helpful contribution to Lukan Christology.¹⁰² Unlike Conzelmann and Franklin and, in some ways, Strauss, Fletcher-Louis does not subsume

¹⁰⁰Ibid.

¹⁰¹Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 23.

¹⁰²For a critique of Fletcher-Louis’ position, see J. C. O’Neill, review *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, by Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *JTS* 50, no. 1 (1999): 225-29.

all of Luke's portrait of Jesus under one controlling christological category. Rather, he affirms both the human and divine emphases in the narrative development of Jesus' identity that is consistent in *both* Luke's Gospel and Acts. This both/and approach to Lukan Christology allows the various categories that Luke uses to describe Jesus to make their unique contribution without collapsing one into the other. This approach better explains the diverse Christology of Luke-Acts.

Christopher Tuckett

Tuckett helpfully wrestles with the methodological challenge of searching for a Lukan Christology.¹⁰³ Tuckett suggests that Luke's tendency is to be a "conservative redactor" of his sources¹⁰⁴ and so he does not attempt to synthesize the diverse portraits of Jesus he presents to his readers.¹⁰⁵ Thus when reading his narratives "we cannot necessarily simply repeat the words of characters in the story and see them as a direct reflection of Luke's own views."¹⁰⁶ In other words, the Lukan writings may give us a "Christology of Luke-Acts" but not necessarily the theology of Luke himself.¹⁰⁷

Tuckett, following in the tradition set by Conzelmann, argues that Luke emphasizes Jesus' humanity¹⁰⁸ and his subordination to God.¹⁰⁹ In addition, he strongly

¹⁰³Christopher M. Tuckett, *Luke*, T & T Clark Study Series (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1996; repr., New York: T & T Clark International, 2004); idem, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," 133-64; idem, *Christology and the New Testament: Jesus and His Earliest Followers*.

¹⁰⁴Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," 161. In addition, Tuckett observes, "Luke is above all a historian and he seems genuinely aware of the fact that the story he is recounting lies in the historical past. He is thus aware of the pastness of the past in a way that other NT writers, and other gospel writers, may not be" (136).

¹⁰⁵*Ibid.*, 164.

¹⁰⁶*Ibid.*, 136.

¹⁰⁷For Tuckett, this means that although Luke himself may hold to a divine Christology he did not force his theological belief into his narrative presentation of Jesus.

¹⁰⁸Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament*, 137.

opposes any form of “divine Christology” and forcefully criticizes the work of Bock and Buckwalter.¹¹⁰ For Tuckett, Luke’s presentation of Jesus as the giver of the Spirit fits within his overall presentation of Jesus as an agent acting on God’s behalf. It does not provide a unique contribution to Lukan Christology.

C. **Kavin Rowe**

Rowe analyzes the use of *κύριος* in Luke’s Gospel and the role it plays in shaping the “narrative identity” of Jesus. His primary argument is two-fold. First, Rowe argues that Luke positions *κύριος* within the movement of the narrative “in such a way as to narrate the relation between God and Jesus as one of inseparability, to the point that they are bound together in a shared identity as *κύριος*.”¹¹¹ Second, “the development of *κύριος* throughout the entire Gospel narrative serves to tell the human or earthly story of the heavenly Lord.”¹¹² For Rowe, Jesus does not *become* *κύριος* as the story develops or progress into someone he was not in the beginning. He writes, “there are not two figures, one Jesus of ‘history,’ as it were, and another exalted Lord, but rather only one: the Lord who was *κύριος* even from the womb.”¹¹³

Rowe’s contribution to Lukan Christology is substantial. Although other scholars have argued for a ‘high’ Christology in Acts based upon Luke’s use of *κύριος* to identify both Jesus and the God of Israel (e.g., Flender, Bock, and Buckwalter), Rowe

¹⁰⁹Ibid., 143. Tuckett argues that this subordination is emphasized by Luke because he is “as much interested in Jesus from the point of view of ‘theo’-logy, that is, the idea of God” (143). In other words, Jesus’ identity is determined by what God has done to and through him. For example, it is God who raises Jesus from the dead (Acts 2:32-33; 3:15; 4:10; 5:31), God declares Jesus to be his son (Luke 3:22; 9:35), God works miracles through Jesus (Acts 2:22), God has made Jesus Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36) and Jesus is a man chosen by God to do his will (Acts 2:22; 17:31).

¹¹⁰Ibid., “Christology,” 155-156.

¹¹¹Rowe, *Narrative Christology*, 27.

¹¹²Ibid.

¹¹³Ibid.

provides a cogent argument for this identical function of *κύριος* in the Gospel. This identification of Jesus with the God of Israel through the title *κύριος* begins in the infancy narrative, in which Luke creates an intentional ambiguity regarding the referent of *κύριος*. Rowe argues that the way Luke introduces Jesus into the story as *κύριος* in Luke 1:43 (“the mother of my *κύριος*”) “effects a duality in the referent of the word *κύριος*, which then allows the ambiguity of 1:17 (‘to prepare for the *κύριος*’), 1:76 (‘you will go before the *κύριος* to prepare his ways’), and 3:4 (‘prepare the way of the *κύριος*’) to emerge narratively with theological force.”¹¹⁴ Thus as the narrative unfolds the story shifts focus from *κύριος θεός* to the *κύριος χριστός*, which, for Rowe, has significant implications for the narrative identity of Jesus: “The narrative itself is the theology: the coming of the *κύριος χριστός* is the coming of *κύριος θεός*. The opening of the Gospel thus narrates, in the move from promise to active fulfillment, the presence of the God of Israel in the life of Jesus.”¹¹⁵

Although Rowe does not deal explicitly with the theme of Jesus as Spirit-giver, I believe his work suggests several implications for rethinking the contribution of this motif to Lukan Christology, especially with regards to John the Baptizer’s announcement concerning the coming one who “will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire” (Luke 3:16). Due to the inclusion of this tradition in all four Gospels, scholars have tended to interpret the accounts identically (at least the Synoptics) or have simply highlighted Luke’s redaction of Mark and Q. However, the narrative approach employed by Rowe demands that this verse be read, not within the context of its pre-synoptic form, but rather within the whole of Luke’s narrative (especially its immediate co-text: 1:5-3:22). John’s announcement follows Luke 1:1-3:6, in which his ministry is presented as the fulfillment of Isaiah 40:3—he is the one “to prepare the way for the *κύριος*” (Luke 1:17, 76; 3:4). If

¹¹⁴Ibid., 200.

¹¹⁵Ibid.

in fact “the opening of the Gospel thus narrates . . . the presence of the God of Israel in the life of Jesus,”¹¹⁶ then John’s announcement of the one who will baptize with the Spirit should be interpreted within this theological co-text. In addition, a narrative reading of Luke’s orderly (*καθ’εξῆς*) account will allow the early reference to the act of giving the Spirit (i.e., 3:16) to influence the interpretation of the subsequent references (e.g., 11:13; 24:49; Acts 2:1-41).

David Höhne

A monograph that has explored the way in which the Holy Spirit functions to identify Jesus in Luke-Acts is Höhne’s monograph entitled, *Spirit and Sonship*.¹¹⁷ Höhne provides a “theological” reading of Luke-Acts by applying Colin Gunton’s proposal that “particularity be understood as an eschatological work of the Holy Spirit.”¹¹⁸

Specifically, Gunton proposed that the activity of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus characterizes him as divine,” and that the Spirit worked “transcendently to enable the incarnate Son to be truly or prototypically human.”¹¹⁹

Within this conceptual framework, Höhne sees in Luke-Acts that “the Spirit . . . act[s] with and for the Son to perfect his identity in relation to God and his people as the events of the Scriptural drama reach a climax.”¹²⁰ This is first evidenced in Luke’s narrative by the Spirit’s role in Jesus’ conception (Luke 1:32-35) where the Spirit shapes the identity of Jesus by “locating him at the anticipated climax of Israel’s drama as the

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷David A. Höhne, *Spirit and Sonship*, ANCT (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010). Höhne’s monograph is the publication of his Ph.D. dissertation: David Allen Höhne, “The Spirit and Sonship: Colin Gunton’s Theology of Particularity” (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 2006).

¹¹⁸Höhne, *Spirit and Sonship*, 20. It is my understanding that “particularity” entails the concept of identity, that is, it explains who someone is. Who Jesus is, or his particularity, lies in his relation to Israel and Israel’s God. For Höhne, this relational matrix is realized by the Holy Spirit.

¹¹⁹Ibid., 21.

¹²⁰Ibid., 41.

son of David; the agent of divine salvation.”¹²¹ The identity-shaping function of the Holy Spirit continues at Jesus’ baptism. Here Jesus’ particularity in relation to Israel and God is demonstrated. With reference to the latter, the Spirit identifies Jesus as God’s “most intimate other.”¹²² With reference to the former the Spirit identifies Jesus as unique; that is, “From among the people and in preference to John, God designates Jesus as the Messiah with the Spirit.”¹²³ This identity-shaping function of the Holy Spirit climaxes in Acts 2 where Peter explicitly links Jesus’ identity to the out pouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33). Through pouring out the Spirit, the Son mediates the filial relationship with the Father and yet, at the same time, his absolute sonship is preserved “because he is the one to whom God gives the prerogative of opening filial relations in the Spirit to others.”¹²⁴

Conclusion

This overview of modern scholars and their understanding of Lukan Christology suggests the need for a study that explores the christological significance of the motif of Jesus as the Spirit-giver in Luke-Acts. Despite the importance of this motif for Luke’s own narrative, there has yet to appear a thorough study devoted to this topic. In general, most scholars have downplayed the unique contribution this act makes to Luke’s portrait of Jesus and have subsumed it under their own controlling Christological category. Even the pioneering and compelling contributions of Turner and Buckwalter point to the need for further study. There is a need for a study which, (1) analyzes the narrative development of this theme throughout the whole of Luke-Acts, (2) connects Luke’s depiction of Jesus as giver of the Spirit to a thorough analysis of the description of

¹²¹ Ibid., 45.

¹²² Ibid., 99.

¹²³ Ibid., 98.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 167.

Yahweh as giver of the Spirit in the OT and the literature of the Second Temple period, and (3) relates this motif with Luke's emphasis on Jesus as receiver of the Holy Spirit. This study will therefore focus exclusively on the motif of the Spirit-giver in order to uncover its significance for Lukan Christology.

Method

When choosing a method for uncovering the Christology of Luke-Acts, one should take into account Luke's own description of his two-volume work in the preface to his Gospel.¹²⁵ First, he locates his volumes alongside the writings of others who had composed "a narrative (διήγησις) concerning the things which have been fulfilled among us" (Luke 1:1), and second, he claims to have written his narrative "in order" (καθεξῆς; 1:3). Although the precise meaning of διήγησις and καθεξῆς are disputed, it is reasonable to conclude that Luke intended his readers/hearers to gain certainty concerning the things they were taught (1:4) by following the sequential development of his testimony to Jesus and the apostles through the whole of his two volumes. It is the narratives themselves that bear theological meaning, and careful attention to the sequential development of each narrative is the proper means for discovering Luke's witness to Jesus.¹²⁶

¹²⁵I view the prologue in Luke 1:1-4 as encompassing both the Gospel and Acts and interpret the prologue in Acts 1:1-3 as connecting Luke's second volume with his *πρῶτον λόγον*. I recognize that the literary relationship between Luke and Acts is not without its own methodological challenges (for a vigorous polemic questioning the literary and theological unity of Luke-Acts, see Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993]), but am persuaded that Cadbury, in general, was correct. The Gospel and Acts "are a single continuous work. Acts is neither an appendix nor an afterthought. It is probably an integral part of the author's original plan and purpose" (Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 9). James. D. G. Dunn, *Christ and the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 20, argues that any theology of Luke must take into account the fact that he wrote two volumes. He suggests that the significance of this fact "implies that there is a continuity and interconnectedness between the two parts of Luke's twofold composition which should prohibit us from drawing conclusions regarding Luke's christology from only one part, or from one part independently of the other." For helpful essays discussing the unity (as well as the disunity) of Luke-Acts, see Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010).

¹²⁶Rowe, *Narrative Christology*, 12-14.

This claim suggests that the method known as narrative or literary criticism is the one most appropriate for studying Christology in Luke-Acts because its approach is consistent with Luke's own description of the nature of his work. First, the narrative approach locates meaning within the text itself rather than behind or in front of the text. Second, the literary approach seeks Luke's meaning within the movement of the story since, "It is of primary importance to locate *where* something occurs in Luke's narrative. The connections between individual vignettes are as important as their respective contents. The sequence itself provides the larger meaning."¹²⁷ In view of this understanding of literary criticism, I will attempt to determine how the passages describing Jesus as Spirit-giver contribute to his narrative identity through exegesis which takes into account each text's placement, development, and intra-textual links within the whole of Luke's two-volume work.¹²⁸

In addition to concern for intra-textual exegesis, literary criticism also takes into account the inter-textual links an author makes to other texts.¹²⁹ The importance of

¹²⁷Johnson, *Luke*, 4. Feiler, "Jesus the Prophet," 23, helpfully categorizes Luke-Acts as a "plotted-narrative." For Feiler, Luke-Acts is a "narrative" in the sense that its "final form reflects a coherent, intelligible world in which the identity of the characters resides . . . in the sum of the actions and comments about actions which occurs throughout the time and space of the text." It is "plotted" in the sense that Luke-Acts is "temporally and logically sequenced by devices that provide continuity of character and theme from scene to scene."

¹²⁸This emphasis on literary criticism is not intended to deny the relevance of redaction criticism for Gospels studies, but it does recognize its limitation. Although I regard Luke's use of Mark for his Gospel as probable, the existence of Q as a written document is more doubtful, and the sources underlying Acts remain hidden within the text itself and therefore redaction criticism cannot be applied to the second volume. Thus the claim to be able to determine Lukan theology through analyzing the way Luke edited his sources does not provide a sure footing for theological formulation in Luke-Acts (*contra* Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*, 79-81; cf. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Lucan Portrait of Christ," *NTS* 2 [1955-56], 160, who writes, "The best way in which we may hope to form some idea of Lucan thought is to examine the use which he has made of material derived from Mark and that which he shares in common with Matthew."). For example, a narrative interpretation of John the Baptizer's prophecy (3:16-17) is determined by Luke's *positioning* of this tradition within the co-text of chaps. 1-3 of his Gospel and his *development* of this motif throughout Luke-Acts.

¹²⁹Joel B. Green, "Narrative Criticism," in *Methods for Luke*, ed. Joel B. Green (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 83, describes Luke-Acts as a narrative within a narrative. That is, Luke intentionally situates his story of Jesus and the early church within the "continuation of the

the OT for Lukan Christology is well known and, yet, its significance for the Spirit-giver motif has not been adequately explored. It is, therefore, necessary to discover the echoes to Yahweh's role as Spirit-giver in the Jewish Scriptures that Luke creates in narrating Jesus' role as Spirit-giver. However, merely noting these OT echoes is not enough. In order to grasp the full significance of these inter-textual links this dissertation employs a methodology established by Richard Bauckham. Up to this point allusions have been made to Bauckham's paradigm-shifting work, but it is now necessary to briefly summarize his approach and demonstrate how I see my work as building upon his method for interpreting Lukan Christology.

In his book *God Crucified*, Bauckham addresses the relationship between Jewish monotheism and New Testament Christology.¹³⁰ He argues that the high Christology reflected in the NT authors (e.g., Paul and John) developed within a Jewish, monotheistic context by the NT authors including Jesus in the unique identity of the one God.¹³¹ Bauckham focuses on the way in which Second Temple Judaism characterized the uniqueness of God (i.e., his "divine identity"). That is, "How did they answer the question, 'Who is God?'" Bauckham considers God's identity as analogous (though not identical) with human identity in that it is defined by his character and personal story.¹³² He writes, "In the narratives of Israel's history . . . God acts as a character in the story, identifiable in ways similar to those in which human characters in the story are

redemptive story, in which divine promises to Abraham are shown not to have escaped God's memory but indeed to be in the process of actualization in the present."

¹³⁰Richard Bauckham, *God Crucified* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998). This book was recently republished as the first chapter in a collection of Bauckham's essays on Christology: idem, *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 1-59. Neil MacDonald, *Metaphysics and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), xvii, pays tribute to the influence of Bauckham's work by stating, "This brilliant little book provided much of the initial impetus to thinking about God in terms of the concept of divine identity instead of the patristic concept of divine *ousia*."

¹³¹Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 3.

¹³²Ibid., 6.

identifiable. He has a personal identity, as Abraham and David do.”¹³³ In other words, there are characteristics of God that make his identity unique from all other reality and these characteristics constitute his “divine identity.”

Bauckham proposes that the unique, divine identity is *especially* (though not exclusively) characterized in the Jewish Scriptures and the Jewish Second Temple literature by two features: “that the one God is sole Creator of all things and that the one God is sole Ruler of all things.”¹³⁴ God’s identity is characterized by his unique roles as the creator and sovereign ruler, which, according to Bauckham, are roles reserved exclusively for Yahweh. The intermediary figures in the Jewish literature such as principal angels and exalted patriarchs do not “participate in the exercises of God’s rule by sharing the divine throne, but only carry out God’s will as servants.”¹³⁵

Against the backdrop of this Jewish notion of Yahweh’s divine identity, Bauckham develops the significance of the inclusion of Jesus within the divine identity by the early church: “They include Jesus in the unique divine sovereignty over all things, they include him in the unique divine creation of all things, they identify him by the divine name which names the unique divine identity, and they portray him as accorded the worship which, for Jewish monotheists, is recognition of the unique divine identity.”¹³⁶ Thus the way the NT authors articulate the deity of Jesus is not through describing his divine nature, but by ascribing to him those very roles which were particular to Yahweh. From the earliest stage of New Testament Christology, the concern was to articulate the identification of Jesus with God.¹³⁷

¹³³Ibid.

¹³⁴Ibid., 18.

¹³⁵Ibid.

¹³⁶Ibid., 19.

¹³⁷Ibid., 176.

Bauckham, thus far, has focused primarily on Yahweh's role as creator and ruler; however, I believe his role as Spirit-giver can also be added to the list of characteristics constituting the "unique divine identity" (especially his "eschatological identity"; see chap. 2, "The Giving of the Spirit and the Unique Identity of Yahweh"). The role of giving or pouring out the Holy Spirit was one reserved for Yahweh alone and was not a role shared by any intermediary figure. In his development of Jesus as the giver of the Spirit, Luke seems to intentionally connect it with the description of Yahweh as Spirit-giver. In so doing, he parallels other NT writers who include Jesus in the divine identity by attributing to him characteristics unique to Yahweh.¹³⁸

The chapters of this work will proceed as follows. Chapter 2 provides an analysis of the OT texts that portray Yahweh as pouring out/giving the eschatological Spirit (Ezek 36:26-27; 37:1-14; Isa 4:4; 32:15; 44:3; Joel 3:1-5; Zech 12:10). The purpose of this chapter is to understand how that *act* of giving the Spirit in the age to come contributes to Yahweh's unique divine identity. The chapter presents three ways the prophets associate this eschatological act with Yahweh's identity as Israel's God: (1) the act of giving the Spirit is consistently portrayed as an act of new creation and new exodus and is thus connected with Yahweh's unique identity as the creator and deliverer of Israel; (2) the act of giving the Spirit is particular to Yahweh; no other figure is portrayed as acting in this role on behalf of Yahweh; (3) the act of giving the Spirit is presented as a means by which Israel will know Yahweh in the age to come. Like his past acts of creation and redemption, which function in the OT to identify Israel's God, the act of giving the Spirit will function, in the age to come, to identify Israel's God.

¹³⁸I am aware of criticisms leveled against Bauckham's approach, but do not believe these alternative approaches explain the texts of the Second Temple Period and the New Testament as well as Bauckham's model. See, e.g., Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation*, WUNT 207 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 22-24; James F. McGrath, *The Only True God* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 10-23; James D. G. Dunn, *Did the First Christians Worship Jesus? New Testament Evidence* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 141-45. However, I have found that Bauckham's analysis better explains the texts of both the Second Temple Jewish literature and the New Testament.

There has yet to appear a study focusing exclusively on the *act* giving the eschatological Spirit and its relation to Yahweh's divine identity. Since the OT provides the source for Luke's Spirit-giver motif, this chapter provides an important foundation for studying the *act* of giving the Spirit in Luke-Acts.

Chapter 3 examines the *act* of giving the Spirit as portrayed in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. As with chapter 2, this chapter is not concerned with Jewish pneumatology in general, but with the way in which the act of giving the Spirit is depicted. Since Luke himself wrote within the theological and literary stream of early Judaism, it is necessary to examine the development of the Spirit-giver motif in this literature. Does the portrayal of this *act* cohere with the OT prophets in associating it with the unique identity of Israel's God in the age to come? This chapter argues that the Second Temple portrait of the Spirit-giver is consistent with that found in the OT: (1) the act of giving the Spirit is consistently portrayed as an act of new creation and (2) the act of giving the Spirit is reserved for Yahweh alone; no intermediary figures participate in this act. In addition to examining the literature of the Second Temple period, this chapter, briefly, looks at the act of giving the eschatological Spirit in the Rabbinic literature.

In view of the conclusions reached in chapters 2 and 3, the portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver, in and of itself, represents a divine Christology (as Max Turner has argued). However, this conclusion tells us little about *Luke's* Christology. Therefore, chapter 4 demonstrates that Luke's unique development of the Spirit-giver motif does in fact reflect a divine Christology. This is seen in the following ways: (1) the "high Christology" of the Lukan co-texts, in which Jesus is characterized as the Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16; 24:49); (2) Luke's unique depiction of the Father as giver of the eschatological Spirit (11:13); and (3) the intertextual links with passages from Isaiah and Ezekiel which depict Yahweh as the giver of the eschatological Spirit. Building on the research of Kavin Rowe, this chapter shows that Luke uses the Spirit-giver motif to bind

the identity of Jesus to the identity of Israel's God, such that they cannot be separated in their role as Spirit-giver.

Chapter 5 builds upon the conclusions reached in chapter 4 and shows that the christological significance of the Spirit-giver motif continues in Luke's second volume. Acts 2 describes the fulfillment of the Spirit-giver promises in Luke 3:16, 11:13, and 24:49. In the actualization of this promise, the portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver also reveals a Lukan divine Christology. This is evident in the following ways: (1) Luke portrays both Jesus and Israel's God as acting in this role (they share the identity of the Spirit-giver), (2) the co-text in which Jesus is depicted as the Spirit-giver reflects a "high Christology," and (3) the allusions to Isaiah and Ezekiel, as well as the citation of Joel 3:1-5 link this act of giving the Spirit with Yahweh's divine identity. In addition, this chapter also examines the significance of the three additional references in Acts to "God" as the Spirit-giver (5:31; 11:17; 15:8) and addresses potential objections to the thesis. Chapter 6 provides a summary and conclusion of the research.

CHAPTER 2

THE GIVING OF THE SPIRIT AND THE UNIQUE IDENTITY OF YAHWEH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The goal of this chapter is to understand how the descriptions of Yahweh as the giver of the Spirit in the age to come contribute to his unique divine identity in Israel's Scriptures.¹ It is necessary to begin with an analysis of Yahweh's role as the giver of the Spirit before analyzing Luke's descriptions of Jesus as the giver of the Spirit because the symbolic world from which Luke drew from to tell his story of Jesus is shaped (primarily) by the Old Testament. Luke, like the other Gospel authors, was "fundamentally conditioned by the biblical stories of God's dealings with his people Israel. . . . All four canonical gospels developed within the matrix of Israel's scripture: the Old Testament was the *generative milieu* for the gospels, the original environment in which the first Christian traditions were conceived, formed and nurtured."² Once conclusions are reached regarding the giving of the Spirit and Yahweh's identity in the

¹In this chapter the term "Old Testament" (OT) designates the *Tanak*, or the body of authoritative literature that Luke designates ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, οἱ προφῆται, καὶ ψαλμοὶ (Luke 24:44) or πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί (Luke 24:27). For a helpful analysis of whether or not these terms in Luke 24:27, 44 designate the Hebrew Bible in general and, in v. 44, a multi-division (*eine Mehrteilung*) of the Hebrew Bible in particular, see Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 258-62. Cf. Marvin A. Sweeney, *Tanak: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 3-41.

²Richard B. Hays, "The Canonical Matrix of the Gospels," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*, ed. S. C. Barton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 53. For a comprehensive analysis of how the OT storyline both shapes and is shaped by the NT authors' presentation of Jesus, see G. K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 16. I appreciate Neil MacDonald's method for doing biblical theology that reads the NT from the context or perspective of the OT (a "back-to-front" model); however, I do not think an either/or option is necessary: Jesus is interpreted by the OT *and* is himself the appropriate lens for interpreting the OT. See Neil B. MacDonald, *Metaphysics and the God of Israel: Systematic Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 187.

OT, it is then possible to ask if and how Yahweh's identity as the giver of the Spirit shapes Luke's narrative descriptions of Jesus.

The thesis of this chapter is that the act of giving the Spirit *is* an act integral to Yahweh's unique divine identity in the age to come. Although that act of giving the Spirit is not commonly employed to characterize Israel's God, it is an act so particular to Yahweh that it contributes to his incomparability and thus distinguishes him from all others. The following reasons will be argued in support of this thesis: (1) the act of giving the Spirit in the age to come is linked with Yahweh's identity as the sole creator and Israel's redeemer; (2) the act of giving the Spirit is linked with explicit references to Yahweh's identity; (3) the act of giving the Spirit is an act which is not shared by any other character in the OT. Before proceeding with these arguments, however, it is necessary to provide justification for connecting the act of giving the Spirit with Yahweh's identity and to describe the primary acts which are used in the OT to articulate Yahweh's unique divine identity.

Methodological Justification: The Relationship Between Action and Identity

Studies that analyze the action of "giving the Spirit" are primarily concerned with the meaning of נָתַן and so incorporate this act into the larger systematic category of OT pneumatology.³ As a result, this action is interpreted in light of its contribution to understanding the function, identity, and/or, significance of the Spirit. Without denying

³Cf. Lloyd Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972); Claus Westermann, "Geist im Alten Testament," *EvT* 41 (1981): 223-30; Robert T. Koch, *Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991); Michael Welker, *Gottes Geist: Theologie des Heiligen Geistes* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993); Wilf Hilderbrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995); John R. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009); John W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, WUNT 251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008). For an exception to this general trend, see Mehrdad Fatehi, *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul: An Examination of its Christological Implications*, WUNT 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). Fatehi argues that the Spirit of Yahweh in the OT "is a relational concept referring to Yahweh in his active relation to his creation and his people" (65).

the relevance of these texts for understanding the Spirit of Yahweh in the OT, I propose that this is not the exclusive interpretative category for these texts. Since Yahweh is the sole subject of this action, it is plausible that these texts contribute as much to the identity of Yahweh as they do to the identity of the Spirit. This claim is grounded in the importance of Yahweh's actions for articulating his unique, divine identity in Israel's Scriptures: who Yahweh is, is often explained by what Yahweh does, has done, or will do. This section attempts to provide methodological justification for linking the action of giving the Spirit with Yahweh's unique identity as Israel's God. It will do so by explaining the way in which the OT writers link Yahweh's actions with his incomparability and by analyzing the primary actions which are employed in the OT to articulate Yahweh's unique divine identity.

The Relationship of Yahweh's Actions and His Incomparability

A central claim that is echoed throughout the various texts of the Hebrew Canon, is the claim of the incomparability of Israel's God, Yahweh. "There is none like Yahweh" is a proclamation made throughout the storyline unfolding from Genesis to Ezra-Nehemiah (both explicitly and implicitly),⁴ along with the various texts of the Writings and Prophets that comment on or develop this storyline.⁵ In his *Theology of the Old Testament*, Walter Brueggemann regards this claim of incomparability as the "most poignant spine and leitmotif of all Israel's testimony concerning Yahweh."⁶ There are

⁴Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 143. I agree with Brueggemann who writes, "It cannot be claimed that this statement of Yahweh's incomparability is uttered everywhere in the Old Testament. I insist only that it is Israel's most extreme witness about God, and that this affirmation, or something like it, is everywhere assumed in the Old Testament."

⁵For a thoughtful analysis of the way in which the Prophets and Writings interpret and develop the narrative of the Torah, see Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*, NSBT (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 125-230.

two explicit formulas that function to express this characteristic understanding of Israel's God. First, the rhetorical question, "Who is like you?" (הַיְיָ כִּמּוֹךָ; τίς ὁμοίός σοι) is often used to directly address Yahweh and anticipates the negative response, "No one" (e.g., Exod 15:11; Pss 35:10; 113:5; Mic 7:18-20).⁷ The second formula is the declarative sentence, "There is none like Yahweh our God"⁸ (e.g., Deut 33:26; 1 Kgs 8:23; Jer 10:1-16; Ps 86:8; 2 Sam 7:22). While there is debate over how these formula relate to the "monotheism" of the Old Testament, it is unambiguous that they provide explicit witness to the claim regarding the uniqueness and incomparability of Yahweh.⁹

⁶Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 139. Cf. C. J. Labuschagne, *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament*, Pretoria Oriental Series, vol. 5 (Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1966): "The concept of the incomparability of Yahweh is of the greatest importance for a more profound understanding of the Hebrew knowledge of God. In a most surprising way it sheds light on those qualities of Yahweh which make Him different and distinguish Him from other gods, and at the same time it shows what qualities of Yahweh may be considered the most characteristic and fundamental" (134).

⁷Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 140.

⁸MT: הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (and variants); LXX: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν κυρίου. Included within this category are those text which affirm Yahweh's uniqueness among the "gods": "Yahweh is the God (הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ); there is no other besides him" (Deut 4:35; cf. 1 Sam 2:2; 1 Kgs 8:6; Isa 45:5, 6, 18; Joel 2:27).

⁹OT scholars have typically accepted the term "monotheism" as an appropriate category for Israel's faith in Yahweh. However, some scholars have recently argued that the modern understanding of the term monotheism (i.e., an intellectual belief in the existence of one God) is anachronistic and inappropriate for describing Israel's belief in the incomparability and oneness of Yahweh. For example, Nathan MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism,"* FAT 2/1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 210, argues that "Deuteronomy does not, at any point, present a doctrine of God that may be described as 'monotheism.' That it affirms that YHWH is one, who is unique, and there is no other for Israel is undeniable. However, this is not 'monotheism,' at least not in the sense in which the term is usually used." He then identifies three ways in which the modern notion of monotheism conflicts with Deuteronomy: (1) modern monotheism is merely intellectual and thus conflicts with Deuteronomy's recognition that the oneness of Yahweh should lead to love for Yahweh (210); (2) modern monotheism is a universal category, while in Deuteronomy Yahweh's oneness relates only to Israel (213); (3) modern monotheism denies the existence of other gods, while in Deuteronomy the existence of other gods is not denied (215). Cf. Ulrich Mauser, "One God Alone: A Pillar of Biblical Theology," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 12 (1991): 262, who also defines God's "oneness" as "the revelation of a God who is incomparable to all other divinities." Christopher Seitz, "The Divine Name in Christian Scripture," in *Word Without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 255, comes to a similar conclusion regarding the 'high monotheism' of Isa 40-55: "nowhere in Second Isaiah would 'monotheism' amount to the practical elimination of all the gods but one." While agreeing with MacDonald that the category of Enlightenment monotheism is an appropriate for understanding OT faith in Yahweh, Bauckham, "Biblical Theology and the Problems of Monotheism," 82, nevertheless, uses the term "Jewish Monotheism" to characterize the OT's witness to the unique identity of Israel's God as the creator,

This testimony to the uniqueness of Yahweh is frequently associated with Yahweh’s actions in the world—among the nations in general and in Israel’s history in particular.¹⁰ That is, the sweeping claim of incomparability is often grounded in the concrete ways in which Yahweh is incomparable.¹¹ This is demonstrated, for example, in Psalm 89:7-8 (MT) where the psalmist proclaims Yahweh’s incomparability among all the other gods in the “council of the holy ones” and then proceeds to list the concrete acts distinguishing Yahweh from all others (89:10-19).¹² Brueggemann highlights the significance of Yahweh’s acts (i.e., “verbs”) for articulating the incomparability of Yahweh: “Israel is characteristically concerned with the action of God . . . and not God’s character, nature, being, or attributes, except as those are evidenced in concrete actions. This focus on verbs, moreover, commits us in profound ways to a *narrative* portrayal of Yahweh, in which Yahweh is the one who is said to have done these deeds.”¹³ Robert Jenson also argues for a link between Yahweh’s actions and his identity and the development of this link throughout the biblical narrative. Jenson writes, “the name of God and the narration of his works . . . belong together. The descriptions that make the name work are items of the narrative. And conversely, identifying God . . . is the very

Sovereign, and Israel’s covenant God. Bauckham’s view aligns with Seitz’ in his conclusion that the Jewish monotheism of the OT “is not the denial of the existence of other ‘gods,’ but an understanding of the uniqueness of YHWH that puts him in a class of his own” (86). For an insightful essay covering the OT and NT, see R. W. L. Moberly, “How Appropriate is ‘Monotheism’ as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 216-34. See also the essays in the monographs edited by M. Oeming and K. Schmid, *Der eine Gott und die Götter*, ATANT Band 82 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2003).

¹⁰MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of ‘Monotheism,’* 215, writes, “In his particular actions for his people, YHWH shows that he is God.”

¹¹Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 140.

¹²The psalmist highlights Yahweh’s rule over the sea, his judgment of his enemies, his creation of the heavens and the earth, his power, his righteous and just reign, and his protection for his people.

¹³Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 145.

function of the biblical narrative.”¹⁴ In other words, Yahweh’s particularity is articulated through the stories of Israel’s history in which he, as a character in the stories, is identifiable by his actions.¹⁵ Yahweh’s incomparability is inseparably tied to the stories in the Old Testament; it is shaped through narrative.¹⁶

The term “identity” best captures this narrative portrayal of Yahweh’s actions as the articulation of his incomparability.¹⁷ By proclaiming Yahweh’s incomparability, the OT authors indicate that Yahweh is somehow identifiable; he is able to be distinguished from other characters in the narrative (both human and divine) by his actions in the story.¹⁸ This association between actions and identity forms the first characteristic of Hans Frei’s description of identity. He writes, “we described [identity] as an intentional act, suggesting that a person is as he acts. What he does in a connected sequence of events over a limited period of time tells us what he is like.”¹⁹ Furthermore, “All of us know that there are actions so typical of a person that when we see them we

¹⁴Robert Jenson, *The Triune Identity* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002), 7. Cf. Bauckham, “Biblical Theology,” 67-69, who argues that Israel recognized Yahweh’s uniqueness in what Yahweh did for Israel; Yahweh’s uniqueness is expressed in what he does for Israel.

¹⁵Richard Bauckham, “God Crucified,” in *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 6; Dale Patrick, *The Rendering of God in the Old Testament*, *Overtures of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 2-43.

¹⁶Patrick, *The Rendering of God*, 34. Patrick writes, “The recital of Yahweh’s deeds . . . render his identity and facilitate recognition. . . . The God who confronts the reader in the narrative present brings his past with him. He is recognizable because he is the same as the one known in the stories of his deeds.”

¹⁷Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 6-7.

¹⁸Yahweh’s actions are not the only way in which his unique identity is expressed. For example, his personal name (Exod 3:13-22) and descriptions of his character (e.g., Exod 34:6-7) also function to identify Yahweh. However, even these key identifying elements are linked with Yahweh’s actions, his roles in Israel’s story. For an analysis of the way in which the divine name functions to express the incomparability of Yahweh, see Seitz, “The Divine Name in Christian Scripture,” 251-62. For Bauckham, the divine name is also significant to the identity of Israel’s God because “it names the unique identity of God” (Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 7).

¹⁹Hans Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 45.

say, ‘That’s him, all right!’”²⁰ The purpose of this chapter is to answer whether or not Yahweh’s action of giving the Spirit contributes to his unique identity as Israel’s God. In other words, do the OT authors themselves link the action of giving the Spirit with Yahweh’s incomparability? Is this role of Spirit-giver so connected with Yahweh’s identity that when this action is narrated the reader can say “That’s him, all right!”? But before moving into an analysis of this theme it is necessary to note the characteristic actions which identify Yahweh in the OT. That is, What is the nature of Yahweh’s incomparability?

The Nature of Yahweh’s Incomparability

Generally speaking, there are three actions that consistently function in the OT to identify Israel’s God: Yahweh is the God who creates, the God who reigns over his people and all reality, and the God who delivers his people. The claim here is not that these are the only ways Yahweh’s identity is rendered in the OT, but that they are the primary actions used to articulate the nature of Yahweh’s incomparability. Bauckham’s comment is helpful: “While these characteristics are by no means *sufficient* to identify God (since they say nothing, for example, about his goodness or his justice), they are the features which most readily distinguish God absolutely from all other reality.”²¹

First, Yahweh is the God who creates.²² Yahweh is frequently identified as the creator of all things; everything owes its existence to him: “I am Yahweh, who made all things, who alone stretched out the heavens, who spread out the earth by myself” (Isa 44:24).²³ From the opening verse of the Torah, to the other divisions of Israel’s

²⁰Ibid., 43.

²¹Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 9. Bauckham focuses primarily on the way in which Second Temple Judaism and the OT distinguish Yahweh from all reality and thus emphasizes Yahweh’s roles as the Creator and Sovereign Ruler (8-9); however, he does acknowledge that Yahweh’s identity is frequently linked with his deliverance of Israel from slavery in Egypt (8).

²²Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 146; Bauckham, “God Crucified,” 8-11.

Scriptures, a common theme is developed, affirmed, celebrated, and emphasized: Israel's God is the creator of heaven and earth.²⁴ Two passages are representative of this theme: "For thus says Yahweh God, the one who created the heavens, the one who stretched them out, the one who spread out the earth and its offspring, the one who gave breath to its people and spirit to those who walk on it" (Isa 42:5); "and [Melchizedek] blessed [Abram], 'Bless Abram by God Most High, creator of heaven and earth'" (Gen 14:19; cf. 14:22).²⁵

This role as the creator (as both Bauckham and Brueggemann have argued) is integral to Yahweh's identity; these descriptions articulate who Yahweh is and function throughout Israel's Scriptures to highlight his uniqueness. For example, in Isaiah 40:25-26, Yahweh declares his incomparability when he asks, "To whom then will you compare me, that I should be like him?" says the Holy One." This claim is immediately grounded in Yahweh's action as the creator of the stars (40:26) and the uniqueness of Yahweh as the creator is summarized two verses later when Isaiah proclaims, "Yahweh is the everlasting God, the creator of the ends of the earth" (40:28). Yahweh is unique from all others in the fact that he is the creator and they are his creatures.

In addition to emphasizing Yahweh's role as the one who brought all things into existence at creation, there are two other ways in which Yahweh's role as the creator functions to articulate his uniqueness. First, Israel viewed its relationship with Yahweh in terms of a creator/creature relationship. Second, Israel anticipated a day when Yahweh, their creator, would act to bring about a new creation, a new heaven and new

²³Unless stated, the translations are my own.

²⁴E.g., Gen 1:1; Deut 4:32; Job 38:4; Isa 40:26, 28; 42:5; 44:24; 45:12, 18; 48:13; 51:16; Neh 9:6; Hos 13:4.

²⁵ESV translation. While קנה can be translated as "possess," "obtain," or "acquire" (cf. NASB, ESV) the parallel with Gen 4:1 and arrangement with "heaven and earth" strongly favor "create" as the appropriate translation in this passage. In addition, the LXX supports this translation with its use of the term κτίζω (Gen 14:19, 22).

earth. Regarding the former, while there are many metaphors which express the unique relationship Yahweh has with Israel, his election of Israel is often depicted as an act of creation.²⁶ For example, in Deuteronomy 32:6 Moses asks, “Is Yahweh not your father, who created you (קָנָךְ), who made you (עָשָׂךְ) and established you (וַיִּכְנֹסְךָ)?”²⁷ and, in Isaiah 43:1a, the prophet also expresses Yahweh’s election of Israel as an act of creation: “But now thus says Yahweh, he who created you (בְּרָאֲךָ), Jacob, he who formed you (וַיִּצְרְךָ), Israel” (cf. Isa 43:15-17). Regarding the latter, the eschatological work of Yahweh is described as an act of new creation: “For behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth” (Isa 65:17; cf. 51:3; 66:22) and the eschatological restoration of Israel in a new-covenant relationship with Yahweh is also presented as an act of re-creation by the creator God (e.g., Isa 44:21-28; Ezek 36-37). In this way the past, present, and future work of Yahweh are defined in terms of his identity as the creator. The God who created the cosmos and breathed the life-breath into humanity, is the same God who created and formed his people Israel and will one day act in future to reveal his identity as the creator God by re-creating his covenant people and transforming the cosmos.

Second, as a corollary to his role as the creator, Israel’s Scriptures articulate Yahweh’s unique identity in light of his role as the ruler of his people and all reality; the one who created all, is the one who rules over all.²⁸ As the psalmist affirms: “Yahweh

²⁶The following categories represent some of the metaphors which depict Yahweh’s relationship with his people: creator/creature (Isa 51: 13); father/son (Deut 1:31; 32:6, 18; Isa 63:16); master/slave (Isa 41:8; Dan 3:17); redeemer/redeemed (Isa 43:1; 63:16); husband/wife (Isa 54:5-6; Ezek 16:1-58; Hos 1:2-11); shepherd/sheep (Isa 40:11; Ps 23).

²⁷The combination of the verbs in this verse strengthen the claim that Moses is here describing Yahweh’s election of Israel as an act of creation. As noted above, קָנָה can be translated “to create,” as in Gen 4:1; 14:19, 22 and כִּוֵּן and עָשָׂה are often paired to describe the creation of the heavens and earth (e.g., Isa 48:18; Jer 10:12; 33:2; 51:15). In addition the parallels with the act of creation are strengthened further by the context of Deut 32:6-18, in particular, v. 11, which describes Yahweh: “Like an eagle that stirs up its nest, that flutters (רָחַף) over its young.” The only other occurrence of the רָחַף in the piel conjugation is in Gen 1:1 where the Spirit of God “hovered” over the waters at creation. Cf. Deut 32:6 LXX: οὐκ αὐτὸς οὐτός σου πατήρ ἐκτίσαστό σε καὶ ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔκτισέν σε.

²⁸E.g., Yahweh’s identity as the creator and ruler are linked in Pss 93:1-5; 95:5 (94:5 LXX).

has established his throne in the heavens, and his kingdom rules over all” (Ps 103:19). This affirmation is corroborated throughout the OT as Yahweh’s sovereign rule over all the nations,²⁹ nature,³⁰ the cosmos,³¹ and individuals³² is boldly proclaimed and celebrated. This link between Yahweh’s reign over the nations and nature is explicitly linked with his unique divine identity in Exodus 15:1-18 where Moses recounts Yahweh’s triumph over Pharaoh and his army through his sovereign control over the Red Sea. In light of Yahweh’s “glorious deeds” displayed in controlling the sea and conquering Pharaoh, Moses concludes: “Who is like you, O Yahweh, among the gods? Who is like you, majestic in holiness, awesome in glorious deeds, doing wonders?” (v. 11).³³

In addition to affirming Yahweh’s unique role as the sovereign of the universe, Israel’s Scriptures also claim that Yahweh’s identity as the sovereign ruler is particularly displayed in his relationship with his people, Israel.³⁴ For example, in Deuteronomy 32:8-9 Yahweh’s election of Israel is juxtaposed with his sovereign rule over all the nations (cf. Deut 7:6) and in Psalm 95:3-7 (LXX 94:3-7) Israel’s relationship with Yahweh (“our maker”; “sheep of his hand”) is analogous to Yahweh’s control over nature (he “made” the sea; “in his hand are the depths of the earth”).³⁵ In this way,

²⁹2 Kgs 18-19; Pss 22:28; 47:8; 66:7; Isa 40:22-23; Dan 4:3, 34-35.

³⁰Gen 6:9-8:19; Exod 15:9-12; Job 38:8-18; Ps 89:9.

³¹Isa 40:25-26.

³²Isa 44:28; Prov 19:21.

³³ESV translation.

³⁴The OT writers often employ the king/subject metaphor to describe Yahweh’s relationship to Israel: e.g., Num 23:21; 1 Sam 8:10-18; Isa 44:6.

³⁵This Psalm explicitly affirms the link between Yahweh’s unique identity and his role as the Ruler of the cosmos in general and his people in particular. The claim in v. 3 that Yahweh is “a great King above all gods” is supported in v. 4 (the conjunction אשר which introduces this verse is causal) with descriptions of Yahweh’s control over nature (e.g., the depths of the earth, the mountains, the sea, and the dry land).

Yahweh's rule over his people was intended to reflect his sovereign rule over all reality and, subsequently, due to Israel's history of covenant rebellion, Yahweh's very identity was at risk.³⁶ And yet, even through judgment and the exile of his people, Yahweh is still affirmed as Israel's ruler and Israel longed for the day when Yahweh's unique identity as the ruler would be known among all the nations.

Third, Yahweh's unique identity as Israel's God is inseparable from his act of rescuing them from Egypt. Yahweh is frequently identified as "your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery" (Exod 20:20).³⁷ Brueggemann rightly observes, "At the core of Israel's God-talk is the persistent claim that Israel knows no God except the One who in an ancient, remembered time acted in a way that made the life of Israel as a people a genuine historical possibility."³⁸ The significance of this act of Yahweh for his unique identity as Israel's God is further indicated by Israel's eschatological hope that Yahweh would once again act, like he did in the exodus, to redeem his exiled-people: "Therefore, behold, the days are coming declares Yahweh, when it shall not longer be said, 'As Yahweh lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the land of Egypt,' but 'As Yahweh lives who brought up the people of Israel out of the north country and out of all the countries where he had driven them'" (Jer 16:14-15;³⁹ cf., Isa 40:1-11; 43:16-21; 52:7-10).

³⁶See, e.g., the narrative account in 2 Kgs 17-19 in which Rabshakeh's charge of Yahweh's inability to deliver Jerusalem (18:19-35; 19:8-13) is grounded in Assyria's recent triumph of the Northern Kingdom (18:34). The covenant unfaithfulness of the Northern Kingdom resulted in their exile (17:6-18) and the Assyrians interpreted this event as an indication of Yahweh's weakness.

³⁷E.g., Lev 25:55; Deut 6:12; 8:14; 13:10; 15:15; 20:1; Neh 9:18; Ps 81:10 (80:11, LXX).

³⁸Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 176.

³⁹ESV translation.

Summary

Who Yahweh is, is often articulated through his actions; his acts in the world in general and in Israel's history in particular shape the very identity of Israel's God. Yahweh's identity cannot be separated from the stories in which he is the creator, ruler, and deliverer of his people. These acts of creation, sovereignty, and redemption are so typical of Yahweh that when we see them, we can say, "That is Yahweh all right!" There are four points to observe in way of summary: (1) as noted, the OT authors often link Yahweh's actions with his identity; (2) there are characteristic acts which articulate the unique identity of Israel's God: creator, ruler, deliverer; (3) while two of these roles are in relation to the cosmos as a whole; they are all three witnessed to in Yahweh's unique relationship with Israel; that is, there is a covenantal dimension to these roles; (4) there is an eschatological dimension to these roles; in the age to come Yahweh's identity as the creator, ruler, and deliverer will be manifest to all the nations, when he acts to restore Israel as his covenant people.⁴⁰ The following arguments regarding the relationship between act of giving the Spirit and Yahweh's unique identity build upon these final two points: the prophetic texts which envision the eschatological hope of Yahweh pouring out his Spirit often linked with Yahweh's unique identity as Israel's God; in addition, the very act of giving the Spirit is linked with these identity-defining roles of Yahweh as the creator, ruler, and deliverer of his people.

⁴⁰Bauckham, "Biblical Theology," 84: "It would be his salvific acts on Israel's behalf that would create this universal recognition [of Yahweh as the creator and ruler], and recognition of the one God, Creator and Lord of all, would be inseparable from recognition of his special relationship to his covenant people." Cf. Patrick, *The Rendering of God*, 104-05: "If the identity of the biblical God assumes his past and anticipates his future action, the action itself must be sequential and cumulative. Each act of God must be a part of the progress of his overall purpose. We say of a human that you achieve integrity by devoting your life to a worthy and truly comprehensive goal. When one does, every stage on life's way is full and lays the foundation for the next. The divine persona achieves unity in an analogous way. Every action enacts his identity and fit into the sequential, cumulative movement toward a comprehensive purpose."

The Eschatological Act of Giving the Spirit: An Act of Israel’s Creator and Covenant God

The polyvalent nature of the term רוּחַ creates a daunting challenge for scholars who attempt to specify the precise referent of its approximately 387 occurrences in the OT.⁴¹ While a detailed analysis of the individual literary contexts is often necessary, even then, much debate exists over the precise denotation of רוּחַ in many passages. Fortunately, it is not necessary for this thesis to attempt a detailed analysis of all such referents of רוּחַ. In fact, in the prophetic texts describing the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit the referent of the term רוּחַ is generally agreed upon—most scholars agree that this denotes the outpouring of Yahweh’s own Spirit.⁴²

And yet, it was the OT authors themselves who initially took advantage of the polyvalent nature of רוּחַ by describing the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit as the typological fulfillment of the inbreathing of the life-breath (i.e., spirit) into humanity at creation (e.g., Ezek 37:7-10). The giving of Yahweh’s Spirit in the age to come is often portrayed as an act of new creation and, at times, corresponds with Yahweh’s inbreathing of the life-breath into Adam in Genesis 2:7. One of the goals of this section is argue that

⁴¹HALOT, s.v. “רוּחַ.” It is possible to categorize the various uses of רוּחַ into the following semantic domains: anthropological (e.g., the life-breath, breath, spirit, mind within an individual or animal), meteorological (e.g., wind), theological (e.g., Yahweh’s own Spirit, the mind of Yahweh). Regarding the difficulty of analyzing this term, Claus Westermann, “Geist in Alten Testament,” *EvT* (1981), 223, writes, “Das Wort [רוּחַ] im AT eine betwegte Geschichte gehabt.” For studies that focus on the use of רוּחַ in the OT, see Paul van Imschoot, “L’esprit de Jahvé, source de vie dans l’ Ancien Testament,” *RB* 44 (1935): 481-501; Daniel Lys, *Rûach : le souffle dans l’Ancien Testament: Enquête Anthropologique à Travers L’histoire Théologique D’Israël* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962).; Lloyd Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972); G. W. H. Lampe, *God as Spirit: The Bampton Lectures, 1976* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977); Jürgen Moltmann, *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*, trans. by Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); Gwynne Henton Davies, “Holy Spirit in the Old Testament,” *RevExp* 63 (1996): 129-34; Heinz-Joseph Fabry, “רוּחַ,” in *TDOT*, trans. David E. Green (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 365-402; John Levison, *Filled with the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009).

⁴²The prophetic texts which are generally recognized as referencing the outpouring of the Spirit are Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 36:26-27; 37:1-10; 39:29 (MT); Joel 3:1-2. This chapter will also include debated texts such as Isa 4:4 and Zech 12:10. Moses’ prayer in Num 11:29 that Yahweh would put (נָתַן; δίδωμι) his Spirit upon all the people (כָּל-עַם; πάντα τὸν λαόν) sets the foundation for the prophetic expectation of Joel and (arguably) Ezekiel.

the prophets who envisioned the eschatological act of giving the Spirit often depict it as an act of new-creation; it is an act of the creator God. Although the book of Ezekiel is most explicit regarding these parallels between creation and new creation, the passages in Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah either parallel or echo Ezekiel's description of the outpouring of the Spirit as an act of new creation.

The second goal of this section is to show that the eschatological act of giving the Spirit is *always* associated with Yahweh's identity as Israel's deliverer. The God who delivered Israel from Egypt and brought her into a covenant relationship with himself (e.g., Exod 6:7) promised to deliver his people from their exile, restore their covenant relationship (i.e., a new covenant), and empower them to live faithfully in the age to come. The act of giving the Spirit, then, is consistently presented as an act of Israel's deliverer to effect a new exodus for his people.⁴³

Before addressing these eschatological texts it is necessary to provide an overview of the way in which the act of giving the life-breath (i.e., the spirit) to humanity is linked with Yahweh's identity as the creator God. Once this has been established a case will be made that there is a correspondence between Yahweh's identity as the giver of the life-breath in creation and Yahweh's identity as the Spirit-giver in the age to come.

⁴³It is important to observe at the outset that the giving of the Spirit as new creation and the giving of the Spirit as covenant restoration are not presented as two separate acts. God's promise to restore his people is described as both a new creation and a new exodus. The metaphors of creation and exodus are employed to characterize or illuminate Israel's eschatological ingathering, new covenant relationship, and transformed heart/spirit. T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and the Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*, CBET 25 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 52, defines a metaphor as follows: "A metaphor typically employs salient features from one object (source domain) to characterise or illuminate another object (target domain). The view of the target through the 'lens' of the source is the subject of the metaphor." In light of this definition, creation and exodus language are the "lens" through which Israel's restoration is depicted. For a helpful analysis of the conclusions of "metaphor scholars" (both ancient and current), see Øystein Lund, *Way metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55*, FAT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 30-43. Lund argues that "the result of the interaction [between the source domain and target domain] cannot be reproduced in literal speech as a distinct meaning" (33).

The Giving of Life-Breath at Creation

Genesis 2:7 (MT)

וַיִּצַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם עֹפָר
מִן־הָאֲדָמָה
וַיִּפַּח בְּאַפָּיו נְשָׁמַת חַיִּים
וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

Genesis 2:7 (LXX)

καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ
τῆς γῆς
καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
πνοὴν ζωῆς
καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν

The creation account of Genesis 2:4-25 further develops Yahweh's identity as the creator in a way that both complements and augments the opening chapter of Genesis.⁴⁴ Genesis 2:4b-2:7 is structured with an opening protasis in 2:4b ("On the day Yahweh God made the earth and heaven"), a series of circumstantial clauses in verses 5-6, and the concluding apodosis in 2:7. The structure suggests a movement in the narrative from the focus on Yahweh as the creator of the heavens and earth to a focus on Yahweh's unique and intimate creation of humanity. Two specific actions are highlighted: first, Yahweh "formed" (יצר) the man, secondly, he "breathed" (נפח) the "breath of life" (נשמת חיים) into the man. The grammatical link between 2:4b and the actions 2:7 has theological implications for the narrative identity of Yahweh: to form man and to breathe life into him are actions unique to the one who created the earth and heavens. Thus at the opening of the canon, Yahweh's uniqueness vis-a-vis humanity is shaped by the author presenting him as the one who breathes life into his created people; humanity owes its life to the inbreathing of God.⁴⁵

However, רוח does not occur in this passage, which initially describes Yahweh breathing the life-breath into Adam; rather, נשמה is used. While at first glance the lack of a verbal parallel between the giving of the life-breath and the eschatological giving of

⁴⁴ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis Chapters 1-17*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990), 156.

⁴⁵ Rolf P. Knierim, *The Task of Old Testament Theology: Method and Cases* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 274: "When Yahweh breathes into humans' nostrils the breath of life, and when he takes their breath away . . . he appears to function as the initiator, the triggerer, and the terminator of living beings."

Yahweh's Spirit appears to weaken the explicit parallel between creation and new creation, this is not the case. There is a consistent tradition in OT of treating נשמה and רוח interchangeably.⁴⁶ This development is represented in two ways.

First, נשמה and רוח are used synonymously in the phrases in Genesis 6:17 and 7:15, which allude to Genesis 2:7. In Genesis 6:17 God promises to destroy every creature “in whom is the breath of life” (רוח חיים) and in 7:15 God orders Noah to collect pairs of every creature “in whom is the breath of life” (רוח חיים). John Yates rightly observes the links between these texts: “In these verses the vivifying breath is described as the רוח חיים in what appears to be a combination of the language of Genesis 2:7 (נשמת חיים) and Genesis 6:3 (רוחי).”⁴⁷ The synonymy between נשמה and רוח is further highlighted in the flood narrative in Genesis 7:22. Here the author summarizes the devastating destruction of the flood waters for every creature on the dry land “in whose nostrils was the breath of the spirit of life” (נשמת־רוח חיים). While the unusualness of this phrase has been interpreted by some as reflecting a late gloss or redaction of 2:7 with 6:17 and 7:15,⁴⁸ the fact that this combination is retained in the final form of the text strengthens the claim that נשמה and רוח were viewed as synonymous in the opening chapters of Genesis—a view consistent with the use of these terms in later texts.⁴⁹

Secondly, many scholars have observed the way נשמה and רוח are treated synonymously in other texts of the OT. The book of Job, in particular, contains multiple instances in which נשמה and רוח are parallel with each other, both denoting the meaning

⁴⁶Fabry, s.v. “רוח,” 375, 386.

⁴⁷Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, 26.

⁴⁸Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, trans. John J. Seullion, A Continental Commentary (London: SPCK, 1984), 439. Westermann argues that the meaning of רוח is broadened in later prophetic texts to include the sense of “life” and as a result its meaning came to overlap with נשמה.

⁴⁹Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, 26; Levinson, *Filled with the Spirit*, 17.

“life-breath.” For example, in Job 27:2-4 Job expresses his commitment to not speak wrongly or deceitfully “as long as my breath (נשמתִי) is in me, and the spirit of God (רוח אֱלֹהִים) is in my nostrils” (Job 27:3). In addition, Elihu’s speech in chapter 32 likewise demonstrates this interpretation of רוח as the life-breath within a person: “But it is the spirit (רוח) in man, the breath (נשמה) of the Almighty, that makes him understand” (Job 32:8). Lastly, Elihu’s speech in Job 34:13-15 not only sets “breath” and “spirit” in parallel but uses other imagery which clearly alludes to Genesis 2:7 and 6:3:

Who gave [God] charge over the earth,
 and who laid on him the whole world?
 If he should set his heart to it
 and gather to himself his spirit (רוחו) and his breath (נשמתו),
 all flesh would perish together,
 and man would return to dust (עפר).⁵⁰

The verbal allusions here in Job 34 imply a reversal of Genesis 2:7. In the garden, Yahweh formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed the breath of life into him; here, Elihu claims that should God take away the life-breath humanity would return to dust (cf. Gen 3:19). This text provides additional evidence that the imagery of Yahweh inbreathing the life-breath into humanity in Genesis 2:7 shapes the identity of God in later texts and emphasizes his unique identity as the creator. Despite the shift in vocabulary, later texts describe Yahweh as the one who gives his ‘spirit,’ or life-breath, to humanity, draw on the imagery in Genesis 2:7 of Yahweh breathing life into Adam.

The overlap of the semantic range of רוח with נשמה in subsequent texts (like Job) demonstrates that texts which describe Israel’s God as giving the life-breath (רוח) to humanity are dependent on the imagery of Genesis 2:7, despite the absence of the term רוח.⁵¹ Although there is a verbal shift from נשמה to רוח, it is clear that the concept is

⁵⁰ESV translation.

⁵¹Other OT passages develop the imagery of Gen 2:7 in their descriptions of Yahweh. In each of these instances the term רוח is used. First, Yahweh is addressed as the “God of the spirits of all flesh”(Num 16:22; 27:16)—a description which likely draws upon the account of Yahweh breathing the life-breath and its development in Gen 6:3. The use of the generic title אֱלֹהִים in Num 16:22 strengthens the link to the creation narrative by emphasizing Yahweh’s identity as the creator (Timothy R. Ashley, *The*

the same: Yahweh’s action of giving the spirit (i.e., the life-breath) to humanity is linked to his identity as the creator God. Thus at the opening of the OT canon, the action of giving ‘spirit’ (i.e., life-breath) is first introduced in the context of creation; that is, it is the action of the creator God whereby he gives life to his people. Therefore, it is plausible that the eschatological texts describing Yahweh giving his Spirit in the age to come, can allude to Genesis 2:7, although it is the immediate co-text that determines whether the allusion is likely.

Ezekiel: The Giving of the Spirit as an Act of Re-creation

Ezekiel’s description of Yahweh as the ‘giver of the spirit’ is particularly relevant for the purpose of this chapter because, more so than any other book, Ezekiel is concerned “with Yahweh’s great self-revelation.”⁵² The claim, **יְהוָה וַיְדַעְתֶּם כִּי־אֲנִי** (ἐπιγνώσασθε ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος) is the theme in each section of the book and reveals the purpose of Yahweh’s present judgment and future restoration of his people. What is surprising in Ezekiel is the fact that despite this emphasis on Yahweh’s identity, descriptions of Yahweh’s attributes are almost completely lacking.⁵³ Instead, Yahweh’s identity is unveiled through his actions. “The passages . . . at the same time make clear that the word of Yahweh, which the prophet has to proclaim, is not a doctrine about the essential nature of god, which can be described apart from any events, but an

Book of Numbers, NICOT [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993], 313) . Second, **נְשָׁמָה** and **רוּחַ** are parallel in Isa 42:5b and the description of Yahweh as the creator of heaven and earth in 42:5a links 42:5b with Gen 2:7. Third, Zech 12:1 is similar to Isa 45:2 in its description of Yahweh as the creator. Here, however, it only uses **רוּחַ** to refer to the life-breath Yahweh gives to every individual. Fourth, Qoh 12:7 describes a reversal of Gen 2:7: in Gen 2 Yahweh creates Adam from the dust of the ground and breaths into him the life-breath; in Qoh 12:7 the dust from which man is made returns to the earth and the life-breath (**רוּחַ**) returns to God.

⁵²Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1-24*, trans. J. D. Martin, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 52.

⁵³Ibid.

announcement of Yahweh’s action towards Israel.”⁵⁴ In other words, who Yahweh is, is revealed by what Yahweh does. Yahweh’s particularity is made known exclusively through his acts of judgment and re-creation (i.e., restoration of his covenant people) and his role as the giver of the Spirit is incorporated into this larger framework of Yahweh’s unique divine identity.

The use of רוּחַ in Ezekiel reflects the polyvalent use of this term throughout the OT and is itself a topic of various articles⁵⁵ and monographs.⁵⁶ The focus of this section is on Yahweh’s promise to give his people a “new spirit” (רוּחַ חַדְשָׁה; e.g., 11:19; 36:26) and the relation this action has to Yahweh giving his Spirit (רוּחִי) to his people (e.g., 36:27), so it is not necessary to analyze the various uses of this term in Ezekiel. This section attempts to show that the act of giving the eschatological Spirit, in Ezekiel, is an act of new creation and new exodus. Israel’s promised restoration (i.e., ingathering of the twelve tribes, covenant renewal, and empowerment to obey) explicitly develops imagery from Genesis 2:7 and also employs the new-exodus typology observed in Isaiah (see below).⁵⁷

⁵⁴Ibid., 55.

⁵⁵Pamela E. Kinlaw, “From Death to Life: The Expanding רוּחַ in Ezekiel,” *PRSt* 30 (2003): 161-72; Harold E. Hosch, “RŪAH in the Book of Ezekiel: A Textlinguistic Analysis,” *JOTT* 14 (2002): 77-125; Siegfried Wagner, “Geist und Leben nach Ezechiel 37, 1-14,” in *Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, ed. D. Mathias (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 151-68; John Woodhouse, “The ‘Spirit’ in the Book of Ezekiel,” in *Spirit of the Living God Part One*, ed. B. G. Webb (Sydney: Lancer, 1991), 1-22; Daniel Block, “The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of RWH in the Book of Ezekiel,” *JETS* 32 (1989): 27-49; idem, “Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit: Reflections on Ezekiel xxxix 21-29,” *VT* 37 (1987): 257-70;

⁵⁶James Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, LHBOTS 447 (New York: T & T Clark, 2006); Paul M. Joyce, *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*, JSOTSup 51 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989); Walther Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25-48*, trans. J. D. Martin, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 566-68 (Excursus: “רוּחַ in the Book of Ezekiel”); Keith W. Carley, *Ezekiel among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel’s Place in Prophetic Tradition*, SBT 2nd Series 31 (London: SCM, 1975).

⁵⁷Martin Sweeney, “Ezekiel’s Conceptualization of the Exile in Intertextual Perspective,” *HBAI* 1 (2012), 154-72, argues that Ezekiel drew upon both Isaiah and Exodus in formulating his understanding of the exile in Ezek 12 (154). He observes the following intertextual links: (1) In Ezek 12:2 Yahweh accuses the people of being rebellious—despite having eyes to see and hears to hear, they refused to do so. In Isa 6:10, Yahweh instructs Isaiah to make sure that the people remain deaf, blind, and ignorant,

Ezekiel 11:19. The first description of Yahweh “giving” a “new spirit” within his people occurs within a larger unit that describes Yahweh’s plan to restore his people after their exile (11:14-21). In verse 19, Yahweh declares: וַנְתַתִּי לָהֶם לֵב אֶחָד וְרוּחַ חַדְשָׁה אֶתֶּן בְּקִרְבְּכֶם (καὶ δώσω αὐτοῖς καρδίαν ἑτέραν καὶ πνεῦμα καινὸν δώσω ἐν αὐτοῖς). Since chapter 2, Ezekiel has announced judgment against the exiles, Jerusalem, and the nation as a whole for their failure to walk in Yahweh’s statutes and obey his rules (11:12). The despair and hopelessness filling chapters 2-11 culminate in Ezekiel’s outcry, “Alas, Lord Yahweh! You are making a complete end of the remnant of Israel” (11:13).⁵⁸ This unit in chapter 11 contains the first glimpse of a future hope for Yahweh’s people.

In response to Ezekiel’s despair Yahweh provides him with a brief description of his plan to restore his people to their land (11:17-18) and resurrect/recreate his people by giving them “one heart” and a “new spirit” (11:19) so that they may “walk in my statutes and keep my rules and obey them” (11:20a). This recreating act of Yahweh will result in a renewed covenant between him and his people: “And they will be my people, and I will be their God” (11:20b).⁵⁹ The parallel between לֵב אֶחָד and רוּחַ חַדְשָׁה here

lest they repent (cf. Isa 29:18; 42:18-21) (163). (2) In Ezek 12:4-6, Yahweh instructs the prophet to prepare for a journey that would symbolize Israel’s imminent exile. The instructions include the baggage to be carried on the shoulder, the digging through the wall, the departure by night, and the witness of the people. Sweeney notes that the motifs of carrying baggage on the shoulder and departing by night also play a role in the Exodus narrative and in Isaiah (e.g., Exod 12:12, 34; Isa 10:24-27). (3) The connections to Exodus and Isaiah are also displayed in Yahweh’s instructions regarding eating bread and drinking water (Ezek 12:18-20). Sweeney sees a connection with Exodus 12:11, regarding Yahweh’s instruction for eating the Passover (cf. Isa 11:1). Sweeney concludes that there are “clear thematic or motific parallels between the conceptualization of Israel’s exile in Ezekiel 12 and the depictions of exile and restoration in Exodus and Isaiah” (168).

⁵⁸Many translations render this exclamation as a question (e.g., NIV, ESV, NRSV) in conformity with 9:8. However, Kathryn Pfisterer Darr, *The Book of Ezekiel*, in vol. 6 of *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), 1187, notes this sentence is best translated as an exclamation and not as a question since the Hebrew text contains no interrogative and this outcry immediately follows the death of Pelatiah, whose name means “Yahweh rescues a remnant.” From everything Ezekiel has seen, enacted, experienced, and announced he concludes that Yahweh is indeed “destroying all the remnant of Israel in the outpouring of your wrath on Jerusalem” (9:8).

in 11:19 (cf. 18:31) is similar to Psalm 51:12 (50:12, LXX) where the psalmist pleads with God for a “clean heart” and a “right spirit.” Together, heart and spirit represent the essence of the individual⁶⁰ with spirit representing the life-breath or driving force that inspires the heart.⁶¹

This reference to a future, re-creating work of Yahweh in 11:19-20 anticipates the lengthy development of this promise in chapters 36 and 37.⁶² Before proceeding to these chapters, a few observations about Yahweh giving his people a new רוח will be made. First, this restoring act of Yahweh is described as a new creation, or better, a creation of a new people.⁶³ Thus, the act of Yahweh placing within his people a “new spirit” is linked with his divine identity as the creator. Second, Yahweh’s act of giving this “new spirit” is linked with his identity as Israel’s covenant God. This act of re-creation is the means through which Yahweh restores his covenant with his people (11:20b),⁶⁴ as is evident by the allusion to the covenant promise of Exodus 6:7 (Ezek

⁵⁹MT: וְהִיְיָ־לִי לְעַם וְאֲנִי אֶהְיֶה לָהֶם לְאֱלֹהִים; LXX: και ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν και ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν (cf. Gen 17:8; Exod 6:7; 29:45).

⁶⁰Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 30.

⁶¹Knierim, *The Task of Old Testament Theology*, 282.

⁶²Walther Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, OTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970), 111, asserts that the existence of the promise in 11:19 creates “the insoluble problem of why Ezekiel should here indulge in a direct and premature anticipation of his greatest promise [in chapter 36]” and as a result views 11:19-20 as a “careless and simplified repetition of 36:26f” added into the text by a reader showing how the promises of 11:17-18 were to be fulfilled. On the contrary Tova Ganzel, “The Descriptions of Restoration,” *VT* 60 (2010): 199, rightly argues that the “optimistic” texts found in the first section of Ezekiel (e.g., 11:14-21; 16:59-63; 20:33-44) are not “secondary” but “constitute an integral and central component of the entire book.” The great promises of restoration in chapters 34-48 are briefly anticipated in the judgment chapters (1-33).

⁶³The act of giving his people one heart and a new spirit is itself a development of the image in Gen 2:7 of Yahweh breathing the life-breath within Adam. However, unlike the development of Gen 2:7 noted in the previous section in which Yahweh’s action of inbreathing breath into Adam is representative of Yahweh’s action of giving his spirit to every individual and creature, this development of Gen 2:7 is a promise for the future and limited in scope to Yahweh’s new humanity.

⁶⁴The promise in Ezek 11:20 recalls Yahweh’s covenant promise to Israel prior to the exodus. In Exod 6:7a, Yahweh proclaims, וּלְקַחְתִּי אֶתְכֶם לִי לְעַם וְהָיִיתִי לָכֶם לְאֱלֹהִים. The act of re-creation in Ezek 11:19-20 is the restoration of Yahweh’s people into a new covenant. Exod 6:7b also connects with

11:20b). This allusion coheres with the exodus typology used throughout Ezekiel to describe Israel’s restoration.⁶⁵

Ezekiel 36:26-27 This second reference in Ezekiel to Yahweh’s promise to give his people a new spirit occurs in the second half of the book, which focuses primarily on Yahweh’s restoration and renewal of his people.⁶⁶

Ezekiel 36:26-27 (MT)

Ezekiel 36:26-27 (LXX)

וְנָתַתִּי לְכֶם לֵב חָדָשׁ וְרוּחַ חֲדָשָׁה אֶתֶּן
בְּקִרְבְּכֶם וְהִסְרֹתִי אֶת-לֵב הָאֲבֹן מִבְּשָׁרְכֶם
וְנָתַתִּי לְכֶם לֵב בְּשָׂר:
וְאֶת-רוּחִי אֶתֶּן בְּקִרְבְּכֶם
וְעָשִׂיתִי אֶת אֲשֶׁר-בָּחַקְתִּי תִלְכוּ
וּמִשְׁפָּטֵי תִשְׁמְרוּ וְעָשִׂיתֶם:

καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν καρδίαν καινὴν καὶ πνεῦμα
καινὸν δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἀφελῶ τὴν καρδίαν
τὴν λιθίνην ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν καὶ δώσω
ὑμῖν καρδίαν σαρκίνην καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου
δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ποιήσω ἵνα ἐν τοῖς
δικαιώμασί μου πορεύησθε καὶ τὰ κρίματά
μου φυλάξησθε καὶ ποιήσητε

Ezekiel’s prophecies. Yahweh states that the result of his rescuing (6:6) and making a covenant with (6:7a) his people is that “you will know that I am Yahweh your God, who brought you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians.” (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם; καὶ γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν). Rebecca G. S. Idestrom, “Echoes of the Book of Exodus in Ezekiel,” *JSOT* 33 (2009): 498: “The theme that the people (whether Israelite, Egyptian, or another nation) will come to know and recognize that the Lord is God through his divine acts (whether judgment or salvation) is a theme that began in Exodus and continues in Ezekiel.”

⁶⁵E.g., Ezek 20:33-42: Yahweh will bring them to the land “with an outstretched arm” (בְּיָד בְּזָקָה; ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ; cf. Deut 4:32; 5:15; 7:19; 11:2; 26:8). Risa Levitt Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 108-09, also sees new-exodus language throughout Ezekiel: “According to Ezek 20:34-40, while the wicked would be prevented from re-entering the land, the righteous remainder would worship Yahweh at his holy mountain, where he would accept their offerings. These future divine actions will be motivated, like Yahweh’s salvation during the Egyptian Exodus, ‘for the sake of his name.’ Ezekiel also foresees a new covenant assuring the people’s future well-being and security. While ignoring Moses of old, Ezekiel in fact portrays *himself* as a new Moses.” Cf. Idestrom, “Echoes of the Book of Exodus in Ezekiel,” 491, who argues that in the book of Ezekiel, “Moses and the exodus become a type for Ezekiel and the new exodus.”

⁶⁶Ganzel, “The Descriptions of Restoration,” 20, notes that the textual unity of Ezek 36:16-38 has been questioned by scholars based on the discovery of early Greek and Latin manuscripts which omit vv. 23c-38. These manuscripts include the Greek translation, Chester-Beatty-Scheide, p. 967 (second or third century C.E.) and an early Latin translation, Vetus Latina. Johan Lust, “Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981), 517-33, has questioned the inclusion of this passage; however, Ganzel notes the cogent defense of the integrity of the MT by Emmanuel Tov, “Recensional Differences in Ezekiel,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: SBL, 1999), 397-410.

Ezekiel 36:26-27 is very similar to 11:19 with one major difference: verse 27 makes reference to Yahweh's own Spirit (רוּחִי). The personal suffix attached to רוּחִי does not *necessarily* indicate a reference to God's own Spirit, as opposed to the spirit, the life-breath, he gives to his creation (cf. Gen 6:3; Pss 51:10 [51:12 MT]; 104:30). This is because the spirit that Yahweh breathes into each individual is "Yahweh's spirit," i.e. the life-breath which comes from Yahweh. As a result, many have interpreted "my Spirit" here in verse 27 as identical to "new spirit" in verse 26 and see both as references to the anthropological spirit inhabiting each individual.

The relationship, however, between "new spirit" and "my Spirit" is better interpreted analogically (as the valley vision in 37:1-14 reveals). When Yahweh places his Spirit within his people, it will fulfill the promise of new spirit of 36:26 and 11:19. However, this new life-breath, which will inhabit Yahweh's new humanity, will in fact be Yahweh's own Spirit.⁶⁷ Israel's need is for a new heart and a new spirit (i.e., life-breath,) and the only רוּחִי sufficient for a restored Israel who will obey Yahweh commands (36:27b) and live in covenant union with their God (36:28) is Yahweh's own Spirit dwelling within his people.⁶⁸

Along with the explanation of the referent of the "new spirit" that Yahweh will place within his people, 36:22-28 further develops this act of Yahweh that was introduced in 11:19 in two ways. First, this act of placing רוּחִי within his people is linked with his promise to cleanse his people by sprinkling clean water on them (36:25) and delivering them from their uncleanness (36:29). Although it is possible to take 36:25 and 36:26 as two separate acts Yahweh will do for his people, the context suggests that the "sprinkling clean" and the placing of a new heart and new spirit within his people are referring to the same act of Yahweh. In other words, Yahweh will cleanse his people by placing within

⁶⁷Christopher R. Seitz, "Ezekiel 37:1-14," *Int* 46 (1992): 53.

⁶⁸Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 247.

them a new heart and a new spirit (or “to be cleansed” means to be given a new heart and new spirit).⁶⁹ This interpretation is likely since 36:33 summarizes these acts of Yahweh in 36:33a with the following declaration: “Thus the Lord Yahweh says: ‘On the day I cleanse you from all your iniquities.’” It is the uncleanness of the people (i.e., iniquities, idolatry, abominations; cf. 36:29-31) that resulted in Yahweh’s judgment upon them and their land; thus their need is for a new heart and new spirit “that they may walk in my statutes and keep my rules and obey them” (11:20).⁷⁰ Second, this cleansing act of Yahweh, in which he places his Spirit within his people, is an act of new creation and thus linked with Yahweh’s identity as the creator. The description of Yahweh giving his people a new heart and a new spirit is itself strong enough to evoke the scene in Genesis 2:7 and yet the parallels between creation and new creation are further strengthened in 36:22-38 where Ezekiel states that Yahweh’s recreated people will dwell in a restored land that will be like the Garden of Eden (36:35).⁷¹ Yahweh will once again breathe the life-breath into his people; however, in the age to come, the life-breath of Yahweh’s re-created people will be his own Spirit.

Ezekiel 37:1-14. The vision of the dry bones in Ezekiel 37:1-14 functions to explain and develop the promises in 11:19 and 36:26-27 that Yahweh will breathe new life into his people.⁷² The account in 37:1-14 solidifies the claim that the act of Yahweh

⁶⁹Ganzel, “The Descriptions of Restoration,” 207.

⁷⁰Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 93-94, argues that Ezek 36:22-28 develops Deuteronomy 30:1-6. “While Deuteronomy 30 promises restoration without cleansing, the dire situation of Israel in protracted exile evokes from Ezekiel a more radical solution of purification. . . . Nor is circumcision of the heart, as in Deut 30:6, adequate; an entirely new heart and spirit are required by the extent of Israel’s fall.”

⁷¹“And they will say, ‘This land that was desolate has become like the garden of Eden’ (הַיְדֵּהּ כְּגַן־עֵדֶן). For analysis of this simile in 36:35, see Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, 324-27, 330-31. Stordalen argues that Ezek 36:35 contains echoes of Gen 2-3.

⁷²Marvin Sweeney argues, “Although the account of the vision of dry bones is frequently read as a separate unit . . . the formal organization of our text incorporates it into the oracular report beginning in Ezek 36:16 so that it functions as a means to illustrate the portrayal of defilement and restoration in Ezek

giving his Spirit is an act of new creation since it is here described as a recapitulation of God's first act of breathing into Adam and giving him life.⁷³

In the dramatic scene that unfolds in these verses, Ezekiel is led to a valley that is filled with dry bones. Yahweh asks Ezekiel, "Son of man, can these bones live?" to which Ezekiel responds "O Yahweh God, you know" (37:3). The following verses depict Yahweh (by means of Ezekiel's prophetic speech) giving life to these dead bones. First, Yahweh proclaims that he will cause spirit (i.e., life-breath) to enter the dry bones (מביא בכם רוח) so that they will live (חייתם) (37:5).⁷⁴ Second, Yahweh announces, "I will lay sinews upon you, and will cause flesh to come upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath in you (ונתתי בכם רוח), and you shall live (חייתם)" (37:6). The result of this creating work is knowledge of Yahweh: "and you shall know that I am Yahweh" (37:6).

The fulfillment of Yahweh's promise occurs in two stages. First, Ezekiel witnesses the bones coming together, fitted with sinews and covered in flesh and skin but lacking breath (רוח) (37:8). Second, Ezekiel is commanded to prophesy to the "breath" (רוח) to "breath on these who are dead and let them live" (37:9). As a result, the breath comes into the corpses and they live (37:10).

This resurrection scene vividly illustrates Yahweh's promise in chapter 36 to cleanse and restore his people by giving them a new heart and new spirit (cf. 37:11-14).⁷⁵ The description of the "breath" entering the corpses and giving them "life" is summarized

36:16-38." Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Assertion of Divine Power in Ezekiel 33:21-39:29," in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 162.

⁷³Fabry, "רוח," 388; Beale, *New Testament Biblical Theology*, 561.

⁷⁴The LXX is clearer regarding the identification of the "spirit" in vv. 5-6 as the Spirit of Yahweh. The LXX reads ἐγὼ φέρω εἰς ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ζωῆς ("I am leading the Spirit of life into you"; v. 5) and δώσω πνεῦμά μου εἰς ὑμᾶς ("I will give my Spirit into you"; v. 6). The MT reads אָנִי מְבִיא בְכֶם רוּחַ וְחַיִּיתֶם ("I am bring spirit into you and you will live"; v. 5) and וְנָתַתִּי בְכֶם ("I am giving spirit into you"; v. 6).

⁷⁵Fabry, "רוח," 388.

in 37:14 with Yahweh’s promise “I will put my Spirit within you (וּנְתַת רוּחִי בְכֶם), and you shall live (חַיִּיתֶם)” This scene, furthermore, highlights the links between the eschatological gift of the Spirit and Genesis 2:7.⁷⁶ The two-stage formation of Adam in Genesis 2:7, is reenacted in the re-creation of Israel in 37:7-10: first, the bodies are formed; then Yahweh breathes life into them.⁷⁷ In addition to the two-stage creation process, Robson observes other links to Genesis 2:7 and its co-text: the repetition of נִפַח (Gen 2:7; Ezek 37:9), the goal of becoming “living” (לְנַפֵּשׁ חַיָּה, Gen 2:7; וַחַיִּיתֶם, Ezek 37:6), and the “setting” (גָּוַח, Gen 2:15; Ezek 37:14) in their “land” (אֲדָמָה, Gen 2:5; Ezek 37:12).⁷⁸ The metaphor of new creation is employed to illustrate Yahweh’s act of restoring his people into a covenant relationship where he is their God and they, having been given a new life-breath (i.e., Yahweh’s own Spirit), are his obedient people.⁷⁹

Ezekiel vividly describes Israel’s restoration using the metaphor of restoring life from the dead.⁸⁰ The creator will again act on behalf of his people by making them a new humanity with a new spirit, his own Spirit, so that they will know that he is Yahweh (37:14). The eschatological outpouring of the Spirit in Ezekiel is presented as an act of Yahweh, the creator God and Israel’s rescuer.

Ezekiel 39:29. The final reference in Ezekiel to Yahweh giving his Spirit to his re-created people occurs at the conclusion of the Gog oracle (39:21-29):

⁷⁶Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, WUNT 194 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 43; Eichrodt, *Ezekiel*, 508-509.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸The clear allusions to Gen 2:7 and its surrounding co-text supports the claim in the section above that later OT authors use רוּחַ when describing the life-breath that Yahweh breathed into Adam (and breathes into every individual) even though נִשְׁמָה is used in Gen 2:7. See Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 225-26.

⁷⁹Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 44.

⁸⁰Marvin A. Sweeney, “Ezekiel: Zadokite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile,” in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 139.

<p>וְלֹא־אֶסְתִּיר עוֹד פְּנֵי מַהֶם אֲשֶׁר שָׁפַכְתִּי אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל נְאֻם אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה:</p>	<p>καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψω οὐκέτι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἀνθ’ οὗ ἔξέχεα τὸν θυμὸν μου ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραηλ λέγει κύριος κύριος</p>
---	---

Although chapters 38-39 are focused on the future judgment against Gog, 39:25 returns to the present situation of Israel’s exile (עתה; νῦν) and Yahweh’s promise to restore his people (39:25b-29).⁸¹ Some interpret the shift in verbs (from נתן in 36:27 and 37:14 to שפך in 39:29) as a shift in meaning. For example, Zimmerli suggests that the concept of “pouring out” “must envisage the concept of the fructifying, beneficent rain from heaven giving growth and nourishment”; a concept which contrasts with the inner transformation of man in 36:27 and 37:14.⁸² Daniel Block also sees a shift in meaning in 39:29.⁸³ Rather than indicating the rebirth of the nation (as in 36:26 and 37:14), the reference to the outpouring of the Spirit in 39:29 indicates “a sign and seal of the covenant.” In light of the other OT texts that describe Yahweh as “pouring out” his Spirit (e.g. Isa 32:15; 44:3; Joel 3:1; Zech 12:10), Block concludes,

It would appear from all these references that the pouring out of the Spirit of Yahweh upon his people signified the ratification and sealing of the covenant relationship. It represented the guarantee of new life, peace and prosperity. But it

⁸¹There is a significant textual variant between the MT and LXX. The latter contains ἐξέχεα τὸν θυμὸν μου (“I will pour out my wrath”). Some claim this variant points to a different *Vorlage* from the MT (see Johan Lust, “The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ezek 39,28,” in *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, ed. Johan Lust, BETL 74 [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986], 48-54). For a strong defense of the MT reading in Ezek 39:29 see Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 254-56. The primary usage of שפך in Ezekiel is in relation to Yahweh’s wrath. Ezek 7:8; 9:8; 20:8, 13, 21, 33, 34; 30:15; 36:18; 21:31 and 22:31 use the phrase שפך חמה to describe Yahweh’s judgment upon his people for their covenant disobedience. Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 47, observes that in the “present passage, Ezekiel changes what was for him a stereotypical threat of judgment—‘I will pour out (שפך) my wrath (חמה)’—into YHWH’s restorative activity—‘I will pour out (שפך) my spirit’ (רוח).”

⁸²Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 567.

⁸³Daniel Block, “Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit: Reflections on Ezekiel xxxix 21-29,” *VT 37* (1987): 267. Block also highlights the shift in the prepositions in the verses; from בכם/בקרבים in 36:27/37:14 to על־בית ישראל in 39:29.

signified more than this. It served as the definitive act whereby he claimed and sealed the newly gathered nation of Israel as his own.⁸⁴

For Block, the pouring out of Yahweh’s Spirit is the seal of Yahweh’s possession of his people, not the act of transformation in order to re-create his people. However, despite the change in vocabulary and the arguments put forth by Zimmerli and Block, Robson provides three cogent reasons for why it is preferable *not* to see a shift in meaning between Yahweh “pouring out his Spirit” and Yahweh “giving his Spirit.” First, there is an “essential similarity” between “giving” רוּחַ and “pouring” רוּחַ throughout the OT. This similarity is demonstrated by the similar sphere of operation as indicated by the interchangeability of the prepositions. Yahweh can “pour” רוּחַ in the midst” (בְּקֶרֶב), though “pour upon” (עַל) is more common; likewise, Yahweh can “give” (נָתַן) רוּחַ “upon” (עַל).⁸⁵ This similarity in meaning is also demonstrated in the way Joel 3:1-2 uses “pouring” to develop Numbers 11, although Numbers 11 uses “giving.” This development suggests that “giving” and “pouring” are not fundamentally different acts.⁸⁶ Second, the linking of רוּחַ with פְּנִים connects 39:29 to the restorative promises of 36:27 and 37:14.⁸⁷ Third, while there is debate about the relationship between 39:21-29 and the Gog oracle of 38:1-39:20, “it is clear that the ‘now’ (עַתָּה) of verse 25 shifts the focus from the future back to the present.”⁸⁸ Therefore, verses 25-29 appear to reflect the same

⁸⁴Ibid., 269.

⁸⁵Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 260.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Ibid., 261. The phrase “I will not again hide my face from them” (39:29a; וְלֹא־אֶסְתִּיר עוֹד; פָּנֵי מִהֶם; καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψω οὐκέτι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν) also links with the vision of the dry bones in 37:1-14. In the vision, the “whole house of Israel” is pictured as “dead” (indicated by the symbol of the “dry bones” and the question, “Can these bones live?”). The reference to Yahweh hiding his face (39:29a) likely signifies death (cf. Ps 104:29; 103:29 LXX) and thus the pouring out of the Spirit is the opposite of death—it is the endowment of new life, as in 37:10-14.

⁸⁸Ibid. Ganzel, “Descriptions of Restoration,” 208: “These concluding verses [39:21-29] actually appear to signify deliberate changes made by Ezekiel in order to conclude his post-Fall restoration prophecies on a conciliatory note, in contrast to the harsh, condemning tone that characterizes the pre-Fall prophecies.” This reversal is demonstrated lexically through the inversion of familiar terms. For example,

setting and perspective as the earlier salvation oracles like 36:26-27 and 37:11-14 because they also anticipate a time when Yahweh's people will be restored and return to their land.⁸⁹ In light of the conceptual and verbal similarities between Ezekiel 39:29 and 36:26-27; 37:11-14, the act of “pouring out” Yahweh's Spirit should be interpreted (at least here in Ezekiel) as an act of new creation whereby the creator God creates for himself a new humanity. Ezekiel employs the metaphor of new creation to describe the action of Israel's covenant God to re-gather from exile (37:15-23) and restore “the whole house of Israel” (i.e., the twelve tribes) into a new covenant relationship with himself.⁹⁰

Summary the Spirit-Giver in Ezekiel. Ezekiel envisions a time when Yahweh will create a new people for himself—a purified people with a new heart and a new spirit who will walk in obedience with their God. The new life-breath Yahweh will give to his people is none other than his own Spirit. Ezekiel presents this act of giving the Spirit as an act of new creation. First, the act of giving Yahweh's Spirit is analogous to the act of giving a רוח חדשה. Yahweh's Spirit is the new life-breath of Yahweh's new humanity. Second, God's re-created people are described as dwelling in a new Eden (36:33-35).⁹¹ Third, the vision of the re-creation of the dry bones which illustrates the s/Spirit-giving promises of 11:19-20 and 36:26-27 is structured after the two-stage creation of Adam in Genesis 2:7 and provides many other verbal parallels with Genesis 2.

the verbs כנס and שפך occur in “pre-fall” texts to describe Yahweh's judgment upon his people; while in 39:28-29 the same verbs are used to describe Yahweh's “post-fall” restoration of his people.

⁸⁹Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 46.

⁹⁰Cf. Ezek 37:11: כָּל-בַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל; πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραηλ.

⁹¹Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 100-01, asserts, “Israel's story-telling begins in Eden. Ezekiel's vision for re-creation returns to Eden.” He supports this claim by noting various ways images of Eden are evoked in Ezek 36:33-35: “The land will be tilled, as in Gen 2:15. Those who pass by will take note of how the former wasteland is now like a garden of Eden. Even the ensuing vision of dry bones may contain a reminiscence of creation in Gen 2:23. Ezek 37:7 describes the initial connection of the bones with the words ‘bone to its bone.’”

Fourth, in 39:29 “pouring out” the Spirit is contrasted with Yahweh “hiding” his face from his people, a likely image of death.

Ezekiel provides a key insight to the eschatological giving of the Spirit, which is significant for the thesis of this chapter. The act of pouring out/giving his Spirit is an act of new creation and is presented as a recapitulation and heightening of Yahweh breathing the life-breath into Adam in Genesis 2:7. The act of new creation (i.e., Yahweh restoring his people) will correspond to original creation in that Yahweh, the creator, will give breath to humanity; and yet new creation will also surpass original creation in that Yahweh’s new humanity will not merely be animated with “breath,” but with Yahweh’s own Spirit.

Furthermore, the new-creation images are metaphors describing Yahweh’s promise to re-gather his exiled people and restore their covenant relationship. The allusions to the covenant formula of Exodus 6:7 (“You will be my people, and I will be your God”), in connection with the return from exile in Ezekiel 11:19-20 and the explicit reference to the restoration of the twelve tribes into a covenant relationship with Yahweh in Ezekiel 37:15-23, associates the act of giving the Spirit with Yahweh’s identity as Israel’s deliverer. While Ezekiel emphasizes new creation, he also associates the act of giving the Spirit with Israel’s new exodus—a theme that is significant for Isaiah’s description of the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit.

Isaiah: The Outpouring of the Spirit as New Creation and New Exodus

The eschatological outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit is a prominent motif throughout Isaiah. There are two separate, though related, references to the future outpouring of the Spirit: the outpouring of the Spirit upon a future prophet-servant-king who will rule over Israel (Isa 11:1-5; 42:1; 61:1-5) and the outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit on his restored people as a whole (Isa 44:32:15; 44:3). The focus of this section

concerns the latter references since these are conceptually parallel with the motif in Luke-Acts of Jesus pouring out the Spirit on his people.⁹²

Although not as direct as Ezekiel in his connections of the eschatological gift of the Spirit and the creation narrative in Genesis, Isaiah still employs new-creation imagery to depict Yahweh's act of giving the Spirit. Furthermore, the references in 32:15 and 44:3 are also associated with Isaiah's new-exodus theme: the God who redeemed Israel from Egypt will once again act to deliver, re-gather, and restore his covenant people. This section will highlight the allusions to the creation narrative in Genesis and Yahweh's identity as the creator in Isaiah 4:4, 32:15, and 44:3 in order to demonstrate that the act of giving the Spirit is presented as an act of the creator God. In addition, this section also focus on the connection between the outpouring of the Spirit and Isaiah's exodus typology.

Isaiah 4:4. In the first chapter of Isaiah, Yahweh argues his case against his covenant people, "a sinful nation" who has "forsaken Yahweh, [and] have despised the Holy One of Israel" (1:4). Despite his pleas to return to him (1:18-20), his people have continued in their unfaithfulness and as a result will suffer judgment for their sin (2:6-4:1; 5:1-30). In the midst of these opening five chapters, which address Israel's covenant disobedience and Yahweh's judgment, there are two brief glimpses of a future promise of hope for the people: 2:1-5; 4:2-6. Yes, they have sinned, the covenant has been broken, judgment will fall, but death is not the final word. Yahweh will restore and renew his people; judgment is not an end in itself but will lead to a new age.⁹³ The promises of a future hope in these early chapters are developed throughout the book, especially in the

⁹²Although the presence of the Spirit upon Jesus is a significant theme for Luke, and he, in fact, draws upon these Isaianic texts to shape his presentation of Jesus (e.g., Luke 4:16-30; Isa 61:1-5), the primary focus of this thesis is on the corporate eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit.

⁹³Christopher R. Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, IBC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 41.

sections often referred to as “Second Isaiah” (chaps. 40-55) and “Third Isaiah” (chaps. 56-66).

Isaiah 4:4 (MT)

Isaiah 4:4 (LXX)

<p>אִם רָחַץ אֲדֹנָי אֶת צִיּוֹן וְאֶת־דָּמֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם יְדִיחַ מִקְרָבָהּ בְּרוּחַ מְשַׁפֵּט וּבְרוּחַ בָּעֵר:</p>	<p>ὅτι ἐκπλυνεῖ κύριος τὸν ῥύπον τῶν υἰῶν καὶ τῶν θυγατέρων Σιων καὶ τὸ αἷμα ἐκκαθαριεῖ ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐν πνεύματι κρίσεως καὶ πνεύματι καύσεως</p>
---	---

In Isaiah 4, the restored remnant is described as a people who have been washed clean from their filth and bloodstains (4:4). Childs observes that this description of the people as a cleansed, redeemed, and purified community contrasts sharply with the haughty, corrupt, and anarchic people described in chapters 2 and 3.⁹⁴ Verses 4:4-6 describe the coming day when the remnant of Israel is cleansed and the presence of Yahweh covers Mount Zion. These verses depict this future work of Yahweh to purify his people with new-creation language.⁹⁵ First, after Yahweh washes and cleanses his people by a Spirit of judgment and by a Spirit of burning (4:4), Yahweh will “create” (ברא) “a cloud by day” and “smoke . . . of a flaming fire by night” over Jerusalem.⁹⁶ Childs writes, “The use of the verb ‘create’ . . . raises the level of the imagery to that of a new divine creation, which starts over, as it were, after the cleansing of Jerusalem.”⁹⁷ Second, Childs also notes that “the promise of a beautiful and glorious increase of vegetation [4:2b] is playing on the eschatological theme of a return to paradise.”⁹⁸

⁹⁴Brevard S. Childs, *Isaiah*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 35.

⁹⁵Ibid., 36.

⁹⁶Along with new-creation language, there is also new-exodus language in this passage. The phrases “cloud by day” and “smoke and . . . of a flaming fire by night” (4:5) recall the signs of Yahweh’s presence with his people as they journeyed to the Promised Land (Exod 40:34-38). See, Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, 41. New exodus and new creation metaphors are often combined in Isa 40-55 to describe the coming day when Yahweh will restore his people. The combination of the themes in this passage support the claim that the images presented here in the opening of Isaiah are developed further in later portions of the book.

⁹⁷Childs, *Isaiah*, 36.

The referent of רוּחַ in 4:4 is ambiguous, although most scholars and translators interpret it as a reference to Yahweh’s “impersonal power,”⁹⁹ “wind,” or even “wrath.”¹⁰⁰ In fact, there is little scholarly support for taking 4:4 as a reference to Yahweh’s Spirit and thus seeing 4:4 in connection with later passages about the eschatological Spirit.¹⁰¹ However, the image of Yahweh washing his people by a Spirit of fire, the restoration hope of a remnant, and the new-creation co-text suggest that this passage anticipates the motif of the outpouring of the Spirit in later passages and therefore it is at least possible that רוּחַ refers to Yahweh’s own Spirit. In addition, the syntax (i.e., verb + a preposition indicating means) and meaning (i.e., Yahweh cleansing his people) of the sentence is similar to John the Baptizer’s prophecy regarding the “coming one” who will baptize (i.e., cleanse) ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Luke 3:16; Matt 3:11).

Despite the ambiguity, it is worth noting that the initial description of Yahweh cleansing his people by means of a רוּחַ is an act of new creation. The remnant created by Yahweh’s purging will dwell in a restored Eden filled with Yahweh’s presence.

Isaiah 32:15. The interjection הִנֵּה, which begins chapter 32, interrupts a series woes (הוֹי) introducing the surrounding chapters (28:1; 29:1; 30:1; 31:1; 33:1).¹⁰² This change in the interjection marks a change in content. Whereas the previous four chapters and the subsequent chapter focus on Yahweh’s judgment, most of chapter 32 contains the

⁹⁸Ibid. This theme is developed throughout the book of Isaiah as the coming age is unveiled (cf. 32:16; 62:3, 9; 65:23; 66:11). Since this opening description of restoration is developed further in later part of Isaiah, it is not surprising to find a direct reference to Eden in connection with Israel’s restoration: וַיֵּשֶׁם מִדְּבָרָהּ כְּעֵדֶן וְעַרְבָתָהּ כְּגַן־יְהוָה ([Yahweh] will make her wilderness like Eden and her desert as the garden of Yahweh; Isa 51:3).

⁹⁹Wonsuk Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes: The Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah*, JSOTSup 271 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 139.

¹⁰⁰Lloyd Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972), 51.

¹⁰¹J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 66, interprets רוּחַ as a reference to Yahweh’s own Spirit.

¹⁰²Walter Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 253.

promise of Yahweh’s future restoration.¹⁰³ Verses 1-8 anticipate the coming of a new king, who will reign in righteousness (32:1a), and the new society, which will exist under his rule (32:2-8). Verses 15-20 also envisions a new creation, as a result of the outpouring of the Spirit (32:15). Verses 9-14 interrupt these promises of restoration/renewal with an oracle against the complacent daughters of Jerusalem (32:1), who are warned of the imminent judgment (32:10-14).

Isaiah 32:15 (MT)

Isaiah 32:15 (LXX)

עַד־יַעֲרָה עָלֵינוּ רוּחַ מְרוֹם	ἕως ἄν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ
וְהָיָה מְדַבֵּר לְכַרְמֶל	καὶ ἔσται ἔρημος ὁ Χερμελ καὶ ὁ Χερμελ εἰς
וְכַרְמֶל לִיעָר יִחְשָׁב:	δρυμὸν λογισθήσεται

The occurrence of רוּחַ with a passive verb in the MT differs from the other passages in Isaiah that explicitly identify Yahweh as the agent of the outpouring of the Spirit.¹⁰⁴ This verse, however, is conceptually parallel with 44:3 and provides a reference to an eschatological, collective outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit upon Israel.¹⁰⁵ Four points will be made about this passage and its significance for understanding the “giving of the spirit” in general and its connection with Yahweh’s identity as the creator and Israel’s redeemer in particular in Isaiah.

First, although the phrase רוּחַ יְהוָה does not occur, it is difficult to interpret רוּחַ here as referring to anything other than “the Spirit of Yahweh.”¹⁰⁶ The noun מְרוֹם

¹⁰³A similar type of “interruption” occurs in Ezek 11:14-21. As noted above, most of Ezek 1-33 focuses on Yahweh’s judgment of his people for their rebellion and 11:14-21 is the first mention of a future restoration. Like Isa 32:15ff, Ezek 11:14-21 introduces the promised gift of the “Spirit”; a promise that is developed later on in the book (Isa 44:3; Ezek 36:26-27).

¹⁰⁴The MT uses the niphthal passive indicative יַעֲרָה; while the LXX uses an active subjunctive verb with Spirit as the subject: ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα.

¹⁰⁵Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 31; Johann Gamberoni, “Die Geistbegabung im Alten Testament, besonders nach Joel 3,1-5,” in *Die Gabe Gottes: Beiträge zur Theologie und Pastoral des Firmsakramentes*, ed. Paul Nordhues and Heinrich Petri (Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1974), 15.

(“high”) often refers to heaven, the dwelling place of God (2 Sam 22:17; Ps 144:7; Jer 25:30; Isa 33:5; 38:14; 57:15), indicating the source of the outpouring. In addition, reference to Yahweh’s רוּחַ have already been made in 11:2 (רוּחַ יְהוָה) and 30:1 (רוּחִי) and the parallels between 32:15 and 44:3 suggest that the poured-out רוּחַ is Yahweh’s Spirit (see below).¹⁰⁷

Second, the outpouring of the Spirit marks a ‘salvation-historical’ shift from Yahweh’s judgment of his people to Yahweh’s restoration of his people.¹⁰⁸ The preposition עַד (ἐως) indicates that the judgment referenced in 32:9-14 will continue “until” the Spirit is poured out. Thus, the outpouring of the Spirit upon Yahweh’s people inaugurates the new age; an age characterized by justice, righteousness, quietness, trust, peace and security (32:16-18). The renewal resulting from the Spirit being poured out upon the people contrasts with the judgment that is described in 32:9-14 for their complacency.¹⁰⁹

Third, while both 32:1-8 and 32:15-20 anticipate the new age, there is no indication in these passages that the future king in 32:1 (i.e., the Messiah)¹¹⁰ is the agent

¹⁰⁶Philip, *Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 54, notes that “scholars unanimously agree that the reference here is to YHWH’s Spirit.” An exception to this general consensus is Wim Beuken, *Isaiah II HCOT* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 233, who interprets רוּחַ as wind.

¹⁰⁷Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 80.

¹⁰⁸As noted above, the restoration promise of 32:15-20 corresponds with the righteous king whose reign effects a reversal of God’s judgment upon his people. Isaiah was commissioned (6:8-10) to “Make the heart of this people dull, and their ears heavy, and blind (שָׁעַשׁ); lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand (בִּין) with their hearts, and turn and be healed” (ESV) However, under the reign of the righteous king, “The eyes will no longer be blind (שָׁעַשׁ), and the ears will perceive listen. The heart of the hasty will understand (בִּין) and know.”

¹⁰⁹Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 79.

¹¹⁰There is debate over the identity of the king who “will reign in righteousness” (32:1). First, Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, 228-33, argues that this king is King Hezekiah. He notes the following reasons: (1) chaps. 28-33 anticipate and are fulfilled by the narratives of Jerusalem’s deliverance in chaps. 36-38 which specifically reference King Hezekiah; (2) the descriptions of Hezekiah in chaps. 36-39 conform to the descriptions of the king in 32:1-8; (3) “the unsurpassability evaluations of the Chronicler and the Deuteronomistic Historian” (4) the absence of Hezekiah’s name in the indictments of chaps. 28-32; (5) “the strong likelihood that the contrast between Ahaz and the Immanuel child and royal figure of Isa 9:1-7 is

of the outpouring of the Spirit.¹¹¹ Despite the strong connection in Isaiah between the Messiah and Yahweh's Spirit (e.g., 11:1-2), no passage presents the future king as the agent of the outpouring of the Spirit upon his people.¹¹²

Fourth, most scholars see the descriptions of the renewal of the land in verses 16-19 as corresponding with the outpouring of the Spirit upon Yahweh's people.¹¹³ The negative effects Israel's sin had upon the land parallels the effect of Adam's sin on the creation. Israel's land (אדמה) was growing thorns (קוץ) and briars (שמיר; 32:13) and the result of Adam's sin is that the land (האדמה) will bring forth thorns (קוץ) and thistles (דרדר; Gen 3:18). In contrast, Isaiah 32:15-20 describes a new age for Jerusalem, an age in which the curses Israel had brought upon her land by her sin are removed. The wilderness (מדבר) will become a fruitful field (כרמל), which will become a forest (יער). Justice will dwell in the wilderness (מדבר) and righteous will abide in the fruitful field (כרמל). As a result there will be Shalom (שלום) in the land. Here, Isaiah envisions a great reversal caused by the outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit upon his people. Philip

meant to point to Hezekiah"; (6) and "the obvious way in which Hezekiah and Ahaz are set in contrast to each in chaps. 7-8 and 36-39." Second, some scholars see a reference to king Josiah (e.g., Ronald E. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39* NCB [London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980], 259). Third, some identify the king in 32:1 with the coming ruler in chaps. 9 and 11, and thus as a reference to the future Messiah (e.g., J. Alec Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993], 257). In response, a reference to King Josiah is doubtful since there is no explicit reference to him anywhere else in the book. While Seitz offers a compelling case for a reference to Hezekiah in this passage, the reference to the outpouring of the Spirit in 32:15 which coincides with the reign of this king (Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, 232) is hardly fulfilled during the reign of King Hezekiah. Thus, both 32:1-8 and 15-20 are better understood as announcements of the age to come. It is likely, then, that Hezekiah functions in chapters 36-39 as a 'type' of the future king who will reign in righteousness. See Childs, *Isaiah*, 241, who argues that the reference to the outpouring of the spirit in 32:15 makes it apparent that vv. 1-8 "are to be understood messianically" (cf. Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 254; John Goldingay, *Isaiah*, NIBC 13 [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002], 179).

¹¹¹Contra, Ronald F. Youngblood, *The Book of Isaiah: An Introductory Commentary*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 93, who writes regarding 32:15, "The Messiah came to pour out his Spirit on his people."

¹¹²Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 258; Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 83.

¹¹³E.g., Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, 76; Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 258; Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 81; Childs, *Isaiah*, 241.

rightly observes, “This fruitfulness of the land is clearly meant as an image of the moral renewal of the nation; the result of pouring out the Spirit is a new ethical life.”¹¹⁴ In addition to the new-creation imagery, there is also covenantal language implied in the curses which came upon the people, as well as in the blessings that follow the outpouring of the Spirit.¹¹⁵

The restoration of Yahweh’s people and the corresponding renewal of the land is presented as an act of new creation. Neve writes, “Just as all of creation received the gift of life from God through the spirit in the beginning, and just as nature must suffer along with man because of man’s sin...so nature again will share in the renewal of creation which comes with the pouring out of the spirit. . . . It is the return of paradise.”¹¹⁶ Although Yahweh is not the explicit subject of the pouring of the Spirit (as in Ezek 39:29), it is important to observe the continued new-creation language used to describe this eschatological descent of the Spirit.

Isaiah 44:3 in the co-text of Isaiah 40-55. The final reference to the corporate, eschatological outpouring of the Spirit in Isaiah occurs within the new-exodus co-text of chapters 40-55. Before analyzing the act of giving this Spirit in 44:3, this section first examines this text in light of its connection to the opening of this section, 40:1-11

¹¹⁴Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 56.

¹¹⁵See, e.g., Hans Walter Wolff, “The Transcendent Nature of Covenant Curse Reversals,” in *Israel’s Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, ed. A. Gileadi (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988), 319. Within the narrative of the Torah, the covenant blessings and curses of Deuteronomy are themselves reminiscent of the blessing in the Garden of Eden and the curse after the Fall; see John H. Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch as Narrative* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 471.

¹¹⁶Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, 76. Brueggemann, *Isaiah 1-39*, 258, likewise associates the outpouring of the spirit with new creation. He writes, “The wondrous outcome of the work of this spirit is inversion, whereby wilderness becomes ‘fruitful land,’ and ‘carmel,’ that is, garden land, becomes thicket. The ‘fruitful land’ is restored creation that will burst with vitality and generativity to create well-being and prosperity.”

Isaiah 44:3 (MT)

Isaiah 44:3 (LXX)

כִּי אֶצְקֶמְיָם עַל־צִמָּא	ὅτι ἐγὼ δώσω ὕδωρ ἐν δίψει τοῖς
וְנִזְלִים עַל־יְבֹשֶׁה	πορευομένοις ἐν ἀνύδρῳ
אֶצְקֶ רוּחִי עַל־זֵרְעֶךָ	ἐπιθήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου
וּבְרַכְתִּי עַל־צִאֲצָאֶיךָ:	καὶ τὰς εὐλογίας μου ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου

Although the material in chapters 40-55 builds upon elements from chapters 1-39, most scholars view 40:1 as marking a significant turn in the book of Isaiah's prophecy. The repeated command, "Comfort, comfort" (נַחֲמוּ נַחֲמוּ), which begins this unit, sets the tone for these chapters and indicates a significant change in content, as well as point of view.¹¹⁷ The book turns from focusing on Israel's covenant unfaithfulness and imminent judgment, to Yahweh's faithfulness and promise of restoration;¹¹⁸ in addition, the point of view switches from pre-exilic (chaps. 1-39), to post-exilic (cf. 40:2).¹¹⁹ Due to the placement of Isaiah 44:3 within such a significant section of Isaiah, it is necessary to interpret this promise within the larger framework of chapters 40-55.¹²⁰

¹¹⁷The repetition of נַחַם (παρακαλέω) occurs also in Isa 51:3: "Yahweh will comfort Zion; he will comfort all her ruins. He will make her desert like Eden and her wilderness like the garden of Yahweh."

¹¹⁸This is not to say that there are no references to Israel's sin and judgment (cf. 42:18-25; 50:1-11), but rather, that the primary focus concerns restoration. Just as chaps. 1-39 contained brief glimpses of Israel's future restoration (e.g., 35:1-10 contains many verbal and conceptual parallels with 40:1-11), so chaps. 40-55 contain reflections on Israel's past rebellion and present spiritual blindness. Furthermore, the blessings of restoration require Israel to turn from her characteristic sin of idolatry (cf. 42:17; 43:22-28). This explains why Isaiah continues to describe Israel as blind (the same charge against Israel as in Isa 6:8-13).

¹¹⁹Bo H. Lim, *The "Way of the LORD" in the Book of Isaiah*, LHBOTS 522 (New York: T & T Clark, 2010), 50. However, I am not equating a post-exilic "point of view" with a post-exilic date of the composition or prophecy. I am simply recognizing that Isaiah's prophecy in these chapters address a people who have and are continuing to experience the judgment prophesied in chaps. 1-39.

¹²⁰Furthermore, much of chaps. 40-55 concerns Yahweh's divine identity: he is distinguishable from all others because he alone is the creator (40:22b, 26, 28; 41:18-20; 42:5, 16; 43:1, 7, 15; 44:2, 21, 24; 45:7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 18; 51:3, 13, 16; 54:5), ruler (40:22a; 41:2-4, 21, 43:15; 44:6), and savior of his people (41:8-10, 14; 43:1, 3-7, 11, 14; 44:6, 22, 23, 24; 45:15, 21, 22; 47:4; 48:17, 20; 49:7, 26; 52:3-5, 9-10; 54:5,

Isaiah 40:1-11 forms a unit and functions as the prologue to all of Isaiah 40-55, thus stating the main theme developed throughout the subsequent chapters.¹²¹ The theme is that of comfort for Yahweh's exiled people because the God who delivered them from Egypt is coming again to deliver them from exile.¹²² In order to depict the cosmic, historical, and spiritual significance of this new act of Yahweh, Isaiah describes Israel's restoration (i.e., ingathering from exile, restoration of a covenant relationship with Yahweh, payment of sins, and ethical transformation) using the language of both new creation and new exodus. Bauckham rightly notes, "The new exodus of the future, especially as predicted in the prophecies we call Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40-55), will be an event of universal significance precisely because the God who brought Israel out of Egypt is also the Creator and Ruler of all things."¹²³ This section establishes the new-exodus context in which the new-creation outpouring the Spirit in 44:3 is set by briefly examining the new-exodus imagery used in the 40:1-11.¹²⁴

It is possible to divide verses 1-11 into four sections. First, verses 1-2 announce the consolation for God's people (יְהוָה) and state the reason for the comfort: her time of exile is over, her penalty has been paid. The terms "my people" and "your God"

8). All three categories contain references to Yahweh's actions past, but there are also many references to Yahweh's eschatological identity in the age to come. At this time Israel and nations will acknowledge his identity as the creator, ruler, and redeemer.

¹²¹Lund, *Way Metaphors*, 72. Cf. Lim, *The "Way of the Lord,"* 49: "How one interprets the first eleven verses has a dramatic effect on how the rest of [Second Isaiah] is viewed."

¹²²Ibid., 77.

¹²³Bauckham, "God Crucified," 8.

¹²⁴Scholars have noted the following new-exodus texts within chaps. 40-55: (1) 40:3-11: the highway in the wilderness; (2) 41:17-20: the transformation of the wilderness; (3) 42:14-17: Yahweh leads his people in a way they know not; (4) 43:1-7: passing through the waters and the fire; (5) 43:14-21: a way in the wilderness; (6) 44:1-5: water on the thirsty land; (7) 44:27: drying of the deep water; (8) 48:20-21: exodus from Babylon; (9) 49:8-12: the new entry into the Promised Land; (10) 50:2: power to deliver; (11) 51:9-10: new victory at sea; (12) 52:11-12: the new exodus (explicit parallels between the exodus from Egypt and return from Babylon); (13) 55:12-13: Israel shall go out in joy and peace. (These passages are cited by Lim, *The "Way of the LORD,"* 47-48.)

echo the “covenant formula” in Exodus 6:7 and imply that Israel’s restoration is the election of a new people for Yahweh. Second, verses 3-5 describe the reversal of Israel’s judgment (as was mentioned in v. 2), as well as the means by which this reversal occurs: Yahweh is coming to deliver his people (cf. 59:19).¹²⁵ Third, verses 6-8 function to contrast the faithlessness of the people with the faithfulness of God’s word. Israel, because of her grass-like commitment (דָּקֵף) to Yahweh, has experienced the judgment of Yahweh and has withered like the grass of the field. Fourth, verses 9-11 elaborate on the theophany implied in verses 3-5—Yahweh is the coming (בּוֹא) to gather his people (קָבֵץ)¹²⁶ to himself. Yahweh’s coming will result in salvation for his people and judgment for their enemies.

There are various new-exodus images in Isaiah 40:1-11 that are used to portray the coming of Yahweh and the restoration of his people.¹²⁷ First, as noted above, the terms עַמִּי (τὸν λαόν μου) and אֱלֹהֵיכֶם (a personal pronoun is not used in the LXX) echo the covenant formula that first appears in Exodus 6:7. Second, the wilderness setting (עֲרָבָה/מִדְבָּר), as the place where Yahweh’s way (דֶּרֶךְ) is prepared, recalls Israel’s journey through the wilderness to the Promised Land, as well as God’s presence with them as they traveled on the “way” (דֶּרֶךְ; Exod 13:21-22; 23:20).¹²⁸ Third, the term מַסְלָה (“highway”; 40:3b) occurs in Isaiah 11:13 where it makes a direct connection

¹²⁵For ways vv. 4-5 parallel other theophany passages, see Lund, *Way Metaphors*, 86.

¹²⁶Cf. Deut 32:3.

¹²⁷For studies on the use and development of the exodus paradigm in all of Isa 40-55, see Roland Beaudet, “La typologie de l’Exode dans le Second-Isaïe,” in *Etudes théologiques: Tricentenaire du Séminaire de Québec*, ed. Lorenzo Roy (Québec: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 1963), 11-21; Joseph Blenkinsopp, “Scope and Depth of the Exodus Tradition in Deutero-Isaiah, 40-55,” in *Dynamism of Biblical Tradition* (New York: Paulist, 1967); Carroll Stuhlmueller, *Creative Redemption* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970), 66; Dale A. Patrick, “Epiphanic Imagery in Second Isaiah’s Portrayal of a New Exodus,” *HAR* 8 (1984): 125-41; George Wesley Buchanan, “Isaianic Midrash and the Exodus,” in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 154 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 89-109; David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000; repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 45-59.

¹²⁸Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 52.

between the return of the remnant from Assyria, and the exodus from Egypt: “And there will be a highway from Assyria for the remnant that remains of his people, as there was for Israel when they came up from the land of Egypt.”¹²⁹ Fourth, as a result of his coming, the glory of Yahweh will be revealed and “all flesh” will see it (וְנִגְלָה כְבוֹד יְהוָה ; 40:5) and during Israel’s exodus journey, the people also “saw” the כְבוֹד יְהוָה (Exod 16:7, 10; cf. 33:18). Fifth, in verse 10, Yahweh is portrayed as a victorious warrior exercising dominion with his arm (זְרוֹעַ). The same metonymy is used to describe Yahweh defeating the Egyptians and delivering his people (Exod 6:6; 15:16; Deut 4:34; 5:15). These images indicate that the God who acted to bring his people out of Egypt was once again acting to deliver his people from exile and re-create their covenant relationship.¹³⁰

Although Yahweh promises to gather his people from exile and establish a new covenant with them, there is also a recognition throughout Isaiah that Israel’s ultimate problem was never the external threat of Babylon and Assyria, nor the original covenant Yahweh established at Sinai. The problem has always been internal (e.g., 40:2; 41:29; 42:18-25) and thus the transformation of the people is necessary. Part of the new-exodus promise, then, is the transformation of the people. For example, in language very similar to Isaiah 40:3-5, 41:19-20 describes Yahweh’s re-creation (עָשָׂה, בְּרָא; v. 20) of the “wilderness” (מִדְבָּר; 41:18, 19), “desert” (עֲרֵבָה; 41:19), and “valley” (בִּקְעָה; 41:18), which result in the “poor and needy” (i.e., the people) “seeing,” (רָאָה) “knowing,” (יָדַע) and “understanding” (שָׁכַל) that Yahweh has acted. This dramatic change contrasts

¹²⁹Ibid., 54. ESV translation.

¹³⁰Many of these exodus images are developed in later chapters. For example, Isa 48:20-21 describes the future departure from Babylon as a reenactment of the exodus journey through the wilderness: “Go out from Babylon, flee from Chaldea, declare this with a shout of joy, proclaim it . . . ‘Yahweh has redeemed his servant Jacob!’ They did not thirst when he led them through the desolate places; he made water flow for them from the rock; he split the rock and the water gushed out.” Isa 51:9-10 develops 40:10: “Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm (זְרוֹעַ) of Yahweh; awake, as in days of old, the generations of long ago. . . . Was it not you who dried up the sea, the waters of the great deep, who made the depths of the sea a way for the redeemed to pass over?”

sharply with Yahweh's complaint that his servant Israel is "deaf" and "blind" (42:18-20) and reflects a reversal of his judgment upon Israel in 6:8-10.¹³¹ This image of Yahweh re-creating geography and transforming his people occurs again in Isaiah 43:18-21:

Remember not the former things, nor consider the things of old. Behold, I am doing a new thing; now it springs forth, do you not perceive it? I will make a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert. The wild beasts will honor me, the jackals and the ostriches, for I give water in the wilderness, rivers in the desert, to give drink to my chosen people, the people whom I formed for myself that they might declare my praise.

The language of Isaiah 44:1-5 develops the re-creation and transformation motif of Isaiah 40:3-5, 41:18-20, and 43:18-21 and is thus part of the new-exodus theme introduced in 40:1-11. The following verbal and thematic connections support this claim:

(1) References to Israel's new/renewed covenant with Yahweh introduces this passage (cf. 40:1). Two times Yahweh mentions that he has chosen (בְּחַרְתִּי) Israel, an act described as the creation of a new people (44:2a). (2) As in the passages cited above, there is a reference to Yahweh "pouring out water on the thirsty land" (אֶצְקֵם מַיִם ; 44:3a). However, unlike the previous topographical changes that lead to Israel seeing the glory of Yahweh (40:5) or knowing Yahweh (41:20)—thus signifying their transformation—the pouring out of water on the land is set in parallel with the "pouring out of Yahweh's Spirit upon Israel's descendents." These parallels indicate that the people of Israel are the dry land that will be transformed or re-created by Yahweh's Spirit. (3) The result of the outpouring of the Spirit is that the people will "spring up among the grass like willows by a flowing stream" (44:4). The vegetation metaphor used to describe Yahweh's vivified people links back with 40:6-8 where the people were described as grass which had withered and died.¹³²

¹³¹Lim, *The "Way of the LORD,"* 54. Cf. also 35:5-7, where Isaiah announces that "the eyes of the blind will be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped" and connects it with Yahweh's re-creation of the wilderness and desert.

¹³²There is another link with the previous chapters that is worth noting. In 42:1, Yahweh states, "Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have placed my Spirit upon him (וְנָתַתִּי רוּחִי עָלָיו); ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν)." Although Israel is frequently described as

Isaiah 44:3 in its immediate co-text. In the MT, the repetition of the verb **יָצַק** provides a clear parallel between **רוּחַ** and water.¹³³ This association suggests that as water is the source of life for the parched land, so Yahweh’s Spirit will be the source of life for his restored people.¹³⁴ This association is further strengthened by the metaphor in verse 4 depicting those upon whom the Spirit is poured out as springing up “among the grass like willows by flowing streams.” Here is a vivid depiction of re-creation: Yahweh’s exiled people are a dry ground, dead, without life; yet Yahweh promises a time when he will breathe breath into his people and they will be made alive.¹³⁵

The description of Yahweh’s Spirit as the life-breath for the eschatological people indicates a strong conceptual parallel between Ezekiel’s and Isaiah’s visions of the outpouring of the Spirit.¹³⁶ Bo Lim also notes the close connection between the activity of the Spirit in Isaiah 44:3 and Ezekiel 37.¹³⁷ First, in Ezekiel, the dry bones signify the whole house of Israel (37:11) that gains new life through the **רוּחַ** of Yahweh (37:5). In Isaiah 44, “When the election of Jacob (**בְּחַרַת**, 44:1-2), Yahweh’s role as creator (44:2), and the naming of the people (44:5) are taken into consideration, it is clear that the outpouring of the Spirit in 44:3 signifies the regeneration of the people of God.”¹³⁸

Yahweh’s servant and chosen one (cf. 41:8; 42:18; 44:1-5), the descriptions between the servant in 42:1-9 parallel the previous descriptions of the Davidic king in 11:1-4 and 32:1-8 and not the other descriptions of the nation of Israel. Israel is described as a blind and deaf servant (41:18-19), but the servant is one who faithfully obeys Yahweh. The close references between 42:1 and 44:3, however, suggest the possibility that the Davidic-servant’s experience of the Spirit is proleptic of restored-Israel’s experience of the Spirit. Despite the differences, Isaiah depicts many similarities between the Davidic-servant and Israel and the Spirit being placed/poured out “upon” (**עַל**; *ἐπι*) each of them strengthens the solidarity between the two.

¹³³The LXX uses two different verbs; cf. 32:15.

¹³⁴Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes*, 85.

¹³⁵Ibid.: “The creation language reinforces the life-giving effect of the spirit.”

¹³⁶The use of **יָצַק** in both Isa 32:15 and Ezek 39:29 [MT] strengthens this link.

¹³⁷Lim, *The “Way of the LORD,”* 57. Cf. Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2001), 57.

Second, 44:3 envisions a reversal of the death mentioned in 40:7. The vegetation, symbolizing the exiled people, “withers” and “fades” when רוּחַ יְהוָה נִשְׁבָּה בּוֹ (‘‘Yahweh’s *ruach* blows on it’’).¹³⁹ In contrast, 44:3 envisions a time when Yahweh will pour out his רוּחַ on his people resulting in their ‘‘sprouting up’’ (צִמַּתָּ, 44:4).¹⁴⁰ Lim concludes, ‘‘Whereas the people remain as but withering grass (40:7), 44:4 indicates that the offspring of Jacob, this new Israel created from amid exile, will flourish like willows nourished by water through the outpouring of the Spirit.’’¹⁴¹

That the act of pouring out the Spirit is an act of new creation is further supported by the co-text of 44:2 where Yahweh is explicitly identified as Israel’s creator: ‘‘Thus says Yahweh who made you (עָשָׂךָ), who formed you (יָצָרְךָ) from the womb and will help you’’ (cf. 44:24). The participles function to articulate the unique identity of Yahweh: Who is Yahweh? He is the one who made and formed Israel. In 44:1-2, Israel’s election is presented as an act of creation and the verbs עָשָׂה and יָצַר provide a link to Yahweh’s creation of the heavens and the earth in general and his creation of Adam in particular (Gen 2:4-8). This link between Israel’s election and creation, as noted above, possibly corresponds with the OT theological concept of Israel as a new Adam; a new humanity.¹⁴² Like Adam, Israel also failed to obey Yahweh and as a result was sent into exile. Yet, in Isaiah 44:3, Yahweh promises to restore his covenant people, by making them alive with his Spirit; exile is not the final scene in the story.¹⁴³ Like a dry

¹³⁸Ibid.

¹³⁹This subordinate clause is absent in the LXX.

¹⁴⁰Lim, *The ‘‘Way of the LORD,’’* 57, notes that the two previous uses of צִמַּתָּ (42:9; 43:19) both refer to the ‘‘new things (רֵאשִׁוֹן) Yahweh is doing in contrast to the former things (רֵאשִׁוֹן).’’

¹⁴¹Ibid.

¹⁴²The author of Genesis uses יָצַר twice (Gen 2:7, 8) to describe Yahweh’s creation of Adam; this verb occurs three times in Isa 44 to describe Yahweh’s creation of Israel (Isa 44:2, 21, 24).

and barren desert renewed by a stream of water, exiled and sinful Israel will be restored by Yahweh's Spirit.

The movement of thought in verses 1-5 suggests a parallel between creation and new creation. Here there is a direct link between the identity of Yahweh as the creator and his action of pouring out his Spirit. The association of water and the Spirit supports the idea that Isaiah envisions the life-giving effect of the Spirit since throughout Isaiah water is the source of refreshing, regeneration, and vitality. The act of pouring out the Spirit is presented as an act of the creator and Israel's covenant God.¹⁴⁴

Summary. The references to the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit in Isaiah support the thesis of this chapter: the outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit is an act of new creation and thus linked to Yahweh's identity as the creator. Isaiah 44:2-3, in particular, is very explicit in associating the outpouring of the Spirit with the particularity of Yahweh the creator God and yet creation imagery also occurs in 32:15. In addition, the act of giving the Spirit is also part of Yahweh's new exodus of his people and thus linked with his identity as Israel's covenant God and redeemer.

The use of this new-creation and new-exodus language to describe Yahweh giving his Spirit is very similar to Ezekiel's description, although the later is more explicit in its development of the parallels between Genesis 2:7. The combination of creation and exodus metaphors to describe the eschatological act of giving the Spirit is consistent with the combination of these metaphors used throughout Isaiah to describe

¹⁴³Isa 44:5 indicates that this act of new creation (i.e., the creation of a new humanity) is linked with Israel's election (i.e., people of a new covenant), just like Israel's original election is linked with creation (44:2).

¹⁴⁴The parallel in v. 3 between the Spirit and בְּרִיָּה heightens the creation imagery in this passage. In addition, Lim, *The "Way of the LORD,"* 57, argues the "blessing" and "the reference to Jacob allude to the patriarchal narratives, and signify that the blessing given to Abraham (Gen 12:2-3) will continue to live on in the exilic generation. . . . The gift of the Spirit and the blessing in 44:3 are to be understood as a fulfillment of the initial Abrahamic promise."

Israel's restoration. David Pao has rightly observed: "The second way the Exodus paradigm is 'eschatologized' is the reformulation of the original Exodus story with the cosmogonic one, thus emphasizing the (new) Exodus as a creative event."¹⁴⁵

Joel: The Outpouring of the Spirit as the Creation of a Nation of Prophets Living in a New Eden

Joel 3:1-2 (2:28-29, ET) is a significant text for Luke's presentation of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit since he quotes it (along with vv. 30-32a) in its entirety in Acts 2:17-21. Before analyzing Luke's use of this passage it is necessary to analyze it in both its immediate context within the book of Joel, as well as its canonical context within the OT.¹⁴⁶ There has been significant attention given to the link between the outpouring of the Spirit and its charismatic effects (especially in light of Luke's emphasis on the association between the Spirit and prophecy).¹⁴⁷ The importance of this association is strengthened further when one sees that Joel develops Numbers 11:16-30 where Moses expresses his longing for Yahweh to make all the people prophets and put his Spirit upon them (יְהוָה אֶת־רוּחוֹ עָלֵיהֶם; δῶ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς; Num 11:29).

¹⁴⁵Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 56.

¹⁴⁶Today it is commonly recognized that Joel and Zechariah are part of a larger composition referred to as the "Book of the Twelve." Marvin A. Sweeney, "The Place and Function of Joel in the Book of the Twelve," in *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, FAT 45 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 189, notes that the twelve "minor prophets" appear as a single book in all canonical forms of the Jewish and Christian Bibles, as well as in three distinct manuscripts from the Judean wilderness (MurXII; 4QXII^a; 8HevXIIgr), and are designed as a single book in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature (Sirach 49:10; 4 Ezra 1:39-40; Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah 4:22; Lives of the Prophets). It is worth noting that the order of the Twelve differ between the MT and LXX. Cf. Barry Alan Jones, *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon*, SBLD 149 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995). He argues that the LXX ordering that places Joel fourth is the original placement of Joel within this corpus (239).

¹⁴⁷The "Spirit" here in Joel is generally interpreted as the "Spirit of Prophecy" and is often contrasted with Ezekiel's (and Isaiah's) life-giving Spirit.

Like Ezekiel and Isaiah, Joel describes the outpouring of the Spirit within the context of Israel's restoration. Although the metaphors of creation and exodus are not as prominent in Joel, they are not absent. This section attempts to show that Joel sets his emphasis on the prophetic effects of the Spirit and his development of Numbers 11:16-30 within a new-creation and new-exodus co-text.

Joel 3:1-2 (MT)

וְהָיָה אַחֲרֵי־כֵן
 אֲשַׁפֹּךְ אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־כָּל־בֶּשָׂר
 וְנִבְאוּ בְנֵיכֶם
 וּבָנוּתֵיכֶם
 זְקֵנֵיכֶם חִלְמוֹת יַחֲלֹמוּן
 בְּחֹזְרֵיכֶם חֲזִינוֹת יִרְאוּ
 וְגַם עַל־הַעֲבָדִים וְעַל־הַשִּׁפְחוֹת בַּיָּמִים
 הַהֵמָּה אֲשַׁפֹּךְ אֶת־רוּחִי

Joel 3:1-2 (LXX)

καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα
 καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν
 σάρκα
 καὶ προφητεῦσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν
 καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν
 καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια
 ἐνυπνιασθήσονται
 καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται
 καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς
 ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου

Joel 3:1-2 is part of a larger unit (2:18-3:5) in which the prophet Joel announces the coming vindication and restoration of Yahweh's people. This promise of a future consolation is in response to the nation's cry of lament in 1:1-2:17.¹⁴⁸ As part of this restoration, Joel announces that Yahweh will pour out his Spirit upon all sections of Israel's society, that is "all flesh" (כָּל־בֶּשָׂר). This will be an event accompanied by cosmic disturbances and will result in salvation for all who call upon Yahweh's name (3:3-5). There are a couple of verbal similarities between Joel 3:1-2 and the promises of Isaiah and Ezekiel. First, the appearance of רוּחַ with the first person pronominal suffix suggests that this is a reference to the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's own Spirit (cf. Ezek 36:27; 37:14; Isa 44:3). Second, the verb שָׁפַךְ occurs, connoting the image of pouring out water, as well as the lavishness of Yahweh's gift (Ezek 39:29 [MT], Isa 32:15; 44:3).¹⁴⁹ In addition, there is, at least, one conceptual parallel. As noted above, in

¹⁴⁸Larry R. McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit: The Cry of a Prophetic Hermeneutic*, JPTSup 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 21.

Isaiah 44:3 and Ezekiel 36:27, 37:1-14, the coming of the Spirit upon or within Yahweh's people results in the transformation of the people and in Joel 3:1-2, the act of pouring out the Spirit results in the transformation of the people into prophets. Claus Westermann has also recognized this similarity. He notes that despite their differences, there are conceptual parallels between Ezekiel 36:26-27 and Joel 3:1-2 because both prophecies concerning the eschatological renewal of God's people "from the inside."¹⁵⁰ In addition to these parallels, the book of Joel also incorporates the outpouring of the Spirit into the promise of Israel's restoration which is characterized as an act of new exodus and new creation.¹⁵¹

New-Exodus imagery in Joel. Joel uses exodus language to portray both the judgment in 1:1-2:17 and the restoration in 2:18-4:21.¹⁵² In 1:2-12 Joel describes the locust plague that has devoured the land as an act of judgment from Yahweh. Sweeney suggests that the emphasis on the locusts' absolute destruction of the vegetation (1:4)

¹⁴⁹Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*, 65; Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, 80; McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit*, 40.

¹⁵⁰Westermann, "Geist im Alten Testament," 228: "Die Vorstellungen sind dabei sehr verschieden; in jedem Fall aber geht es dabei um die Erneuerung des Gottesvolkes von innen her in der Endzeit." Cf. Matthias Wenk, *Community Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 58: "The statement 'I will pour out my Spirit on all people' is reminiscent of Isa 44:43 and 32:15, although each passage uses a different Hebrew term for 'pouring out,' yet they all denote the same idea. While at first glance the Joel passage does not seem to describe the eschatological age as covenant renewal in terms of a purifying experience (cf. Jer 31 and Ezek 36), this impression is misleading."

¹⁵¹Building upon the work of James Crenshaw (*Joel*, ABC [New York: Doubleday, 1995], 148), John Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and Scripture's Use of Joel*, BIS (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 168, notes eight additional parallels between Joel 2:18-4:3 and Ezekiel: (1) Both texts share similarities with a recognition formula 39:22/Joel 2:28; (2) They both share the promise of restoration 39:25a/Joel 4:2, 3; (3) The concept of Yahweh's jealousy is shared in 39:25b/Joel 2:18; (4) They both reflect aspects of the presence and removal of shame 39:26/Joel 2:17, 19; (5) Both allude to living securely in the land without fear 39:26/Joel 2:27; (6) They speak of the gathering and turning of Yahweh's exiled people 39:27/Joel 4:1-2; (7) They both note the outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit upon the house of Israel 39:29/Joel 3:1; (8) The topic of the foe from the north 39:15/Joel 2:20.

¹⁵²Joseph Bourke, "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël," *RB* 66 (1959), 191-212; Siegfried Bergler, *Joel als Schrifinterpret*, BEATAJ 16 (New York: Peter Lang, 1988); Sweeney, "The Place and Function of Joel," 198-200; Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and Scripture's Use of Joel*, 33-252.

parallels the locust plague over the land of Egypt (10:5, 12, 15).¹⁵³ In addition, Joel instructs כָּל יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ (1:2) to tell (סִפְרוּ) their children and grandchildren about Yahweh’s judgment and Yahweh gives Moses similar instruction prior to the locust plague: וּלְמַעַן תִּסְפֹּר בְּאָזְנֵי בְנֶךָ וּבֶן-בְּנֶךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר הִתְעַלְלֹתִי בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֶת-אֶתְתִּי בָם (Exod 10:2). Furthermore, in 2:2 Joel describes the “Day of Yahweh” as a day of “darkness and gloom” (יּוֹם חֹשֶׁךְ וְאֶפְלָה), a hendiadys that is also used to describe the plague of darkness in Exodus 10:22: וַיְהִי חֹשֶׁךְ-אֶפְלָה בְּכָל-אֶרֶץ.¹⁵⁴ The plagues that came upon Egypt for Pharaoh’s failure to acknowledge Yahweh as God and obey his commands, have likewise come upon God’s people for their covenant failure.

As the judgment is described using language from the Exodus narrative, so too is Yahweh’s promise of deliverance and restoration (2:18-4:21). First, the transition from judgment to restoration is marked in 2:18: “Then Yahweh became jealous (קָנָא) for his land and had pity (חָמַל) on his people.” John Strazicich argues that these two verbs evoke “the underlying covenantal bond that exists between Yahweh, the people, and the land” (cf. Exod 20:5; 34:14; Deut 5:9).¹⁵⁵ Second, the demise of the “northerner,” the enemy who threatened Yahweh’s people and land (2:1-11) is described in terms of the locusts in 1:2-12. When Yahweh gets rid of the “northerner,” he promises to do so in language that recalls his banishing of the locusts from Egypt. Yahweh casts the locusts into the Red Sea and in 2:20 promises to drive out the northern to the eastern sea and the western sea.¹⁵⁶ Third, the reason Yahweh acts to restore his people is similar to the

¹⁵³Sweeney, “The Place and Function of Joel,” 199.

¹⁵⁴The term “Day of Yahweh” (יּוֹם יְהוָה; ἡμέρα κυρίου) occurs in Joel 1:15; 2:1; and 4:14. In the former uses it signifies the threat of Yahweh’s judgment upon his people, but in the latter use it indicates Yahweh’s deliverance of his people from their enemies.

¹⁵⁵Strazicich, *Joel’s Use of Scripture*, 167. The covenantal language continues in v. 19 (cf. Deut 11:13-17) (170). Strazicich also notes the use of these verbs in connection with Ezekiel’s promise of restoration (e.g., Ezek 36:21; 39:25). Cf. Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 87-88.

¹⁵⁶Strazicich, *Joel’s Use of Scripture*, 172-73.

reason Yahweh acted to rescue them from Egypt (Exod 6:7; 10:2): “You will know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am Yahweh your God” (Joel 2:27). Fourth, the “wonders” (מוֹפְתִים; τέρατος) of blood, fire and columns of smoke which Yahweh will perform in the heavens and on the earth recall the signs and wonders Yahweh did in Egypt.¹⁵⁷ Sweeney helpfully summarizes the function of these allusions to the Exodus narrative as follows: “Joel draws upon past tradition to assert that YHWH has the capacity to bring a threat against Jerusalem and Judah and to deliver Jerusalem and Judah from that threat, just as YHWH did at the time of the Exodus from Egyptian slavery.”¹⁵⁸

The theme of Yahweh restoring his remnant (cf. 3:5b) climaxes in 3:5a: “All who call on Yahweh’s name will be delivered” (וְהָיָה כָּל אֲשֶׁר-יִקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה יִמְלֹט; και ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται). The noun “all” connects the offer of deliverance with the outpouring of the Spirit on “all flesh” (כָּל-בָּשָׂר; πᾶσαν σάρκα) in 3:1.¹⁵⁹ From this connection, Gamberoni suggests that the two texts “partially parallel” and “partially complement” each other.¹⁶⁰ If so, then the act of pouring out the Spirit, and its subsequent transformation, is an act of deliverance, salvation for all who call upon Yahweh’s name.

New-Creation imagery in Joel. Joel continues the prophetic pattern of mixing exodus and creation imagery to depict the significance of Israel’s deliverance. The promised restoration in 2:18-3:5 is a deliberate reversal of the imminent devastation

¹⁵⁷Sweeney, “The Place and Function of Joel,” 199. In light of the “theophanic” elements in 2:30-31, Bourke “Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël,” 200, also sees a parallel with the events in Egypt: “Pris ensemble, ces prodiges ne manquent pas de nous rappeler les plaies d’Egypte et l’Exode.”

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Note the parallels between כָּל-בְּיַת יִשְׂרָאֵל / πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραηλ in Ezek 37:11 and 39:25.

¹⁶⁰Gamberoni, “Die Geistbegabung im Alten Testament, besonders nach Joel 3,1-5,” 23: “Kaum zu klären ist, wie Geistausgießung, genauer Geistempfang und Anrufung Jahwes sich zueinander verhalten, ob ein ursächliches Verhältnis besteht, in welcher Richtung, ob es von Joel (von dem Redaktor) intendiert ist. Wahrscheinlich geht es um zwei teils parallele, teils komplementäre Aussagen.”

Joel announced in the earlier part of the book (1:15-20) and is depicted with images drawn from the opening chapters of Genesis. First, the restoration is presented as a reversal of the curses in Genesis 3:14-19 (cf. Joel 2:22). Allen notes, “Human, animal, and plant life is to be re-created with a glorious total harmony of divine blessing, a striking contrast for the reader of the OT to the threefold effect of the Fall.”¹⁶¹ Second, there is a thematic parallel between the restoration progressing in ascending order of worth from the land (2:21), to beasts (2:22), to children of Zion (2:23) and the progression of the creation order of land (Gen 1:11), beasts (1:24), and humanity (1:26).¹⁶² Third, Judah’s restored relationship with Yahweh is pictured as “a restoration back into God’s presence in a new creation, the kind of presence that the first Adam enjoyed.”¹⁶³ Furthermore, like Ezekiel (e.g., Ezek 36:35; cf. 28:13; 31:9; 31:16; 31:18) and Isaiah (e.g., Isa 51:3), Joel underscores that Israel’s restoration will include a return to Edenic conditions (cf. 2:3; 3:18-20).¹⁶⁴ The framework of new exodus and new creation provides the context for interpreting the act of pouring out the Spirit in 3:1-2. This act is a key component of Yahweh’s promise to re-create his people to live in a restored covenant with him; this will occur “when” Yahweh pours out his Spirit (3:1).

The Timing of the Outpouring of the Spirit. One challenge in understanding Joel’s prophecy of the Spirit in connection with the promised restoration concerns the timing of Yahweh’s action in relation to the restoration of the people and the land (2:18-27). Scholars often interpret the outpouring of the Spirit as occurring “after” (אחרי־כן; μετὰ ταῦτα) the events described in 2:18-27.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶¹Allen, *The Book of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, 91.

¹⁶²Strazicich, *Joel’s Use of Scripture*, 181; Ulrich Dahmen, “Das Buch Joel,” in *Das Buch Joel, Das Buch Amos*, NSKAT 22 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2001), 72.

¹⁶³Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 566.

¹⁶⁴Ibid.

Yet not all scholars agree that אַחֲרֵי־כֵן in Joel 3:1 functions to indicate a temporal sequence. For example, William VanGemen proposes that the phrase can function as a “temporal conjunctive” indicating a transition and proposes that in these instances it is best translated “when” (e.g., 2 Chr 20:1; cf. Judg 16:4; 1 Sam 24:6; 2 Sam 2:1; 8:1; 2 Kgs 6:24; 2 Chr 24:4).¹⁶⁶ The parallel expression בְּיָמֵי הַחֲמָה (“in those days”) in Joel 3:2 supports VanGemen’s interpretation since Joel 3:1-5 does not envision a time temporally distinct from that of 2:18-27. He writes, “[3:1-5] are complementary and explanatory of verses 18-27, as both sections explicate the new era of covenant renewal.”¹⁶⁷ However, even if one interprets אַחֲרֵי־כֵן as indicating a temporal sequence (“afterwards”), it is not necessary to conclude that Joel is distinguishing the time of the Spirit from the restoration promises in 2:18-27. Ronald Simkins has proposed that is referring back to the oracles of judgment in 1:2-2:17.¹⁶⁸ In this case, Joel is announcing that the outpouring of the Spirit will take place “after” the judgment announced in 2:12-17. In either case, it is doubtful the promise of salvation in 3:1-5 should be separated from the promises of restoration in 2:18-27. Simkins concludes,

It is unlikely that chapter 3 follows 2.18-27 sequentially, that the destruction of the locust plague and the restoration of the land must precede the pouring out of Yahweh’s spirit, for 3.5 also entails the promise of salvation for the people. Therefore, the salvation oracle of 3.1-5 should be interpreted parallel to 2.18-27.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁵This phrase is used to signify a temporal sequence in 2 Chr 20:35; Jer 16:16; 34:11. Neve, *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*, 80; McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit*, 40.

¹⁶⁶W. A. VanGemen, “The Spirit of Restoration,” *WTJ* 50 (1988): 84.

¹⁶⁷*Ibid.* Cf. Elizabeth Achtemeier, “The Book of Joel,” vol. 7 of *The New Interpreters Bible*, ed. David L. Petersen (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 326; Hildebrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*, 97-98. For a critique of VanGemen’s proposal, see Raymond Bryan, “Joel,” in *The Minor Prophets*, ed. Thomas Edward McComiskey (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 294.

¹⁶⁸Ronald Simkins, *Yahweh’s Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*, ANETS 10 (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 211. Also, the LXX translator appears to have interpreted אַחֲרֵי־כֵן as indicating a temporal sequence: μετὰ ταῦτα.

¹⁶⁹*Ibid.*

It is likely that Joel 3:1-2 does not indicate that the outpouring of the Spirit will occur after the restoration of the land and people and that the restoration of the land and people will take place “when” Yahweh pours out his Spirit upon all flesh. Like, Isaiah and Ezekiel, the outpouring of the Spirit in Joel is associated with the restoration of the land and covenant renewal of the people.¹⁷⁰

The Effects of the Outpouring of the Spirit. Joel highlights the transformation of the people as a result of the Spirit coming upon them. “All flesh” will experience the effects of the Spirit, effects that in Israel’s history had been typically limited to prophetic figures. Now, all will be made prophets; all will experience this unique intimacy with Yahweh (cf. 2:27). McQueen has rightly observed, “The enablement of all the people of Judah to prophesy means that all will have immediate knowledge of Yahweh.”¹⁷¹

Most scholars see this emphasis on the prophetic effects as a fulfillment of Moses’ plea in Numbers 11:16-30 (cf. 12: 1-8) that Yahweh would give his Spirit to all his people. In response to Moses’ unbearable burden of leading Yahweh’s people by himself, Yahweh appointed seventy elders upon whom he will place (נָתַן; שִׁים) his Spirit (11:17, 25, 26, 28) and when the Spirit rested (נָוָה) on the elders (11:25)—along with two men who were not initially appointed as elders (11:26)—the men began prophesying. In response to the two “unofficial” recipients of the Spirit, a concerned Joshua asks Moses to stop the men, to which Moses responds: “Are you jealous for my sake? Would that all Yahweh’s people were prophets, that Yahweh would put (נָתַן) his Spirit on them!” (11:29). Joel’s announcement of the outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit upon Yahweh’s people (“all flesh”) fulfills Moses’ longing that all Yahweh’s people would have a direct knowledge of Yahweh. Although the emphasis on giving the Spirit in Numbers 11 is not

¹⁷⁰McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit*, 40.

¹⁷¹Ibid.; Bryan, “Joel,” 294.

connected with Yahweh's identity as the creator or redeemer, Joel incorporates this promise into the framework of new creation and new exodus, and, therefore, like Isaiah and Ezekiel, links this act with Yahweh's unique, divine identity.¹⁷²

As noted above, the creation of a nation of prophets in Joel 3:1-2 is an act of transformation that parallels, despite their differences, the transformative effects of the Spirit in Isaiah 44:3 and Ezekiel 37:1-14. In Israel's history, the coming of the Spirit upon judges or prophets is not always presented as a transformative act (the emphasis is often on the empowering or inspiring presence of the Spirit); however, 1 Samuel 10:6 explicitly links the coming of the Spirit, its prophetic effects, and the transformation of the recipient: וְצִלְחָהּ עָלֶיךָ רוּחַ יְהוָה וְהָיָה וְהָיְתָ נְבִיִּיתָ עִמָּם וְנִהְפַכְתָּ לְאִישׁ אֲחֵר׃ (“And the Spirit of Yahweh will rush upon you and you will prophesy with them and you will be changed to another man”). Furthermore, if in fact Joel is developing Numbers 11 and Moses is the paradigm of the nation of prophets in the age to come, then it is necessary to observe that

¹⁷²It is possible that the book of Ezekiel likewise develops Moses' prayer in Numbers 11. Scholars have noted, in connection with Ezekiel's new-exodus theme, that the prophet Ezekiel is portrayed as a new Moses (e.g., Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul*, 109-10; Idestrom, "Echoes of the Book of Exodus," 489-510). In Exodus-Deuteronomy, Moses functions as a priest, a prophet, and a legislator; Ezekiel also functions as a prophet, priest, and legislator. Both Ezekiel and Moses are warned that their missions will fail due to the hardened hearts of others (cf. Ezek 2:4; Exod 2:7). Moses promises that a "prophet like me" will arise (Deut 18:18), and Ezekiel's mission signified to Israel that there was "a prophet among them" (Ezek 2:5). In addition, both men have a unique experience of Yahweh's Spirit that is paradigmatic for Israel's experience of the Spirit. Robson, *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*, 99 observes that many of the "theological, or theologically significant, references to רוּחַ relate directly to the life and ministry of the prophet Ezekiel himself" (cf. Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 100). He argues that this prominent theme is shaped in such a way so as to present Ezekiel's experience of רוּחַ as paradigmatic for future/restored Israel's eschatological experience of the רוּחַ. Ezekiel's experience of the Spirit is described as follows: twice the רוּחַ "enters" (בוא) Ezekiel (בי) and "sets" him on his feet (עמד; 2:2; 3:24), on six occasions the רוּחַ "lifts up" Ezekiel (נשא; 3:12, 14; 8:3; 11:1, 24a; 43:5), four times it "carries" Ezekiel (בוא; 11:1, 24; 43:5), once it "takes" Ezekiel (לקח; 3:14); on one occasion the רוּחַ יהיה "falls upon" (ותפל עלי) Ezekiel (11:5); and twice the רוּחַ is the agent of God/Yahweh who "carries" Ezekiel to the exiles (11:24b) and "brings him out" to the valley (37:1). In seven verses (3:12, 14; 8:3; 11:1, 5, 24a; 43:5) רוּחַ is the subject of the finite verb and in 11:24b and 37:1 is the agent (ב) by whom the vision is given (11:24) and through whom Yahweh acts (37:1). Restored Israel's experience of the Spirit is described using similar terms: Yahweh's רוּחַ will "enter" Israel (ותבוא בהם הרוח), as it "entered" Ezekiel (בוא; 2:2; 3:24); Yahweh will "pour out" his רוּחַ "upon" (על) the house of Israel (39:29), as Yahweh's רוּחַ fell "upon" (על) Ezekiel, and Yahweh will put his רוּחַ "in" (ב) his people, as the רוּחַ entered "into" (ב) Ezekiel. In light of these parallels it is possible that both Ezekiel and Joel present restored Israel as prophets in fulfillment of Num 11.

it is not so much Moses' inspired speech that defines him as a prophet, but his special relationship with Yahweh (cf. Exod 33:11; Deut 34:10). Both Ezekiel and Joel emphasize this special relationship with Yahweh that is the result of the act of pouring out the Spirit. Aaron Keucker rightly observes, "The gift of prophecy is fundamentally concerned with communion: communion between the prophet and God, communion between the people and God as urged by the Spirit through the prophet. . . . Emphasis on the act of prophecy overlooks necessary implications for the identity of prophets."¹⁷³ Both Joel and Ezekiel connect the outpouring of the Spirit with knowledge of Yahweh (Joel 2:27; Ezek 37:14).

Summary. The act of Yahweh pouring out his Spirit is incorporated into the theme of restoration, and the prophet Joel evokes images of exodus and creation to describe this restoration. Yahweh acts to transform his people so that they might know him and, due to the connection with the new-exodus theme and the parallels with 3:5a, this act is likely an act of salvation. Gamberoni comments that the creation of prophets is the "realization" and "highest culmination" of salvation.¹⁷⁴ Wolff's comment regarding Joel 3:1 is also helpful: "The pouring out of God's spirit upon flesh means the establishment of new, vigorous life through God's unreserved giving of himself."¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ Aaron J. Keucker, *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*, LNTS 444 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 15.

¹⁷⁴ Gamberoni, "Die Geistbegabung im Alten Testament, besonders nach Joel 3,1-5," 27: "Prophetentum' bedeutet nicht mehr Sendung, Aufgabe und Vermittlung, sondern eher unmittelbare Annahme des einzelnen durch Gott. Prophetisches Sein ist nicht mehr so sehr Aufgabe an einem zu wirkenden Heil, sondern Realisierung und höchste Aufgipfelung des Heils.

¹⁷⁵ H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos*, Hermeneia, trans. by W. Janzen et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 66. Cf. Hildebrandt, *An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God*, 98, who links Joel 3:1-2 with Ezek 36:26-27.

Zechariah: The Outpouring of the Spirit of Grace

Zechariah 12:10 (MT)

Zechariah 12:10 (LXX)

וְשִׁפְכֵי עַל־בַּיִת דָּוִד
וְעַל יוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם
רוּחַ חַן וְתַהֲנוּגִים

καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Δαυὶδ
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλημ
πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ

As with Isaiah 4:4, there is ambiguity regarding the referent of “the spirit of grace and supplication” in Zechariah 12:10. The lack of a pronominal suffix contributes to this ambiguity (however, see Isa 32:15) and the co-text of Zechariah’s prophecy is different from that of the others examined so far. In Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Joel, the outpouring of the Spirit is consistently associated with the return from exile. However, in Zechariah the people have returned to Jerusalem, yet they still await the promised outpouring of the Spirit.¹⁷⁶ It is possible that Zechariah envisions a different outpouring of the Spirit than Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Joel.

Yet there are a number of parallels with the other references to the eschatological Spirit that suggest the necessity of examining how Zechariah connects the act of giving the Spirit to the unique identity of Israel’s God. First, the verb שִׁפַּךְ (ἐκχέω) is used in both Ezekiel 39:29 and Joel 3:1, 2. Second, the preposition עַל, marking the object of the outpouring (i.e., “the house of David,” and “the one dwelling in Jerusalem”) is also used in Ezekiel 39:29, Isaiah 32:15, 44:3, and Joel 3:1, 2.¹⁷⁷ Third, the outpouring of the Spirit transforms the people’s response to Yahweh. The outpouring of the Spirit leads to mourning and repentance (12:10b-14), a transformation that may connect with 13:1 where Yahweh declares, “On that day there shall be a fountain (מְקוֹר) opened for the house of David (לְבַיִת דָּוִד) and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (וְלִישְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם) for sin and uncleanness (לְחַטָּאת וּלְנִדָּה).” The imagery of water, and the repetition of the phrases “house of David” and “inhabitants of Jerusalem” create the

¹⁷⁶Gamberoni, “Die Geistbegabung im Alten Testament, besonders nach Joel 3,1-5,” 12-13.

¹⁷⁷The term “house of David” is a possible parallel with Ezekiel term “all the house of Israel,” which in 37:15-28 is described as the united twelve living under a Davidic king.

possibility that 13:1 develops the outpouring the spirit in 12:10. It was noted above, that Ezekiel 36:26, 37, Isaiah 4:4, 44:3, and Joel 3:1, 2 all describe the transforming effects of the Spirit upon the recipients. In fact, Ezekiel 36:26 associates the “giving” of the Spirit with the cleansing of Israel. In light of these connections, it is possible that Zechariah 12:10 envisions the eschatological out pouring of Yahweh’s Spirit.

The Creation and Restoration Co-Text. All other references to the eschatological gift of the Spirit occur in literary contexts that emphasize Yahweh’s identity as Israel’s creator and redeemer. This section will look at the co-text of 12:10 to see whether or not this reference to the outpouring of the Spirit occurs in such a context.

Zechariah 12:10 is part of a larger unit (12:1-13:6), which announces Yahweh’s plan to renew his people.¹⁷⁸ This section appears to be structured around the phrase “on that day” (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא), which occurs in 12:3, 9; 13:2, 4.¹⁷⁹ The passage begins by identifying Yahweh as the one “who stretched out (נִטָּה) the heavens and founded (יָסַד) the earth and formed (יָצַר) the spirit of man within him (רוּחַ אָדָם בְּקִרְבוֹ; πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου ἐν αὐτῷ)” (v. 1). This description of Yahweh sets the framework for understanding the subsequent actions of Yahweh in relation to Israel:¹⁸⁰ (1) He will “set/make” (שָׂם) Israel as a cup of staggering to the surrounding nations (v. 2); (2) He will “set/make” (שָׂם) Israel a heavy stone for all things nations (v. 3); (3) He will strike the horses of the nations which oppose Judah (v. 4); (4) He will “set/make” (שָׂם) the clans of Judah like a blazing pot, which devours the nations (v. 6); (5) He will deliver Judah (v. 7); (6) He will protect the inhabitants of Jerusalem so that they shall be like

¹⁷⁸Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, NIVAC (Grand Rapid: Zondervan, 2004), 480.

¹⁷⁹Ibid., Cf. the analysis of the structure of this passage by E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*, OtSt 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 116-20.

¹⁸⁰Ralph L. Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, WBC, vol. 32 (Waco: Word Books, 1984), 274. Smith, notes that the term “Israel” in v. 1 likely refers to all the tribes (275).

David, and the house of David shall be like God, like the angel of Yahweh, going before them (v.8); (6) Verse 9 summarizes verses 2-8 by stating, he will destroy the nations that oppose Jerusalem; (7) He will pour out a spirit of grace and supplication (v. 10); (8) He will cut off the idols from the land (13:2-6).

In these verses, salvation does concern Yahweh's protection of Judah from their physical enemies, yet it is more than this. Verse 8 describes the transformation of the people (with a possible allusion to Gen 1:26-27 and Exod 23:20) and this description is likely developed in 12:10; 13:1, and 13:2-6. The reference at the beginning of this unit to Yahweh's identity as the creator, the specific reference to Genesis 2:7 ("he formed the life-breath/spirit of man within him"), and the association of the Spirit with transformation (e.g., repentance, cleansing) creates the possibility that the act in 12:10 is an act of the creator God whereby he endows his restored people with a new life-breath, his very own Spirit. The allusion to Genesis 2:7 and the transformative effects of the eschatological Spirit suggest a parallel with Ezekiel 37:1-14. At the very least, the outpouring of the Spirit in 12:10 fits the pattern demonstrated so far that the eschatological gift of the Spirit is consistently presented in contexts which highlight Yahweh's identity as the creator and Israel's covenant God. In light of the way verse 1 functions to introduce this section, Rex Mason has concluded: "the final act of salvation is to be an act of re-creation of a cosmic renewal."¹⁸¹

Summary: The Divine Identity of the Eschatological Spirit-Giver

This section has related the eschatological act of giving the Spirit with the unique identity of Israel's God. It has aimed to demonstrate that in each reference to the gift of the Spirit there are allusions and direct references to Yahweh's identity as the creator and covenant God of Israel. The act of giving the Spirit is part of Yahweh's

¹⁸¹Rex A. Mason, "The Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Proto Zechariah," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 115 (as cited in, Smith, *Micah-Malachi*, 275).

restoration of his people, a restoration that is depicted using creation and exodus metaphors. New creation and new exodus are the lens through which the prophets depict Yahweh's restoration of his people and as a result reveal that the act of giving the Spirit is the act unique to the identity of Israel's God.

Explicit Links Between the Giving of the Spirit and Yahweh's Divine Identity

This section highlights the explicit connections between Yahweh's identity in the age to come and the act of giving his Spirit. Both Ezekiel and Joel associate the act of giving the Spirit with Israel's recognition of Yahweh as its covenant God. These texts, drawing on the covenantal formula introduced in Exodus 6:7, suggest that the act of giving the Spirit is one of the ways in which Israel will identify Yahweh in the age to come.

Ezekiel: "Then They Will Know that I am Yahweh"

As noted above, the book of Ezekiel emphasizes the unique identity of Yahweh based on his acts of judgment and restoration. The refrain **וַיִּדְעוּתָם כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה** (*καὶ γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος*) and its variants occur approximately seventy times in the book of Ezekiel.¹⁸² This refrain is connected with Yahweh's act of judgment upon Israel or the nations, as well as in his promised acts of restoration. "The knowledge implied by the statement of recognition can only be described in connection with the actions of Yahweh that precede the recognition, prompt it, and provide it with a basis. Nowhere does the statement of recognition speak of recognition apart from the divine acts which nourish it."¹⁸³ Yahweh's particularity is made known exclusively through his acts of judgment

¹⁸²Ezek 5:13; 6:7, 10, 13, 14; 7:4, 9, 27; 11:10, 12; 12:15, 16, 20, 25; 13:14, 21, 23; 14:8; 15:7; 16:62; 17:21, 24; 20:12, 20, 38, 42, 44; 21:4, 10, 37; 22:16, 22; 24:47; 25:5, 7, 11, 17; 26:6, 14; 28:22, 23, 26; 29:6, 9, 21; 30:8, 19, 25, 26; 32:15; 33:29; 34:27, 30; 35:4, 9, 12, 15; 36:11, 23, 36, 38; 37:6, 13, 14, 28; 38:23; 39:6, 7, 22, 28.

and restoration and his role as the giver of the Spirit is incorporated into this larger framework of Yahweh's unique divine identity.

The link between the recognition formula and the act of giving the Spirit is strongest in Ezekiel 37:14. After Ezekiel's vision of the re-creation of the dry bones (37:1-10), Yahweh interprets the vision (37:11-14). The bones symbolize "the whole house of Israel" and the act of creation pictured in 37:1-10 signifies their restoration into covenant relationship with Yahweh: Yahweh will create from himself a new people, a people with a new spirit (37:7-10). This act of creation/restoration is summarized in 37:14: "And I will put my Spirit within you (וּנְתַתִּי רוּחִי בְכֶם), and you shall live, and I will place you in your own land." As noted above, this act of giving the Spirit is the creation of a new, Adam-like humanity. Immediately following this summary, Yahweh declares: "And you shall know that I am Yahweh" (37:15). For Ezekiel, the identity of Yahweh in the age to come is articulated in terms of his role as the Spirit-giver.¹⁸⁴

Joel: "And You Shall Know that I am Yahweh your God"

As argued above, the act of pouring out the Spirit in Joel 3:1-2 occurs in a context in which Israel's restoration is also described with images of new creation and new exodus. The outpouring of the Spirit creates a new people, a people who will have immediate knowledge of Yahweh; they will no longer need a mediator like Moses, because they too will be prophets with true knowledge of Yahweh. Like Ezekiel, Joel links this act of new creation with the unique identity of Yahweh, but in addition includes an assertion of Yahweh's incomparability: "And you shall know . . . that I am Yahweh

¹⁸³Zimmerli, Walther, *I Am Yahweh*, trans. Douglas W. Scott (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982), 64.

¹⁸⁴The cleansing act of Yahweh giving his people a new heart and a new spirit in Ezek 36:26 is likewise linked with Yahweh's concern for his identity among the nations. Philip, *The Origin of Pauline Pneumatology*, 37, writes, "In Ezek 36:26-27, the theme of the promise of the Spirit upon the **ישראל בית** derives from YHWH's concern for his reputation."

your God and there is no other” (וְאֵין עֹד) אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְאֵין יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם).¹⁸⁵ The addition of the phrase to the recognition formula links the incomparability of Yahweh (i.e., his unique identity) with his new-creation work; a work of which the giving of the Spirit plays a significant role.

Yahweh Alone Is the Giver of His Spirit

The final argument supporting the claim that the act of giving the Spirit is unique to the identity of Israel’s God in the age to come is the claim that Yahweh alone is the one who gives the Spirit. No other character in Israel’s Scriptures is depicted as participating in this eschatological act. In some texts, the giving of the Spirit coincides with the work of a future, Messianic figure;¹⁸⁶ however, in no instances is this figure ever presented as the agent of the outpouring of the Spirit.¹⁸⁷ The OT only presents the Messiah as one endowed with the Spirit of Yahweh, not as the direct agent of the outpouring.

However, there is one figure who is presented as pouring out a “spirit/Spirit” in a way that appears to parallel Yahweh’s eschatological act. This figure is Lady Wisdom in Proverbs 1:23: “If you turn at my reproof, behold, I will pour out (אֲבִיעֶה)¹⁸⁸ my spirit (רוּחִי) to you (לְכֶם); I will make my words known to you.”¹⁸⁹ Some scholars interpret

¹⁸⁵Cf. Deut 4:35; cf. 1 Sam 2:2; I Kgs 8:6; Isa 45:5, 6, 18.

¹⁸⁶Isa 32:1-8 (a righteous king), 32:9-20 (out pouring of the Spirit); Ezek 37:24-28 (Davidic King), 36:22-37:17 (the giving of the Spirit).

¹⁸⁷*Contra*, Adolf Schlatter, *The History of the Christ: The Foundation for New Testament Theology*, trans. Andreas J. Köstenberger (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 58, who writes, “Prophetic pronouncements did not describe merely the Christ as the bearer of the divine Spirit; they also cast the endtime community as filled by him.” Cf. James M. Hamilton Jr., *God’s Indwelling Presence*, NACSBT (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006), 106, who, following Schlatter, links the messianic figure in Isa 32 and Ezek 37 with the outpouring of the Spirit.

¹⁸⁸Although נָבַע is translated “pour out” like שָׁפַךְ (Ezek 39:29; Joel 3:1, 2; Zech 12:10), עָרָה (Isa 32:15), and יָצַק (Isa 44:3), its semantic domain concerns speech, not water (cf. Prov 19:3).

רוּחִי in verse 23 as a reference to Yahweh’s own Spirit and as parallel with the other references to the eschatological “outpouring” of Yahweh’s Spirit (e.g., Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 39:29; Joel 3:1).¹⁹⁰ Therefore, Proverbs 1:23 presents a figure other than Yahweh as pouring out the Spirit. However, it is doubtful that Proverbs 1:23 is parallel with these prophetic texts regarding the outpouring of the Spirit in the age to come. In fact, most scholars interpret רוּחִי in its immediate context as parallel with דְּבַרִי in the following line—“I will pour out my spirit” is in parallel position with “I will make known my words to you.”¹⁹¹

Furthermore, even if one does interpret Proverbs 1:23 as a reference to the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit, Yahweh’s unique role as the giver of the Spirit would not be questioned. Throughout Proverbs, Wisdom is presented as a personification or hypostatization of an attribute of God and as such is an aspect of God’s own identity. This association between Yahweh and Wisdom is strengthened by the specific ways in which Wisdom is personified.¹⁹² First, Wisdom is personified in her calls for the “simple” and “scoffers” to repent (שׁוּב; 1:23). The role of wisdom echoes the prophetic literature in which Yahweh, via the prophet, calls Israel to repent.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁹The LXX reads, προήσομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν διδάξω δὲ ὑμᾶς τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον (“I will bring forth to you the expression of my breath and I will teach you my word”; NETS translation).

¹⁹⁰Andrew E. Steinmann, *Proverbs*, Concordia Commentary (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2009), 79.

¹⁹¹E.g., Roland E. Murphy, *Proverbs*, WBC, vol. 22 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998), 10, interprets “spirit” as Wisdom’s anger which is manifest through the threatening “words” that follow. Scott L. Harris, *Proverbs 1-9: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation*, SBLDS (Atlanta: Scholars Press), 78, interprets רוּחִי as synonymous with דְּבַרִי and translates it as “thoughts.”

¹⁹²Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 17; cf. Steinmann, *Proverbs*, 21-22.

¹⁹³Some suggest Wisdom herself is presented as a prophet in 1:20-33 (e.g., Roland E. Murphy, “Wisdom’s Song: Proverbs 1:20-33,” *CBQ* 48 [1986], 456). However, the language Wisdom uses to refer to herself goes beyond the language a prophet would use to refer to himself. For example, in 1:23 Wisdom says, “I will make my words known to you”; a prophet did not speak his own words, but the words of Yahweh (cf. Jer 7:13). In 1:26 Wisdom proclaims, “Then they will call upon me, but I will not answer; they will seek me diligently but will not find me”; this language strongly echoes Yahweh’s warnings to his

Second, Wisdom, is presented as having participated in Yahweh's work of creation (8:22-31). As such, Wisdom is not a figure external to Yahweh, but is portrayed as intrinsic to Yahweh's own identity.¹⁹⁴ Mehrdad Fatehi rightly claims, "We do have a portrait of personified Wisdom, standing here for Yahweh's wisdom itself, pouring out his Spirit."¹⁹⁵

Conclusion

The OT writers consistently articulate the unique identity of Israel's God in terms of his actions within the world in general and within Israel's history in particular. They ground the frequent refrain, "There is none like Yahweh," in a coherent story that reveals the particularity of their God and distinguishes him from all others. Yahweh's identity, according to both Bauckham and Brueggemann, is especially highlighted by three acts: Yahweh is the creator, ruler, and deliverer of Israel. These actions are time and again presented as exclusive to Yahweh and function within the OT storyline to identify him as Israel's God. Hans Frei's axiom appropriately describes the relationship between Yahweh's identity and his acts of creation, sovereignty, and redemption: "All of us know that there are actions so typical of a person that when we see them we say, 'That's him, all right!'"¹⁹⁶

unrepentant people in the Prophetic writings. Helmer Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund: Häkam Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1947), 96, makes a similar observation: "We notice especially that Wisdom is speaking with divine authority. 'Turn to my admonition,' she says, 'behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you'; men will seek her that she may save them from misfortunes. A preacher of wisdom does not speak like that; it must be a divine being."

¹⁹⁴Concerning the identity of Yahweh's Wisdom and Word in the OT and Second Temple literature, Bauckham, "God Crucified," 17, writes, "In a variety of ways, they *express* God, his mind and his will in relation to the world. They are not created beings, but nor are they semi-divine entities occupying some ambiguous status between the one God and the rest of reality. They belong to the unique divine identity."

¹⁹⁵Fatehi, *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord*, 94.

¹⁹⁶Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ*, 43.

Building upon this notion of Yahweh's divine identity, this chapter sought to explain the way in which the eschatological act of giving the Spirit functions to articulate the identity of Yahweh. This chapter presented three ways in which this act is depicted as unique to Yahweh and, as such, functions to shape his divine identity in the age to come. The points are here summarized in reverse order. First, the OT writers present no other figure as participating in this role. It is Yahweh alone who will act to give the gift of the Spirit, just as it is Yahweh alone who acted to give the life-breath to Adam. Although the messiah is presented with a significant role in the re-creation and restoration of Israel (e.g., Isa 32; Ezek 37), the role of Spirit-giver is reserved for Yahweh alone. In addition, the only other figure who is portrayed as acting in a way that parallels this eschatological act is Lady Wisdom—a character who is included within the divine identity. Second, both Ezekiel and Joel link the act of giving the Spirit with Israel's recognition of Yahweh as its God in the age to come. The act of giving the Spirit will lead Israel to know that Yahweh alone is God (e.g., Ezek 37:14; Joel 2:27-3:2) and as a result, like the act of creating the universe and the act of delivering from Egypt, Yahweh's identity will be articulated in terms of his act as the Spirit-giver. Third, the act of pouring out the Spirit is always linked with Yahweh's unique identity as the creator and deliverer of his people. In every reference to outpouring of the Spirit in the Prophets, Yahweh's role as the creator is highlighted (either explicitly or implicitly); and Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and (possibly) Zechariah present this act as part of Yahweh's new-exodus rescue of his people. The one who acted in the past to create the world and to deliver Israel from Egypt is very the one who will act in the future to restore his people. By depicting this act using the metaphors of creation and exodus, the OT prophets highlight the continuity between Yahweh's past and future actions. In the age to come, Yahweh will be known by his acts of restoration on behalf of his people (cf. Jer 16:14-15) and the act of giving the Spirit is an essential component of that promised restoration. Therefore, according to the OT witness, in the age to come, Yahweh will be identified as the one

who pours out his Spirit upon his people. It is presented as an act of the creator and covenant God whereby he re-creates and rescues his people. This promised act of re-creation and restoration is so typical to Yahweh's identity that when his people witness it, they will say, "That him all right!"

Since the OT writers portray this act as comprising the unique divine identity in the age to come, it is not surprising that no other figures are presented as acting in this role. And yet, in all four New Testament Gospels, John the Baptizer describes the coming messiah as one who will act to pour out the Spirit upon Israel. In view of the OT witness, the inclusion of Jesus within the role of the Spirit-giver is possibly an attempt by the Gospel writers to include Jesus within the unique identity of Israel's God. That is, because the act of giving the Spirit is so aligned with Yahweh's identity as the creator and redeemer, when Jesus is presented as acting in this role the ideal reader cannot help but see in him the unique divine identity and declare, "That's him all right!" However, before determining whether or not this was Luke's goal, an analysis needs to be provided regarding the identity of the Spirit-giver in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. Since John the Baptizer, Jesus, and Luke operated within this world and were influenced by its religious history and culture, their understanding of the identity of the Spirit-giver was influenced by the interpretation of the promised outpouring of the Spirit in early Judaism. Thus, it is possible that the understanding of the Spirit-giver shifted from that of the OT prophets, so that including Jesus within this role did not mean anything other than that Jesus is the expected messiah who will act as the key figure in Yahweh's restoration of his people and, therefore, does not function to create a shared identity between Jesus and Israel's God. We turn now to this literature.

CHAPTER 3

THE IDENTITY OF ISRAEL'S GOD AND THE ESCHATOLOGICAL OUTPOURING OF THE SPIRIT IN EARLY JUDAISM

Introduction

As noted in chapter 2, Richard Bauckham has provided a helpful framework for understanding the way in which the Jewish writers of the Second Temple Period articulate the particularity of Yahweh in relation to all reality. Yahweh's identity is shaped by the Old Testament (OT) stories that the Jewish people retold and preserved during this period: Yahweh is the creator and sovereign God who, in the past, chose Israel and delivered her from oppression and, in the future, he will once again act to deliver Israel in a way that demonstrates to all people his unique identity as the creator and ruler. The "Jewish monotheism" of this period was, according to Bauckham, not concerned with describing the nature of Yahweh, nor with denying the existence of other "gods." Rather, it sought to affirm the oneness of Yahweh in terms of his identity as creator and ruler, as well as the eschatological hope that he would fulfill his promise to restore Israel. This articulation of Yahweh's uniqueness led to the belief that Yahweh alone was worthy of their allegiance and worship.¹

Building upon Bauckham's notion of divine identity, as well as the findings in the previous chapter, this chapter examines the way in which the *act* of giving the

¹Richard Bauckham, "God Crucified," in *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 7-9. Cf. Larry Hurtado, "Monotheism, Principle Angels, and the Background of Christology," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 547, who writes, "Both Jewish and non-Jewish sources of the Second Temple period portray Jews as holding a distinctive religious stance and practice that involve reserving a unique status to the God of Israel, and a firm refusal to worship any other deity."

eschatological Spirit is associated with the unique identity of Israel's God in the literature of the Second Temple Period. I will attempt to demonstrate that the act of pouring out the eschatological Spirit is associated with the unique identity of Israel's God in two ways. First, as in the Old Testament, these early Jewish texts that reference the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit consistently describe it as an act of new creation—it is an act that will be (or has been) performed by the creator God. These texts, on occasion, allude to Yahweh's promise to restore Israel according to the promises of Isaiah 40-55, Ezekiel 36-37, Joel 3 and Zechariah 12. Second, the act of pouring out the eschatological Spirit is an act reserved for Yahweh alone—no exalted patriarch, angel, or anticipated messiah(s) is ever described as taking on this role. The one who will give the divine Spirit is none other than Israel's God, the one who created humanity and will one day create a new humanity enlivened by his Spirit in fulfillment of his covenant promises.

The first section of this chapter will examine various Second Temple texts that reference God giving a new s/Spirit to his people. In these texts, the primary metaphor employed for describing this activity of God is “new creation”; even in the Book of Wisdom, with its apparent lack of eschatology, the act of giving the divine Spirit is described as a creative activity. Following the analysis of the Second Temple texts, a brief summary will be provided of the anticipated outpouring of the Spirit in Rabbinic literature. Although this literature does strongly associate the eschatological Spirit with the “Spirit of Prophecy,” many texts associate the act of pouring out the Spirit with God's identity as the creator. The second section will address Second Temple texts which appear to call into question the claim that the act of pouring out the Spirit is unique to Israel's God. Passages in *Joseph and Aseneth*, *Susana*, and *The Testament of Judah* appear to attribute the act of giving the Spirit with figures other than Israel's God and so need to be examined as to whether or not they in fact cast doubt on the thesis of this chapter. Yet, before proceeding with the primary arguments of this chapter, it is

necessary to address (briefly) how this chapter connects with current studies on the pneumatology of the Second Temple Period.

The Divine Spirit in Early Judaism: A Brief Overview of Modern Scholarship

From a *religionsgeschichtlich* perspective—for New Testament scholars in general, and Lukan scholars in particular—the Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period is the appropriate background for interpreting Luke’s pneumatology.² It is therefore necessary to explore the theological stream in which Luke swam in order to see the way in which the act of pouring out the Spirit was interpreted in this period.

In view of this consensus, the logical question becomes, What was the pneumatology of Second Temple Judaism? Granted, that the Jewish literature composed from the third century B.C.E. up through the first century C.E. offers no systematic presentation the divine ΠΝ/πνεῦμα, and granted, that it is more appropriate to speak of *Judaisms* as opposed to a monolithic religion during this period of time; there is nevertheless, a general concurrence among scholars that the literature of this period presents the divine Spirit *primarily* as the “Spirit of Prophecy.” That is, the divine Spirit is regarded almost exclusively as a *donum superadditum* that was the source of special

²E.g., Hermann Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888), 11-61; Hans von Baer, *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926), 43; W. Eugene March, “God with Us: A Survey of Jewish Pneumatology,” *Austin Seminary Bulletin* 83 (1967): 3-16; Eduard Schweizer, “πνεῦμα,” in *TDNT*, 407; Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: With Special Reference to Luke-Acts*, JSNTS 54 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 112; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, JPTS 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 82-85; Gonzalo Haya-Prats, *Empowered Believers: The Holy Spirit in the Book of Acts*, trans. Scott A. Ellington (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2011), 26-29; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The Holy Spirit—in Biblical Teaching, through the Centuries, and Today* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013), 22-32. *Contra*, Hans Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist: Das Wesen und Werden der mystisch-intuitiven Erkenntnis in der Philosophie und Religion der Griechen* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1919), 53-69, who argued that New Testament pneumatology should be interpreted against the background of the Hellenistic mystery religions. John Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*, AGAJU 29 (New York: Brill, 1997), 237-59, develops and nuances Leisegang’s thesis and demonstrates the influence of Greco-Roman notions of πνεῦμα on first-century Jewish authors such as Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, and Philo.

insight and inspired speech. This interpretation of the Spirit is frequently contrasted with the Spirit as a *donum salutis* or *donum creaturae novae*. From Gunkel, to Schweizer, to Haya-Prata, to Menzies, and, to a degree, Turner, this category has become the primary lens through which the early Jewish literature has been interpreted. And yet, despite this general consensus, scholars have begun to acknowledge that the category “Spirit of Prophecy” does not encompass the entirety of the diverse actions and effects of the Spirit in this literature. The Spirit of God is also associated with soteriology,³ ethics,⁴ the original life-breath,⁵ creation and new creation.⁶

The diverse functions of the Spirit within this literature should caution one from collapsing all references to the divine Spirit under the category “Spirit of prophecy.” The context should determine the identity and function of $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ in these variegated writings.⁷ Furthermore, as was demonstrated in chapter 2, the Old Testament does not present the *act* of giving the divine Spirit as identical with the effects of the Spirit’s presence upon a people or individual. The eschatological act of pouring out the Spirit is consistently presented as an act of the creator God whereby he breathes (i.e., “pours out,” “gives”) new life to his new humanity (i.e., restored Israel) in order to restore his

³Turner, *Power from on High*.

⁴Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

⁵Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*.

⁶John W. Yates, *The Spirit and Creation in Paul*, WUNT 2/251 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*.

⁷In light of Levison’s work one must proceed with caution when identifying the referent of $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ in this literature. Levison has demonstrated that there is no technical term that distinguishes the Spirit of God (i.e., the Spirit which participated in creation and will be poured out upon God’s new humanity in the age to come) from the spirit of God as the “life breath” which God has given to all humanity. Even the term “holy S/spirit” can designate either the eschatological Spirit (e.g., 1 QH^a 16) or the spirit of life (e.g., Sus 1:44-45 [Theo.]). In this chapter (as with the previous) I have chosen to capitalize all instances of $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ that I have interpreted as referring to the eschatological gift. The close parallels between the Spirit and the life-breath in this literature necessitate stylistic distinction between these two terms.

covenant people. Although this *act* results in, for example, knowledge of Yahweh and prophet-like experiences for Yahweh's new humanity, the eschatological *act* of giving his Spirit is itself primarily linked with Yahweh's identity as the creator and his new-exodus restoration of Israel. If this is in fact the OT view, then caution should be employed in equating the effects of the Spirit with the act of giving the Spirit.

In view of this admittedly brief and generalized summary of pneumatological research in early Judaism, it is necessary to note how my analysis differs from other studies. First, this study is concerned primarily with the relation the *act* of giving the Spirit has with the unique identity of Yahweh. As with chapter two, it will not analyze every reference of $\Pi\Omega\Gamma/\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in the literature, but only the passages that depict Yahweh as the subject of an action with the Spirit as the direct object or means by which the action is accomplished.⁸ Due to the limited focus of this chapter, its conclusions are modest and relate only to the eschatological *act of giving* $\Pi\Omega\Gamma/\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ and not to the entire pneumatology of this period. Second, with this exclusive focus on the *act of giving*, this chapter differs from those studies which focus on the various effects (*Wirkungen*) of the Spirit upon a community or an individual (e.g., prophecy, knowledge, wisdom, inspired speech, salvation, transformation, etc.). It is possible (especially in light of chapter 2) that the *act of giving* can be described as an act of new creation or new exodus even though the effects produced by the act focus on prophecy or wisdom. One conclusion drawn from this chapter is that in those texts which do speak of the act of giving the Spirit, Yahweh's identity as the creator is highlighted, implying that the act of giving is an act of new creation.⁹ Third, this chapter observes that texts referencing the

⁸For an analysis of the use of this term in the literature of "Palestinian Judaism," see Erik Sjöberg, "Rûach in Palestinian Judaism," in *TDNT*, vol. 6: 375-89. Cf. Eugene W. March, "God With Us: A Survey of Jewish Pneumatology," *ASB* 83 (1967): 3-16.

⁹One possible exception is Susanna 45. However, in this text it is not God but an angel who gave Daniel a "spirit of understanding" (see below). Menzies, *Development*, 59, also points to Josephus (*A. J.* 8.114) where he adds "send some portion of your Spirit into the temple that you might appear to be with us on earth" (*ἵκετεύω καὶ μοῖραν τινα τοῦ σοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὸν ναδὸν ἀποικίσειαι ὡς ἂν καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἡμῖν εἶναι*

eschatological Spirit (or a new spirit) combine new creation/restoration language with prophetic effects such as inspired speech and knowledge. Thus, it is possible that the findings of chapter 2 can help to navigate some of the Second Temple references to the eschatological Spirit: since Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah all connect the promised outpouring of the Spirit with Yahweh's new-creation and new-exodus restoration of his people, it is not necessary to conclude that they are describing distinct acts, despite their different emphases regarding the effects of the act. Therefore, it may not be helpful to separate the Spirit of "salvation" or "new creation" from the Spirit of "prophecy."¹⁰ This possibly explains why later Rabbinic texts conflated Ezekiel 36-37 with Joel 3:1-2 and the Qumran literature and why *Wisdom of Solomon* can describe the prophetic effects of the Spirit within new-creation or restoration co-texts (see below).¹¹

δοκῆς) to Solomon's prayer (cf. 1 Kgs 8:27-30). Menzies speculates that this might possibly mean a "plea for the bestowal of the prophetic gift upon the temple priests." If this is the case, then here is an instance where the act of sending the Spirit is not presented as an act of new creation. However, this text is more concerned with God dwelling with his people by his Spirit and not with the prophetic activity of the priests (cf. Neh 9:20; 63:11). In addition, this chapter is focused on the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit to individuals or groups and its association with Yahweh's unique identity.

¹⁰Since Philo does not discuss the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit, his complex and philosophical view of πνεῦμα θεῖον and πνεῦμα προφητικόν will not be addressed in this chapter. For studies on πνεῦμα in Philo, see Fatehi, *The Spirit's Relation*, 108-20; Menzies, *Development*, 63-72; Bieder, "πνεῦμα," in *TDNT*, vol. 6: 372-75; M. E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and its Bearing on the New Testament*, HM 1 (London: H. Charlesworth & Co., 1976), 3-64; Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 109-201. However, in one of his analyses of the "Spirit of prophecy," Philo demonstrates the way in which the *act* of giving the Spirit can be presented as a new creation, while the effect of the *act* is the inspiration of the prophet to communicate divine revelation. In *De Virtutibus* 1:217 Philo describes the ordinary character and quality of the prophet before the Spirit comes upon him. However, once the Spirit comes, the prophet is changed into a different man. Philo writes, "He begins to change (μετέβαλλε) all things for the better: his countenance, his appearance, his size, his stature, his mannerisms, his voice whenever he is taken hold of by the divine Spirit (κατασχεθείη . . . τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος), which having been breathed out from above (ἄνωθεν καταπνευσθέν), establishes himself in his soul, on the one hand, clothing his body with special beauty, on the other hand, his words with persuasiveness, and understanding for the ones who hear." The dramatic transformation of the prophet into a different man, as well as the allusion to Gen 2:7 ("being breathed out from above") suggests that the *act* of bestowing the Spirit (i.e., breathing out the Spirit from above) is an act of new creation, even though Philo emphasizes the prophetic effects of the Spirit.

¹¹Although the term "Spirit of Prophecy" has become the primary descriptor of the Jewish view of the Spirit, the term itself is rarely used outside of Rabbinic literature: Philo uses the phrase προφητικόν πνεῦμα (*Mos.* 1.277; *Fug.* 186) and the phrase "spirit of prophecy" is used in the Ethiopic translation of *Jub.* 31:12. To highlight the "Spirit of Prophecy" category, Menzies draws (primarily) from

The Divine Identity and the Eschatological Act of Pouring Out the Spirit in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature

The Dead Sea Scrolls¹²

The use of רוּחַ in the literature of the Qumran community reflects the polyvalent meaning of this term as found in the OT.¹³ Thorough analyses of the meaning of this term have been provided and the purpose of this section is not to offer an exhaustive account of the semantic range of רוּחַ in this literature.¹⁴ Rather, the goal here

texts which reflect on Israel's history, not texts that anticipate the eschatological gift of the Spirit. The following are the specific references cited by Menzies, *Development*, 55-90: (1) Aristobulus *Frag. 2* (as recorded by Eusebius) references Moses; (2) *Sus 45* (Theodotion) references Daniel; (3) *Testament of Job* references Eliphaz (43:2) and Job's daughter (48:3); (4) In his *Antiquities*, Josephus explicitly links πνεῦμα and prophecy even in places where the term is absent from the MT and LXX (*A. J.* 4:108; *A. J.* 4:119f; *A. J.* 6:166; *A. J.* 8:408; *A. J.* 8:114; *A. J.* 5:285) and yet, each instance is a reference to an Old Testament figure; (5) *Sir 48:24* references Isaiah; (6) *1 Enoch 91:1* references Enoch; (7) Pseudo-Philo 9:10 references Miriam; (8) *Jub. 25:14* references Rebecca; *Jub 31:12* references Jacob; (9) 4 *Ezra 5:22; 14:22* reference Ezra; (10) *Mart. Asc. Isa. 1:7; 5:14* reference Isaiah; (11) 1QS 8:14-16 and CD 2:11-13 reference the Prophets and 1Q34bis 2:6-7 references the inspiration of the words of the covenant by the Spirit; (12) Philo, *Virt.* 216-19 references Abraham and in *Gig. 47* and *Mos. 240* references Moses. With regards to the Qumran literature Menzies acknowledges: "These texts are, of course, descriptions of the Spirit's activity in the distant past." But he proceeds to claim, "However, the inspiration of the Spirit is not limited to the prophets of the past . . . the scrolls suggest that the Spirit continued to grant esoteric wisdom to the wise in the community for the purpose of instruction" (*Development*, 88). Menzies, to support this latter claim, cites the following texts: 1QS 3:13-15; 4:22; 9:12-20; 1QH^a 1:27-29; 3:6-18; 5:11; 7:11; 8:36; 11:12; 12:11. However, these passages (see below) are not exclusively related to the effects prophecy and wisdom, but also concern restoration and new creation. Menzies also cites *Sirach 39:1-8*, where Ben Sira claims that if the Lord is willing he will fill the man who devotes himself to studying Torah with a spirit of understanding; however, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 119-26, who argues that this text in *Sirach* is not a description of the divine spirit as a *donum superadditum*, but to the life-breath given by God at birth.

¹²The Qumran citations are taken from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1997; repr., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000); idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1998; repr., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).

¹³Émile Peuch, "L'Esprit Saint À Qumrân," *Liber Annuus* 49 (1999): 283, lists the various functions of רוּחַ as follows: "En hébreu biblique comme dans les langues classiques, le mot "esprit" est susceptible de recouvrer plusieurs significations, depuis le vent, la respiration, le souffle vital, l'esprit et les esprits de l'homme ou forces bienfaisantes et malfaisantes, jusqu'à l'Esprit de Dieu, cette force divine qui transforme l'homme en vue d'une mission particulière, tels les juges, rois, prophètes, le serviteur, ou qui renverse l'impie . . . ou remplit l'univers." Peuch proceeds to note that the Qumran literature reflects this polyvalent meaning of the term: "Malgré des manuscrits souvent lacunaires, les textes qumraniens se distinguent peu en général de ces passages bibliques ou de la littérature juive contemporaine" (284).

is to understand how the writers of these documents interpret the eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit and whether or not this *act* is linked with the unique identity of Yahweh.

1QHodayot^a. The *Hodayot* is a collection of prayers in which the hymnist offers blessings and thanksgivings to God for his lavish acts on behalf of himself individually, as well as the community he represents. One of the striking images employed to express the uniqueness the *yahad* (הַיְהוּדָה) is that of new creation. In addition, the community is portrayed as the partial fulfillment of Yahweh's promises of restoration. In particular, the frequent allusions to Genesis 1-3 (e.g., 16:1-40) suggest that the community identified itself as the first-fruits of God's new creation, with the community portrayed as a new Eden and its members as inheriting all the glory of Adam.¹⁵ It is within this eschatological framework that Yahweh's action in giving his Spirit is understood within this corpus. The hymnist parallels the רוּחַ as the life-breath given at creation and with a new רוּחַ he has received; these parallels suggest that the community represented in these texts understood the eschatological gift of Yahweh's spirit as an act of new creation (similar to Ezek 36-37). In 1QH^a 5:19-26, the hymnist prays,

[However, what is] the spirit of flesh [רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר] to understand all these matters and to have insight in [your wondrous] and great counsel? What is someone born of a woman among all your awesome works? He is a structure of dust [עֶפֶר] fashioned with water, his counsel is the [iniquity] of sin, shame of dishonor and so[urce of] impurity, and a depraved spirit [רוּחַ] rules over him. If he acts wickedly, he will be an eternal [sign,] a portent for generations, shame [for all] flesh. Only by your

¹⁴For an exhaustive study of each occurrence of רוּחַ in the Qumran literature see Arthur Everett Sekki, *The Meaning of RUAḤ at Qumran*, SBLDS 110 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

¹⁵Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, Acta Theologica Danica (Aarhus, Denmark: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 313; Yates, *Spirit and Creation in Paul*, 65. New-creation imagery is not unique to the *Hodayot* (cf. CD 3:20; 1QS 4:23; 4QFlorilegium; 4Q265). See Joseph Baumgarten, "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 212-13; idem, "Purification and the Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, STDJ 15 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 3-10; Michael O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 123-32.

goodness is man acquitted, [purified] by the abundance of [your] compa[ssion.] You embellish him with your splendour, you install [him over an abun]dance of pleasures, with everlasting peace and length of days. For [you are the truth, and] your word does not depart. *Blank* And I, your servant, have known, thanks to the spirit you have placed in me (ברוח אשר נתתה בי) [...] and all your deeds are just, and your word does not depart, and a[ll] your periods are fixed [...pu]rified for their affairs.

In this hymn, the hymnist contrasts the “spirit of flesh” with a new spirit that Yahweh has placed in him. Whereas the original רוח (i.e., life-breath)¹⁶ has become depraved and thus hinders a person from understanding the secret works of God, the new רוח God has placed in the hymnist allows him to know Yahweh’s mysteries. In fact the new רוח enables the recipient to grasp the very mysteries he could not comprehend while controlled by the original spirit. In lines 6-18, the hymnist explicitly states that he was not able to understand Yahweh’s ordering of the world into fixed periods of time due to the “spirit of flesh” (רוח בשר) within him; then, at the end of line 26, the hymnist states that he now knows that “your periods are fixed” (line 26) by the new spirit Yahweh has given him.

There are four reasons for interpreting this description of the רוח that God has placed in him as an act of new creation and a fulfillment of Yahweh’s promise in Ezekiel 36-37 to give his people a new spirit, a life-breath none other than Yahweh’s own Spirit. First, there are lexical links to Genesis 2:7 and Genesis 6:3 to describe the original spirit and allusions to Ezekiel 36-37 to describe the new spirit. The description of the original רוח as a רוח בשר and a person’s body as simply עפר recall Yahweh’s negative assessment of humanity as “flesh” in Genesis 6:3 and the description of the formation of Adam’s body in Genesis 2:7 respectively. The collocation of the new רוח with the verb נתן, followed by the preposition ב, parallels Yahweh’s promise to put a new Spirit within his people (Ezek 11:19; 36:26; 37:6; 37:14).

¹⁶רוח is identified as the life-breath throughout the 1QH^a: 2:19-24; 9:21-23; 11:23-25; 14:3-4; 18:3-7.

Second, the parallel between the original spirit and the new Spirit in this psalm is analogous to the way Ezekiel presents Yahweh's gift of a new spirit as an act of new creation, an act paralleling the inbreathing of the life-breath into Adam in Genesis 2:7.¹⁷ It was noted in chapter 2, that the giving of Yahweh's Spirit is analogous to the giving of the life-breath at creation. Ezekiel 37 makes clear that the gift of Yahweh's Spirit is a new life-breath that gives life to his people and empowers them to walk faithfully (as it did for the prophet Ezekiel). Despite their contrasting effects, the רוּחַ given by God, is analogous to the רוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר.

Third, the act of giving the רוּחַ effects some type of change within the recipient: he moves from a the sinful state of ignorance, to a state of understanding. Fourth, the link in this hymn between the giving of the spirit and knowledge is thematically parallel with the connection Ezekiel makes between the gift of Yahweh's spirit and knowledge of Yahweh (Ezek 37:14). According to the hymnist the effect of this new Spirit within him is that he has knowledge of the mysteries of God. This association between the gift of the Spirit and knowledge is emphasized throughout the *Hodayot* and this new Spirit is even described as a "spirit of knowledge." For example, in the subsequent column (6:25) the psalmist declares that the Lord has "favored me with the spirit of knowledge" (חַנּוּתִי בְרוּחַ דַּעַה).

The lexical, conceptual, and thematic links to Ezekiel 36-37 suggest that this new spirit, a spirit of knowledge, God has given the psalmist is understood as parallel with Yahweh's promise in Ezekiel 36-37 to put his Spirit within his people. For the hymnist, this act of giving the Spirit is an act of re-creation (suggested by the contrast between the original, corrupted spirit and the new, received Spirit; as well as the allusions

¹⁷Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 205, suggests the following texts allude to Gen 2:7: 1QH^a 18:3-7; 9:21-23; 14:3-4; 2:19-24; 11:23-25.

to Ezek 36-37), an act paralleling the inbreathing of the original life-breath into a body of dust, but supersedes this spirit by being the very Spirit of Yahweh.¹⁸

Three additional hymns make reference to this Spirit God has placed within the hymnist and the community as a whole. 1QH^a 8:18-20,¹⁹ 20:11-12,²⁰ 21:12-14²¹ contain the identical phrase **בִּי נִתְּנָה אֲשֶׁר בְּרוּחַ** to refer to the special Spirit Yahweh has placed within the hymnist. In two instances this phrase is parallel with **בְּרוּחַ קוֹדֶשֶׁךָ** (8:18-20; 20:11-12—**בְּרוּחַ קוֹדֶשְׁכֶּה**).²² Levison has persuasively demonstrated that in the Second Temple literature the term “holy spirit” or “spirit of holiness” is not a technical term for Yahweh’s Spirit (i.e., the spirit of God which hovered over the waters in Genesis 1:1 and which Ezekiel, et. al. envisioned as dwelling within Yahweh’s restored people). He shows that it is frequently applied to the life-breath that is given to every individual (e.g., CD 5:11-13; 7:3-6).²³ However, parallels between “holy spirit” and this spirit God has given the hymnist—a spirit that is likely the fulfillment of Ezekiel 36-37—suggest that

¹⁸Ibid., 206-07: “The conception of the spirit in the *Hymns* has a clear symmetry, an obvious balance. The spirit within that is rooted in Gen 2:7 has been transformed into something depraved and errant. No hope for purification and inclusion resides in the gift of this spirit. The spirit within that is rooted in Ezek 36-37, on the other hand, is the source of purity and communal embrace. The spirit of creation, of Gen 2:7, a spirit of error and depravity, has now been neatly supplanted, through the force of Ezek 36-37, by the spirit that purifies and grants entrée to the community of the covenant.”

¹⁹“And since I know that you have recorded the spirit of the just man, I have chosen to purify my hands in accordance with [your] will and your servant’s soul detests every work of iniquity. I know that no-one besides you is just. I have appeased your face by the spirit which you have placed [in me] (**בִּי נִתְּנָה אֲשֶׁר בְּרוּחַ**) to lavish your [kind]nesses on [your] serv[ant] for [ever,] to purify me with your holy spirit [**לְטַהֲרֵנִי בְּרוּחַ קוֹדֶשְׁךָ**], to bring me near by your will according to the extent of your kindnesses.”

²⁰“And I, the Instructor, have known you, my God, through the spirit which you gave in me (**אֲשֶׁר נִתְּנָה בִּי בְּרוּחַ**), and I have listened loyally to your wonderful secret through your holy spirit (**בְּרוּחַ קוֹדֶשְׁכֶּה**).”

²¹“You are the God of knowledge [...] [...] You have made them, and without you no[thing] is made [...] [and I, cr]eature from dust, I have known by the spirit which you have given in me (**בִּי נִתְּנָה אֲשֶׁר בְּרוּחַ**)).”

²²Puech, “L’Esprit Saint À Qumrân,” 286.

²³Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 74-75.

the term “holy spirit” could just as readily been applied to Yahweh’s Spirit, as to the life-breath. In other words, in two instances the new Spirit Yahweh has placed within the psalmist is referred to as Yahweh’s holy Spirit.

Although none of these three passages provides an explicit contrast between the original, corrupted spirit (life-breath) and the new, eschatological Spirit (as in 1QH^a 5:19-26), it is plausible that they too refer to a new life-breath the hymnist received—thus providing a parallel with the eschatological Spirit of Ezekiel 36-37. First, scholars have observed that in the *Hodayot*, the origin of the spirit (i.e., the life-breath) in man is described with the verb יצר; however, רוח with the verb נתן is used with reference to the spirit given to man as an act of new creation.²⁴ An example of the former is found in 1QH^a 7:24-25 where the hymnist asks: “What, then, is flesh, to understand [your mysteries?] blank You have fashioned the spirit (אתה יצרתה רוח) and have organized its task [before the centuries.] From you comes the path of every living being.”²⁵ The “formed” or “fashioned” spirit is associated with birth (and is often portrayed as corrupted), but the “given” Spirit is a gift from God and is portrayed as undoing the negative effects caused by the corrupted spirit. Second, in 1QH^a 8:18-20, the רוח is the means by which Yahweh purifies (טהר) the hymnist in order to bring him into the community. This link between purity and רוח occurs in Ezekiel 36 where the act of Yahweh cleansing his people is associated with his act of giving them a new spirit (Ezek 36:25, 33). Third, the spirit God has given to the hymnist is linked with true knowledge of God, a reference to the refrain throughout Ezekiel: “Then they will know that I am Yahweh.”²⁶ In light these links to the giving of the spirit in Ezekiel 36-37, the ‘spirit that

²⁴Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, 76-82.

²⁵Cf. 1QH^a 9:14-15; 12:30-31; 18:22.

²⁶Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 206. Some scholars have acknowledged the salvific effects of the Spirit upon the recipients in 1QH^a (e.g., Turner, *Power from on High*, 128; Youngmo Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts*, PBM [Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster Press, 2005], 21-22). Although in agreement with Cho regarding the “salvific effects of

God has given' is the Spirit of new creation, it is God's gift of a new Spirit (his own Spirit) for the creation of a new humanity.²⁷ Levison rightly concludes the following regarding the collocation of רוח and purity: "The spirit, in this context, is a lavish gift of re-creation that brings purification and inclusion within the Qumran community."²⁸

Rule of the community. Creation theology provides the framework for the regulations of the *yahad* in 1QS. Members of the community, who follow Torah according to the rules of the community, will inherit the "glory of Adam" and become a new Eden in which Yahweh dwells by his Spirit. In addition, the community viewed the present time, a time of wickedness, as coming to an end when God establishes a new creation (עשות חדשה; 4:25). As in the *Hodayot*, the act of giving a new or special רוח occurs within a context anticipating the day when the community will experience God's act of re-creation; when he replaces their unclean spirit with a new spirit—a spirit that will purify and instruct them in the true knowledge of God.²⁹

the Spirit," the argument of this section aligns better with Levison's claim. The category of "new creation" best explains the transformative role the Spirit plays in the life of the hymnist.

²⁷There are three other passages in the *Hodayot* which present a רוח as the object of God's action. 1QH^a 4:26, 15:6-7, and 23:9-14 use the phrase [ך] קודש רוח ("you have spread out your holy Spirit") followed by the prepositional phrase על עבדך ("over your servant"; 4:26) or בי ("on me"; 15:6-7) or an infinitive clause אשמה לכפר ("to cover up guilt"; 23:13). In two of these instances (4:26 and 23:9-14) there is a clear contrast between the original רוח (life-breath) given at birth and a new רוח which God has given to the hymnist. This contrast implies that the new רוח is a new life-breath and is therefore likely a reference to Yahweh's Spirit. 1QH^a 11:21-22 appears to be in conflict with the other passages throughout the *Hodayot* which depict Yahweh giving the hymnist a new Spirit which *replaces* the old, corrupted spirit. 1QH^a 11:21-22 states "The depraved spirit you have purified from great offence so that he can take a place with the host of the holy ones, and can enter in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven." Here the original רוח is not juxtaposed with a new רוח but is itself restored.

²⁸Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 206.

²⁹Although the emphasis in the *Hodayot* is placed on the community as the inauguration of Yahweh's act of new creation, the focus in 1QS 4:20-25 is on an age to come in which the community will be purified by a new spirit. Even though there are other places in 1QS that present the Community as a restored Israel or a new Adam, the actual eschatological gift of the Spirit is a 'not yet' reality in this context (cf. 1QS 3:1-12).

Within the complex instruction (1QS 3:13-4:26) regarding the two spirits God has placed within each individual at birth—the spirit of truth and the spirit of injustice—the writer anticipates a day when God will create a new humanity by removing the corrupted spirit and replacing it with a new spirit:

Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice (כול רוח עולה) from the innermost part of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness (ולטהרו) (ברוח קודש) from every wicked deeds. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth (ויז עליו רוח אמת) like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and (from) the defilement of the unclean spirit, in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour. For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam. There will be no more injustice and all the deeds of trickery will be a dishonour. Until now the spirits of truth and injustice (רוחי אמת ועול) feud in the heart of man: they walk in wisdom or in folly. In agreement with man's inheritance in the truth, he shall be righteous and so abhor injustice; and according to his share in the lot of injustice, he shall act wickedly in it, and so abhor the truth. For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed end and the new creation (עשות חדשה) (1QS 4:20-25)

Verse 3:13 transitions to an extended instruction regarding the “nature of all the sons of man” (1QS 3:13-4:26). Various scholars have attempted to unravel the complex meaning of רוח in this passage and it is outside the scope of this thesis to unravel every knot. The specific goal is to understand the act of God “sprinkling” man with a “spirit of truth” in the new creation. Is this act conceptually related to the act of giving the Spirit in the *Hodayot* and best understood as an act of new creation and the fulfillment of Ezekiel 36-37? If so, how does this interpretation fit within the context of the instruction regarding the two spirits?

Menzies has argued against identifying the “spirit of truth” in 1QS 4:20 with “the spirit God has given” in the *Hodayot*.³⁰ He disassociates these two texts for the following reasons: first, none of the passages in 1QS explicitly names the spirit of truth as the subject of the action; second, any parallels between the spirit 1QH^a and 1QS are

³⁰Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 80-81.

superficial; third, the “two spirits” in 1QS are created by God which cannot be said of the “Holy Spirit” in 1QH^a; and fourth, the dualistic conflict of the two spirits in 1QS stands in sharp contrast to the “Holy Spirit” in 1QH^a. However, upon closer examination it appears that Menzies has overlooked the significance of the parallels between 1QH^a and 1QS and, in addition, has neglected to account for the likely allusions to Ezekiel 36-37 in 1QS 4:20-25.

First, as in 1QH^a 5:19-26, 1QS 4:20-25 contrasts the new Spirit God will sprinkle upon those he has chosen, with the defiled spirit that presently dwells within them. As noted above, in 1QH^a 5:19-26 the hymnist contrast the “spirit of flesh,” which indwells humanity and prevents man from understanding the mysteries of God, with a new Spirit, which God has placed within him, a Spirit allowing him to discern the deeds of God. This contrast implies that this new Spirit is a new life-breath, a life-breath that (in view of Ezek 36-37) is none other than the Spirit of Yahweh. This contrast between the original רוח and a new רוח is also found in 1QS 4:20-25: God will “rip out all spirit of injustice” and will replace it (i.e., “sprinkle” upon the individual) with the “spirit of truth.” This contrast between the original, corrupted spirit within man and the new spirit that God will place/sprinkle within him in the new creation suggests that both texts have in view the same re-creative act of God.

Another similarity between the two texts is the way in which “the Spirit which has been given” in 1QH^a and “the spirit of truth” in 1QS 4:20-25 are both parallel with the phrase ברוח קודש (1QS 4:21; 1QH^a 8:18-20; 20:11-20).³¹ In addition, the association between the “spirit of holiness” and purity in both 1QS 4:21 and 1QH^a 8:20 makes the similarities between the two texts even stronger.³²

³¹The phrase in 1QS 4:21 does not contain the 2ms pronominal suffix as in 1QH^a. However, as noted above, Levison has demonstrated that the phrase “holy spirit” plus a pronominal suffix with reference to God does not automatically indicate the “Holy Spirit” (as Menzies appears to assume). Rather, it is the context of the phrase that determines whether or not it is a reference to the life-breath given at creation or Yahweh’s spirit given at new creation.

Third, the allusions to Ezekiel 36-37 in both 1QS 4:20-25 and the passages in 1QH^a suggest that both texts depict the eschatological gift of Yahweh's Spirit. These allusions are evident in two of the three effects that the act of sprinkling the Spirit (יִי עליו רוח אמת) will have upon its recipients (1QS 4:21-22): (1) cleansing from all deceit and defilement (ולטהרון] מכול תועבות שקר והתגולל),³³ (2) instruction in the knowledge of the Most High (להבין ישרים בדעת עליון), and (3) an understanding of wisdom (וחכמת בני שמים להשכיל).³⁴ The association between the act of sprinkling the Spirit with purity and knowledge of God has a strong connection with Ezekiel 36-37 where purity and knowledge of Yahweh are linked with Yahweh placing his Spirit within his people. One possibly additional link is the justification given for Yahweh transforming the community: "For (ביא) those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant (לברית עולמים) and to them shall belong all the glory of Adam (כול כבוד אדם)." It was observed in chapter 2 that Ezekiel portrays restored Israel as a new-Adam living within a new Eden.

In light of the above observations it is most likely that the Spirit of truth in 1QS 4:20-25 and the Spirit "which God has given" in 1QH^a both are references to the eschatological gift of Yahweh's Spirit as envisioned in Ezekiel 36-37.³⁵ The lexical and conceptual links to each other and the likely intertextual links with Ezekiel support this

³²Menzies' claim that the spirit in 1QS is never the subject of an action and therefore dissimilar to the spirit in 1QH^a is not a compelling argument. Although it is true that the "spirit of truth" or "the spirit of holiness" in 1QS 4:20-25 are not subjects of any action, neither is the spirit in 1QH^a. Rather, like 1QS 4:21 the action of the spirit is always placed with the instrumental preposition ב. In both instances, the רוח is the means by which the action occurs and God is the subject of the action.

³³The infinitive "to cleanse" is implied from the context of the previous line: "The God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man, ripping out all spirit of injustice from the innermost part of his flesh and [cleansing] him with the spirit of holiness."

³⁴Cf. 1QS 3:6-9.

³⁵The metaphor of "sprinkling" (יִי) and the simile "as lustral water" (כמי נדה) used to describe this sprinkling places this act in a similar semantic domain as the OT verbs which described Yahweh "pouring out" the Spirit (Ezek 39:29; Isa 32:15; 44:3; Joel 3:1, 2; Zech 12:10).

claim. The essential question however, is whether or not this interpretation of the Spirit of truth in 1QS 4:20-25 fits within the co-text of the two-spirit instruction in 1QS 3:13-4:26.

Although 1QS 4:20-25 is situated within the instruction on the two-spirits and two-paths it is temporally separated from the rest of the instruction. According to 1QS 3:17-18, God has created (ברא) man to rule the world and has placed two spirits (i.e., the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit) within him; these spirits determine the path in which each individual will walk until the time of God's visitation (עד מועד פקודתו). 1QS 4:2-8 describes the path of those who are controlled by the spirit of truth and 1QS 4:9-14 describes the path of those who are controlled by the spirit of deceit. 1QS 4:15-18a describes the enmity that exists between the two spirits and those under their respective reigns. 1QS 4:18b-19 transitions from the present reality of the conflict of the two spirits, to a future day, the day of God's visitation (פקודה) when he will put an end to the injustice caused by the spirit of deceit. A series of clauses marked by the temporal adverb אז indicate that the following actions in 4:19-25 will take place at the time of God's visitation: "Then truth shall rise up forever. . . . Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the structure of man. . . . He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth." Therefore, the reference to the "spirit of truth" that God will sprinkle upon his covenant people is not the same as the "spirit of truth" that God placed within man at creation. There is no conflict in 4:19-25 between the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit (as implied by Menzies) because God has obliterated the spirit of injustice and the only spirit God's purified people will have is a *new* "spirit of truth."³⁶ The act of Yahweh sprinkling the "spirit of truth" upon his people is an

³⁶There is therefore, not an identical relationship between the original "spirit of truth" and the eschatological "spirit of truth," but an analogical relationship.

eschatological act, an act of new creation whereby he removes the original, corrupted life-breath and replaces it with a new life-breath, his own Spirit.³⁷

The spirit of truth God will sprinkle upon his people in 4:25 is not the same spirit of truth God placed within humanity at creation. And yet, the use of the identical phrase “spirit of truth” to refer to both the life-breath or disposition God has placed within all people at creation and the eschatological Spirit of Yahweh, which he will “sprinkle” upon his people in the age to come, mimics the use of רוח in Ezekiel, as proposed in chapter 2. In Ezekiel the eschatological gift of Yahweh’s Spirit is a new life-breath, it is a new spirit for Yahweh’s restored people (e.g., Ezek 37) and yet it is not the same life-breath that Yahweh breathed into Adam in Genesis 2:7—because it is none other than Yahweh’s own Spirit, the same Spirit which hovered over the waters at creation (Gen 1:1) and by whom God created the world (Ps 34). Yahweh’s own Spirit is portrayed as the animating life for Yahweh’s new humanity and 1QS 4:20-25 anticipates this day when Yahweh will “sprinkle” his people with this “Spirit of truth.”

Wisdom of Solomon

The term *πνεῦμα* occurs three times in the opening chapter of Wisdom (1:5, 6, 7) with two distinct, yet corresponding, references.³⁸ In 1:5, and likely 1:6, *πνεῦμα* refers to the life-breath that all men receive at birth. This use of *πνεῦμα* is found throughout the

³⁷Mehrdad Fatehi, *The Spirit’s Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul*, WUNT 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 70, provides a helpful insight regarding the act of giving the Spirit in the Dead Sea Scroll and the identity of God: “An examination of the context of many of the references to the Spirit makes clear that it is God’s activity, in revelation or redemption, which is under focus. Moreover, in many of these passages the fact that God is the subject of a Spirit-activity is emphasised by explicitly stating that it is God who imparts, gives or sheds his Spirit; or by making the Spirit the instrument of God’s actions (like strengthening or purifying).” However, Fatehi’s conclusion does not sufficiently describe the texts cited above in terms of their connection of the Spirit with the identity of God. He writes, these texts refer “to an *extension* of God’s being, to God in *reaching out* to his creation and in his acting towards and among his people” (72). This section has also noted that these texts connect the giving of the eschatological Spirit with Yahweh’s identity as creator.

³⁸For an analysis of the relationship of the two *πνεύματα* in this chapter, see Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 142-44.

Wisdom (2:3; 5:3; 11:20a; 15:11, 16; 16:14). In 15:11, this meaning of πνεῦμα is used with an allusion to Genesis 2:7 and the act of God inbreathing the life-breath into man,³⁹ and is even designated as a ἅγιον πνεῦμα (1:5). However, in 1:7 there is a reference to the Lord’s own Spirit that “fills the world” (ὅτι πνεῦμα κυρίου πεπλήρωκεν τὴν οἰκουμένην). This reference to the Lord’s πνεῦμα is also found in 12:1 where Solomon claims “your incorruptible Spirit is in all things” (τὸ γὰρ ἀφθαρτὸν σου πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἐν πᾶσιν). This distinction in the referent of πνεῦμα in Wisdom, corresponds with the Old Testament distinction (as noted in chapter 2) between the “Spirit of God which hovered over the waters at creation” and the “spirit/life-breath from God which gives life to all humanity.”

There is one explicit reference to God giving his Spirit in Wisdom and it occurs in a context of God’s creative activity in the world. Although Menzies has highlighted the “soteriological” significance of this text,⁴⁰ Yates has proposed that soteriological work of wisdom/Spirit in 9:17-18 should not be isolated from its creation theology—soteriology (in Wisdom) is the “logical outworking of wisdom’s role in the creation of the cosmos.”⁴¹ For Yates, soteriology in Wisdom is a sub-set of creation theology. The context of chapter 9, as well as the parallels between Wisdom and Proverbs (with its prominent creation theology and Lady-Wisdom’s role in the creation and care of the cosmos), suggest that Yates is correct. The act of giving the Spirit is presented as an act of the creator God and is itself an act of new creation. In Wisdom 9:17-18 (cf. 7:7) Solomon prays:

³⁹See Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, 46. Wis 15:10-11: “His heart is ashes, his hope cheaper than earth, his life is more ignoble than clay, because he did not know the one who molded him and infused (τὸν ἐμπνεύσαντα) him with an active soul (ἐνεργοῦσαν ψυχήν) and breathed (ἐμφυσήσαντα) into him the life-giving spirit (πνεῦμα ζωτικόν)” The translation for Wisdom of Solomon is taken from Michael A. Knibb, “Wisdom of Solomon,” ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, NETS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 698-714.

⁴⁰Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 63, 310.

⁴¹Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 48.

βουλήν δέ σου τίς ἔγνω εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν καὶ ἔπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων καὶ οὕτως διωρθώθησαν αἱ τρίβοι τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ τὰ ἀρεστά σου ἐδιδάχθησαν ἄνθρωποι καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν

Solomon's prayer begins in 9:1-2 by acknowledging God as "the one who made all things" and the role Wisdom played in the formation of humanity (cf. 10:1-2). Wisdom is identified further as one who participates in God's rule of the universe (9:4) and uniquely understands what is pleasing to God (9:9; τί ἀρεστὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου). In light of Wisdom's ability to rule the cosmos with God and her particular insight into how to please God, Solomon asks God to "send her out from the holy heavens, and from your glorious throne send her, (ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτὴν ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου δόξης σου πέμψον αὐτήν) that, being present with me, she may labor with me" (9:10). In order to rule in a manner which pleases God, Solomon needs Wisdom.

Then, in 9:12-16, Solomon laments mankind's inability to learn divine counsel (γνώσεται βουλήν θεοῦ) due to the corruptible body in which the soul dwells. Therefore, knowledge of the council of God (9:17; βουλήν δέ σου τίς ἔγνω) occurs when God gives wisdom and sends his holy spirit from on high (ἔπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων; 9:18). Based on this truth, Solomon infers (οὕτως) that mankind is saved by wisdom (9:18c; τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν). Following this conclusion in 9:18, verses 10:1-11:14 then provides a retelling of Israel's history—beginning with Adam and concluding with Israel's deliverance from Egypt and wilderness wanderings—through the specific theme of the way in which Wisdom has *saved* God's people.⁴² In view of the way in which the author includes Wisdom within Yahweh's unique identity as the redeemer of his people (see chap. 2), Bauckham's assertion regarding the identity of Wisdom in this text is appropriate:

⁴²Although there are no specific names mentioned, the following people/events are highlighted: the creation and preservation of Adam (10:2), Noah and the ark (10:4), Babel (10:5), Lot (10:6-8), Jacob (10:9-12), Joseph (10:13-14), the exodus (10:15-21), Israel's wilderness wanderings (11:1-14). In all these episodes, wisdom is presented as the one who rescued and preserved (i.e. saved) humanity.

The personifications of God's Word and God's Wisdom in the literature are not parallel to the depictions of exalted angels as God's servants. The personifications have been developed precisely out of the ideas of God's own Wisdom and God's own Word, that is, aspects of God's own identity.⁴³

Creation theology is indispensable to Solomon's understanding of his role as king and the s/Spirit he needs to reign wisely. First, Solomon views his rule over God's people against the backdrop of God's purpose for creating humanity. God formed humanity in order "to rule over the creatures . . . and to manage the world . . . and to pronounce judgment" (9:2-3); and Solomon was chosen to be king and judge God's people justly" (9:7, 12). In his role as king, Solomon represents humanity and thus fulfills humanity's creation mandate in his rule over God's people.⁴⁴ As such, Solomon is presented as a new-Adam.⁴⁵ Second, the act of giving the "holy Spirit" reverses mankind's plight—its inability to know the counsel of God (9:13)—since the one who receives the Spirit/wisdom is able to know God's counsel (9:17; cf. 7:7).⁴⁶ Therefore, the act of sending the Spirit from on high is an act new creation transforming its recipient from one who cannot know God's counsel to one who does know God's counsel (9:18). If one allows the OT retelling in 10:1-11:14 to determine the meaning of the clause τῆ σοφία ἐσώθησαν (9:18),⁴⁷ then, at the very least, the act of giving the Spirit is an act of salvation like (for example) Wisdom's rescue of Israel from Egypt (Wis 10:15-21). Third, the role that Wisdom plays in this act of new creation is similar to her role in the

⁴³Bauckham, "God Crucified," 17.

⁴⁴Matthew Edwards, *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom*, FRLANT 242 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 152.

⁴⁵In 7:1 the king describes himself with an allusion to Adam. He states, "I myself am a mortal man like everyone, and a descendent of the first-formed individual born on earth (γῆγενοῦς ἀπόγονος πρωτοπλάστου)."

⁴⁶Menzies, *Early Development*, 62, rightly claims, that the identity between Spirit and Wisdom should be interpreted in terms of function: "wisdom is experienced through the Spirit."

⁴⁷Edwards, *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom*, 48: "Wisdom 10 is attached closely to the preceding chapter, not merely because of its announcement in 9:18 but because it offers practical demonstrations in history of the saving work of the cosmic Sophia in the soul of individual sages (7:27)."

formation of humanity at original creation. In 9:2 Wisdom is the means by which God formed humanity (τῆ σοφία σου κατασκευάσας ἄνθρωπον) and she is the means by which God’s new humanity (i.e., those who receive his holy Spirit) is saved (ἄνθρωποι καὶ τῆ σοφία ἐσώθησαν; 9:18).

Although Wisdom 9:18 clearly depicts the act of sending the Spirit as an act of salvation,⁴⁸ the creation context, as well as the contrast between humanity’s plight and the solution brought by the Spirit, suggest that the *act* of sending the Spirit is an act of the creator God, whereby he creates a new humanity who understand his counsel and lives accordingly. Furthermore, in Wisdom 7:7 Solomon’s reception of the “spirit of wisdom” (πνεῦμα σοφίας) is described and his retelling of this story in chapter 9 against the backdrop of God’s creation of humanity and humanity’s inability to discern God’s counsel suggest that the author of Wisdom viewed Solomon’s experience as paradigmatic—it expresses an eschatological hope that God would one day act to send his Spirit to humanity as a whole.⁴⁹ Solomon at one time lacked wisdom and the ability to please God, but with the Spirit, Solomon gained wisdom and the ability to discern how to please God. The “plight” of Solomon parallels the plight of humanity in chapter 9, suggesting that Solomon’s “solution” is the only solution for humanity.

Joseph and Aseneth

In this symbolic narrative,⁵⁰ the act of “giving” the Spirit is strongly associated with the conversion of Aseneth.⁵¹ This conversion is portrayed as a re-creation, a

⁴⁸Cho, *Spirit and the Kingdom*, 23.

⁴⁹Edwards, *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in Wisdom*, 152.

⁵⁰All English translations of *Joseph and Aseneth* are from Christoph Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, ed. J. H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 177-247; the Greek text is from idem, *Joseph und Aseneth: Kritisch Herausgegeben*, PVGT 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

transformation from darkness to light, from death to life.⁵² In 8:9-11 Joseph prays that God would renew Aseneth by his Spirit saying:

Lord God of my father Israel,
The Most High, the Powerful one of
Jacob,
Who gave life to all (things)
And called (them) from the darkness
to the light,
And from the error to the truth,
And from the death to the life;
you, Lord, bless this virgin,
and renew her by your spirit,
and form her anew by your hidden
hand,
and make her alive again by your life.

Κύριε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου Ἰσραὴλ
ὁ ὑψίστος ὁ δυνατὸς τοῦ Ἰακώβ
ὁ ζωοποιήσας τὰ πάντα
καὶ καλέσας ἀπὸ τοῦ σκότους εἰς τὸ ψῶς
καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πλάνης εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν
καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν
Σὺ κύριε εὐλόγησον τὴν παρθένον ταύτην
Καὶ ἀνακαινίσον αὐτὴν τῷ πνεύματί σου
Καὶ ἀνάπλασον αὐτὴν τῇ χειρί σου τῇ
κρυφαίᾳ
Καὶ ἀναζωοποίησον αὐτὴν τῇ ζωῇ σου.

In his prayer, Joseph uses three similar verbs to describe the requested conversion of Aseneth: ἀνακαινίζω (“renew”), ἀναπλάσσω (“form anew”), and ἀναζωοποιέω (“make alive again”) followed a dative noun indicating the means by which the transformative act will occur: τῷ πνεύματί σου, τῇ χειρί σου, and τῇ ζωῇ σου. In her prayer of confession and repentance (12:1-13:15), Aseneth identifies Joseph’s God as the “Lord God of the ages, who created all things (ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα) and gave life (to them), who gave breath of life to your whole creation (ὁ δὸς πᾶσι πνοὴν ζωῆς)” and cries out to him for mercy (12:1, 4). In response to her prayer, an angelic figure visits Aseneth and reveals to her that God has heard her prayer and will answer it (chaps. 14-17). The angelic figure explains to Aseneth, “Behold, from today, you will be renewed (ἀνακαινισθήσῃ) and formed anew (ἀναπλασθήσῃ) and made alive again (ἀναζωοποιηθήσῃ)” (15:4a). The three verbs in 15:4a are identical with those in Joseph’s

⁵¹Michael Penn, “Identity, Transformation, and Authorial Intent,” *JSP* 13 (2002): 177: “The transformation of Aseneth from an impure daughter of a pagan priest into an acceptable mate for Joseph.”

⁵²For an analysis of the theme of “new creation” in *Joseph and Aseneth*, see Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” 192; Randall D. Chestnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*, *JSP* Sup 16, (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Moyer V. Hubbard, *New Creation in Paul’s Letters and Thought*, *SNTSMS* 119 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 54-78; Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, 53-54; Ronald Charles, “Une Lecture Narrative de *Joseph et Aséneth* À la Lumière du Motif de la ‘Nouvelle Creation,’” *Science et Esprit* 63 (2001):73-84.

prayer (8:11) and their repetition here indicates that Joseph’s prayer is being answered. As part of the process of renewal, the angel asks Aseneth to eat from a honeycomb, which is “(full of the) spirit of life” (πνεῦμα ζωῆς; 16:14), and the transformation reaches its climax when Joseph returns, embraces Aseneth and they kiss: “Joseph kissed Aseneth and gave her spirit of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς), and he kissed her the second time and gave her spirit of wisdom (πνεῦμα σοφίας), and he kissed her the third time and gave her spirit of truth (πνεῦμα ἀλήθειας)” (19:11).⁵³ This final, symbolic act likely summarizes and symbolizes the re-creation of Aseneth by God’s Spirit in chapters 14-17.

New-creation language is employed to describe God’s act of transforming Aseneth.⁵⁴ In fact, each of the four stages portray this transformation using creation language.⁵⁵ This is first demonstrated in Joseph’s prayer on Aseneth’s behalf (8:9-11). Here, God’s work of renewing Aseneth by his Spirit is linked with his identity as the creator—he is the one who gave all things life (ὁ ζωοποίησας τὰ πάντα)—and this act of renewal is an act of re-creation by which God gives Aseneth new life (ἀναζωοποίησον αὐτήν). The phrase “from error to truth” indicates that Joseph is not describing God’s original creation, but the conversion of Aseneth—an act of new creation.⁵⁶ Second, in

⁵³Christoph Burchard, “Küssen in *Joseph and Aseneth*,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 36 (2005): 321, notes that the complete fulfillment of Joseph’s prayer does not occur until 22:9 when Aseneth is blessed by Jacob. He proposes that it was through this blessing that Aseneth became incorporated into the people of God: Erst jetzt war Aseneth nicht nur Jüdin und Geistträgerin, sondern auch förmlich ins Gottesvolk aufgenommen, und alles, was Joseph für sie erbeten hatte (8,9), war verwirklicht, soweit auf Erden möglich.”

⁵⁴Chesnutt, *From Death to Life*, 145: “Conversion in *Joseph and Aseneth* naturally is conceived as transition from death, destruction, and corruption which characterize the predicament of the godless, to the life, immortality and incorruption enjoyed by those who worship God. Accordingly, creation imagery is the language most often used to describe Aseneth’s conversion.”

⁵⁵Charles, “Une Lecture Narrative de *Joseph et Aséneth*,” 82. In light of the description of Aseneth as a “City of Refuge” (15:6), Charles suggests that Aseneth is portrayed as a new Adam because she becomes a channel through which “nations can access the divine favor” (i.e., blessing): “La promesse de bénédiction qui accompagne Abraham et ceux-là qui l'accueillent et reçoivent ses enfants signifie que les nations sont, après tout, eux aussi, les enfants de Dieu. Donc, selon cette logique, Abraham, et maintenant Aséneth, joue le rôle d'un nouvel Adam. Aséneth devient ainsi la filière par laquelle les nations pourront accéder à la faveur divine.”

her prayer to God (12:1-2), Aseneth also addresses him as the creator and giver of life. Concerning this prayer, Chesnutt observes the link between Yahweh's identity and Aseneth's conversion: "It is as the giver of life, the creator of being out of non-being, that God [resolves] Aseneth's predicament. God's salvific activity is conceived as analogous to his creative activity."⁵⁷ Third, the association between the symbolic honeycomb and πνεῦμα ζωῆς (16:14; cf. 16:8 πνοή ζωῆς) also links the Spirit and new creation.⁵⁸ The angel describes the honeycomb using language that recalls the tree of life in the Garden of Eden: "For this comb is full of the spirit of life. And the bees of the paradise of delight have made this from the dew of the roses of life that are in the paradise of God . . . and everyone who eats of it will not die forever and ever" (16:14).⁵⁹ Fourth, the image of Joseph giving Aseneth "spirit of life," "spirit of truth," and "spirit of wisdom" possibly alludes to Genesis 2:7 and Yahweh breathing the life-breath into Adam at creation.⁶⁰ Charles rightly summarizes the new-creation imagery evoked in the transfer of the "Spirit of life" through Joseph's kiss. He writes,

The old world of Aseneth, marked by death, error and darkness is no more. Now, in her new creation, she is the beneficiary of a life of grace, truth and light. Her

⁵⁶Chesnutt, *From Death to Life*, 145.

⁵⁷Ibid., 146-47.

⁵⁸For a helpful summary of the various interpretations of the honeycomb, see Anthea E. Portier-Young, "Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth's Honeycomb," *JSP* 14 (2005): 133-57. Portier-Young concludes that the honeycomb symbolizes "God's mercy (157). Cf. Moyer Hubbard, "Honey for Aseneth: Interpreting a Religious Symbol," *JSP* 16 (1997): 97-110. Hubbard argues that the honeycomb symbolizes new birth (105).

⁵⁹Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," 229 note n, states that the Greek phrase τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς is the LXX translation of the "Garden of Eden" in Gen 3:23.

⁶⁰Charles, "Une Lecture Narrative de *Joseph et Aséneth*," 80-82, notes that the new creation motif occurs at the beginning of the story (2:19-20). He suggests the following parallels with the opening chapters of Genesis: (1) La description d'Aséneth et de sa maison est celle d'un parfait état, (2) Aséneth est aussi belle que les filles des Hébreux, and (3) et sa maison est décrite comme le jardin d'Eden. He proceeds to observe, however, that Aseneth's mourning in 8:5-7 is portrayed as spiritual chaos, echoing Genesis 1:2. To obtain "the true picture of creation," therefore, Aseneth must subject, like the earth in Genesis 1, to the action of the Spirit of God" ("Pour bénéficier de la vraie image de la création, Aséneth doit être l'objet, comme la terre en Genèse 1, de l'action de l'esprit de Dieu").

salvation foreshadows the eschatological transformation and perfection of all those who are still in a state of chaos. The new creation which she accesses is a symbol of eschatological realities of not only the salvation of the human being, but the salvation of the universe.⁶¹

Jubilees

The book of *Jubilees* offers a retelling of the book of Genesis and the beginning of the book of Exodus.⁶² According to its prologue, it is a record of God's revelation to Moses on Mt. Sinai at the time he received the law. VanderKam notes that the biblical background for *Jubilees* is Exodus 24 where Moses spends forty days with Yahweh on Mt. Sinai.⁶³ It is generally understood that *Jubilees* lacks any reference to eschatological outpouring of Yahweh's Spirit, a conclusion that would put this text outside the scope of this chapter.⁶⁴ However, there are two passages worth quoting at length because they refer (especially in light of the conclusion reached above regarding 1QS) to Yahweh giving his people Israel a new spirit in the age to come.

This promise is made within the context of Yahweh warning Moses that Israel will do evil and go into exile, after which, he promises to gather and restore them. Yahweh promises, "And afterward they will turn to me from among the nations with all their heart . . . And I shall gather them from the midst of all the nations. . . . And with all my heart and with all my soul I shall transplant them as a righteous plant. And they will be a blessing and not a curse" (1:15-17). In light of this description of Israel's future, Moses falls down and prays:

⁶¹Ibid., 83, "Le vieux monde d'Aséneth, marqué par la mort, l'erreur et l'obscurité, n'est plus. Désormais, dans sa nouvelle création, elle est la bénéficiaire d'une vie de grâce, de vérité et de lumière. Son salut préfigure la transformation et la perfection eschatologiques de tous ceux qui sont encore dans un état de chaos. La nouvelle création à laquelle elle accède est symbole de réalités eschatologiques concernant non seulement le salut de l'être humain, mais encore le salut de l'univers."

⁶²James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies on the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2012), 1.

⁶³James C. VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 23.

⁶⁴Hubbard, *New Creation*, 45.

O Lord, let your mercy be lifted up upon your people, and create for them an upright spirit. And do not let the spirit of Beliar⁶⁵ rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face. But they are your people and your inheritance, whom you saved by your great might from the hand of the Egyptians. Create a pure heart and a holy spirit for them. And do not let them be ensnared by their sin henceforth and forever (1:20-21).

Two observations suggest a possible link to 1QH^a and 1QS and the Qumran understanding as the gift of Yahweh's Spirit as a new life-breath. First, in two places Moses asks God to "create" for them an upright/holy spirit. The verb "create" and its collocation with "heart" (v. 21) evoke new-creation imagery. Second, the reference to the "spirit of Beliar" is likely a reference to the original life-breath within Israel that is corrupted because it is under the influence of Beliar. Moses appears to contrast the original life-breath (corrupted) with a new life-breath (holy and upright). A similar comparison was noted above in 1QS and 1QH^a.

Yahweh responds to Moses as follows:

I know their contrariness and their thoughts and their stubbornness. And they will not obey until they acknowledge their sin and the sins of their fathers. But after this they will return to me in all uprightness and with all of (their) heart and soul. And I shall cut off the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their descendents. And I shall create for them a holy spirit, and I shall purify them so that they will not turn away from following me from that day and forever. And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments. And they will do my commandments. And I shall be a father to them, and they will be sons to me. And they will all be called 'sons of the living God.' And every angel and spirit will know and acknowledge that they are my sons and I am their father in uprightness and righteousness. And I shall love them (1:22-25).

Again, it is most plausible that a human "spirit" (i.e., life-breath) is in view in this passage and yet, the allusions to Ezekiel create the possibility that a fulfillment of Ezekiel 36:26-27 is referenced. First, the parallel between "I shall create for them a holy spirit" and "I shall purify them so that they will not turn away" reflects the parallel in Ezekiel 36 between Yahweh giving a new spirit to his people and his act of cleansing them from their iniquities (cf. Zech 12:10; 13:1). Second, there is an emphasis in Ezekiel on the fact

⁶⁵Kugal, *A Walk through Jubilees*, 25, states, "In Second Temple times, Belial was a wicked angel, sometimes identified with Satan."

that the Spirit-endowed people of Yahweh will obey their covenant God. A similar emphasis on obedience and Yahweh's covenant with Israel is stressed in *Jubilees*. These passages only refer to a "holy spirit," which Moses prays for and the Lord promises to give, and not to Yahweh's Spirit, but the possible allusions to Ezekiel and the parallels with Qumran suggest that the author of *Jubilees* did not envision a distinction between the two in the age to come: the new life-breath God will give his people is his very own Spirit.⁶⁶

Sibylline Oracles

In 4.187-89 the author of the oracles writes, ὅσσοι δ' εὐσεβέουσι, πάλιν ζήσονται ἐπὶ γαῖαν πνεῦμα θεοῦ δόντος ζωὴν θ' ἅμα καὶ χάριν αὐτοῖς ("but all who are godly, will live on the earth again, when God gives to them a spirit, life, and at the same time grace"). This oracle envisions a future resurrection of the pious. Although it is possible to read πνεῦμα as simply a reference to a new spirit (i.e., life-breath) and not as a reference to the Spirit, two reasons suggest that the latter reading is also plausible.⁶⁷ First, lines 4:179-182 contain an allusion to Ezekiel 37:1-10⁶⁸: "But when everything is already dusty ashes, and God puts to sleep the unspeakable fire, even as he kindled it, God himself will again *fashion bones* (μορφώσει ὀστέα) and ashes of men and *he will raise up mortals again as they were before.*"⁶⁹ The fashioning of bones and the resurrecting a new people suggests a fulfillment of Ezekiel 37:1-10. Second, as noted in

⁶⁶*Jubilees* 1:19-25 employs the metaphor of creation to describe God's renewal of his people. Four verses later, the time when God will renew heaven, earth, and all creation is described as a "new creation" (*Jub* 1:29). Here, it is possible, that the author describes Israel's renewal against the backdrop of the renewal of the cosmos; that is, Israel's renewal was to be the first-fruits of God's renewal of all creation.

⁶⁷Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 113.

⁶⁸J. J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983), 389. Collins defends the Jewish origin of the Oracles, dating them to the first century.

⁶⁹Translation by Collins. Italics added for emphasis.

the Qumran texts and Wisdom, the act of giving a new spirit (i.e., life-breath) should not be disconnected from the eschatological promises of God giving his people his own Spirit. In the previous texts, the contrast between the original life-breath and the new Spirit suggests that Second Temple Jews could understand the fulfillment of texts such as Ezekiel 36-37 as the act of God giving his people a new life-breath, his very own Spirit.

2 Maccabees

In the inspiring story of the martyrdom of the seven sons, the mother expresses her hope that her sons will one day be given new life and breath: *τοιγαροῦν ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης ὁ πλάσας ἀνθρώπου γένεσιν καὶ πάντων ἐξευρῶν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσιν μετ’ ἐλέους ὡς νῦν ὑπερορᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους* (“therefore, the creator of the world, the one who formed the beginning of humanity and the beginning and who planned the beginning of all things, he will return the spirit/breath and the life to you again with mercy, since you now disregard yourselves on account of his laws”; 7:23). Here the resurrection is clearly portrayed as an act of new creation corresponding with original creation. Again, *τὸ πνεῦμα* refers to the life-breath (especially with the verb *ἀποδίδωμι*); nevertheless, the giving of *τὸ πνεῦμα* in the age to come conceptually coheres with the interpretation of the previous Second-Temple texts: the act of giving *τὸ πνεῦμα* is an act of the creator God.⁷⁰

Rabbinic Literature

Although acknowledging the difficulty of using Rabbinic literature to reconstruct a first-century Jewish understanding of the gift of the divine Spirit, it is nevertheless necessary to highlight a few texts from this literature.⁷¹ It is generally

⁷⁰Yates, *Spirit and Creation*, 48.

⁷¹Cf. Menzies, *Development*, 91-111; Turner, *Power from on High*, 129-33; Fatehi, *Spirit's Relation*, 140-63. For detailed studies on the Spirit of Prophecy in Rabbinic literature see, Peter Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur*, Studien zum Alten und Neuen

agreed that the primary conception of the divine Spirit in the Rabbinic literature is that of the “Spirit of prophecy.”⁷² Fatehi points to the Targums as an example of this emphasis. He observes that the two phrases רוח הקודש (“Spirit of holiness”) and רוח נבואה (“Spirit of prophecy”) are used in places where the MT refers to רוח יהוה (“Spirit of Yahweh”) and רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים (“Spirit of God”).⁷³ In addition, Menzies notes the example of *T. Sot.* 13:2, which laments the departure of the Holy Spirit from Israel and the subsequent cessation of prophecy (cf. *y. Sot.* 9:13/14; *b. Sot.* 48b; *b. Sanh.* 11a; *b. Yom.* 9b).⁷⁴ This association between the divine Spirit and prophecy is, according to Menzies, further highlighted in the texts that reference the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit—the Rabbis anticipated the day when the Spirit would return to Israel and thus restore prophecy.⁷⁵

Max Turner, while still acknowledging the significance of the “Spirit of Prophecy” for this literature, has challenged some of Menzies’ conclusions and has cogently demonstrated that the anticipated effects of the Spirit’s eschatological activity

Testament 28 (Munich: Kosel, 1972); idem, “Die Termini ‘Heiliger Geist’ und ‘Geist der Prophetie’ in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim Zueinander,” *VT* 20 (1970): 304-14.

⁷²Schäfer, *Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist*, 143, writes “der Begriff des hl. Geistes ist zunächst auf den Begriff der Prophetie bezogen und durch diesen eingegrenzt.” Schäfer, “Die Termini,” 310-11, proposes that the terms “Holy Spirit (“hl. Geist”) and “Spirit of Prophecy” (“Geist der Prophetie”) differ in two ways: (1) the Holy Spirit refers to the prophetic Spirit sent by God (“Auch der Terminus ‘hl. Geist’ bezeichnet den von Gott gesandten prophetischen Geist”) and (2) the semantic range of the term Holy Spirit is broader than “Spirit of Prophecy” (“Der Terminus ‘hl. Geist’ geht in seiner Bedeutungsbreite über den Terminus ‘Geist der Prophetie’ hinaus”).

⁷³Fatehi, *Spirit’s Relation*, 143. E.g., MT Gen 41:38, *Tg. Onq., Cod. Neof, Tg. Ps.-J.* He proceeds by stating, “The most characteristic function of the Spirit as Spirit of prophecy in rabbinic literature is to give the prophet knowledge or foreknowledge of things or events which are hidden from ordinary people. Therefore, one may say that according to the rabbinic view, the Holy Spirit is most characteristically *the spirit of revelation*” (143-44).

⁷⁴Due to the strong link between the Spirit and prophecy, many modern scholars have concluded that the early Jewish literature (and especially the Rabbinic texts) imply that the Holy Spirit departed from Israel when the last prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi died. However, John Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 113-17, has argued that this is a false characterization of Second Temple Judaism.

⁷⁵Menzies, *The Development*, 104-06.

include more than prophetic revelations and inspired speech; these effects also include the moral and religious renewal of God's people in the world-to-come.⁷⁶ John Yates has further undermined the concept of the "Spirit of prophecy" as a comprehensive category for understanding the divine Spirit by demonstrating that the eschatological expectation of the outpouring of the Spirit is presented as an act of new creation.⁷⁷

Building upon the observations of both Yates and Turner, this section aims to demonstrate that in various texts from the Rabbinic corpus the *act* of giving the eschatological Spirit is understood as an act of the creator God whereby he re-creates a people for himself by giving them his own Spirit as their new life-breath. This interpretation corresponds with the interpretation of the Second Temple Jewish literature analyzed above.

First, the act of giving the divine spirit in Ezekiel 36-37 is interpreted as an act of new creation whereby the divine Spirit replaces the original life-breath. *Gen. Rab.*

14:18 (on Gen 2:7) explains Genesis 2:7 as follows:

And He breathed into his nostrils. This teaches that He set him up as a lifeless mass reaching from earth to heaven and then infused a soul into him. Because in this world [he was endowed with life] by breathing [therefore he is mortal]; but in the time to come he shall receive it as a gift, as it is written, *And I will put my spirit into you, and ye shall live.*

The parallel between original creation and new creation is developed further in *Gen. Rab.* 26:6 (on Gen 6:3): "R. Hiyya b. Abba interpreted: I will not fill them with My spirit when I fill all other men with My spirit, because in this world it [My spirit] spreads only through one of [the main] limbs, but in the future it will spread throughout the body, as it is written, *And I will put My spirit within you.*" In both midrashim, the act of giving the eschatological divine Spirit is presented as a re-enactment of the original creation.⁷⁸ In

⁷⁶Turner, *Power from on High*, 129-31.

⁷⁷Yates, *The Spirit and Creation*, 56-59.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, 59.

the world-to-come, God will give his new humanity his own Spirit, in a way that parallels the inbreathing of the life-breath into humanity at creation. The eschatological gift of the Spirit is thus interpreted as a new life-breath, a life-breath superseding its original archetype because it is none other than God's own Spirit.⁷⁹

Second, various texts link Joel 3:1 and Ezekiel 36:26 in such a way as to suggest that even when the prophetic effects of the Spirit's presence are being emphasized, the actual *act* of giving the spirit is an act of new creation. *Deut. Rab.* 6:14 and *Midr. Ps.* 14:6 link Joel 3:1 with Ezekiel 36:26:

God said: 'In this world, because there are amongst you slanderers, I have withdrawn My divine Presence from among you,' as it is said, *Be Thou exalted, O God, above the heavens* (Ps 52:12). 'But in the time to come, when I will uproot the Evil Inclination from amongst you', as it is said, *And I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh* (Ezek 36:26), 'I will restore My Divine Presence amongst you'. Whence this? For it is said, *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh*, etc. (Joel 3:1); 'and because I will cause My Divine Presence to rest upon you, all of you will merit the Torah, and you will dwell in peace in the world', as it is said, *And all children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children* (Isa 44:13). (*Deut. Rab.* 6:14)

Another comment: David spoke the first time in behalf of the Master, the Holy One, blessed be He, who said: *Oh that they had such a heart as this always, to fear Me, and keep My commandments* (Deut 5:25); and he spoke the second time in behalf of Moses who said: *Would that all the Lord's people were prophets* (Num 11:29). Neither the words of the Master nor the words of the disciple are to be fulfilled in this world, but the words of both will be fulfilled in the world-to-come: The words of the Master, *A new heart also will I give you and ye shall keep Mine ordinances* (Ezek 36:26), will be fulfilled; and the words of the disciple, *I will pour out My*

⁷⁹A few other examples of this new-creation imagery in relation to the eschatological Spirit are worth noting: (1) *Exod. Rab.* 48:4: R. Hanina provides a description about the eschatological effects of the divine Spirit of Ezek 37: "Said the Holy one, blessed be He, to Israel: 'In this world, My spirit hath given you wisdom, but in the time to come it will give you new life,' for it says, *And I will put My spirit in you and ye shall live.*" (2) *Targum Jonathan Ezekiel 36:25-27*: "And I will forgive your sins, as though you had been purified by the waters of sprinkling and by the ashes of the heifer sin-offering, and you shall be cleansed of all your defilements, and from your idols I will cleanse you. And I will give you a faithful heart, and I will put a faithful spirit deep inside you, and I will demolish the wicked heart, which is as hard as stone, from your flesh; and I will give you a heart that is faithful before Me, to do My will. And My holy spirit will I put deep inside of you and I will act so that you shall walk in my statutes and keep my laws and observe them." (3) *Midrash Tanhuma (Midr. Tanh. Addition to תקה)*: "concerning this the Wise say: 'The one who does not look at another's wife, the evil impulse has no power over him. In the world to come the Holy One, blessed be he, will take the evil impulse from us and place in us his Holy Spirit, as it is written: 'I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and I will put My Spirit in you.'"

spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy (Joel 3:1), will also be fulfilled. (*Midr. Ps.* 14:6)

Menzies claims that the act of giving a new heart (Ezek 36:26) and the act of pouring out the Spirit (Joel 3:1) are presented in these texts as two distinct acts, with the former being the “prerequisite” for the latter.⁸⁰ Turner, however, although acknowledging the possibility of this reading of *Midr. Ps.* 14:6, suggests that it is “more natural to assume that the promise of the Spirit in Ezekiel 36:27 is understood in terms of the Joel promise.”⁸¹ That is, *Midr. Ps.* 14:6 does not envision two separate events that are temporally distinct; rather, the giving of a new heart and the pouring out of the Spirit are fulfilled simultaneously. Furthermore, *Deut. R.* 6:14 makes the association between the two texts even more explicit by indicating that Joel’s promise of the outpouring of the Spirit is the means by which Ezekiel 36:26-27 is fulfilled.⁸²

The link made between Ezekiel 36 and Joel 3:1 in these Rabbinic passages is similar to the interpretation offered in chapter 2. Joel’s prophecy of the outpouring of Yahweh’s Spirit and Ezekiel’s prophecy of Yahweh giving his people his Spirit are references to the same eschatological act of new creation. While the emphasized effects may differ (e.g., Joel emphasizes prophecy; Ezekiel emphasizes obedience and knowledge of Yahweh), the actual *act* of giving the Spirit is an act of the creator God.⁸³

⁸⁰Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 107.

⁸¹Turner, *Power from on High*, 130.

⁸²*Ibid.*, 131.

⁸³Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 106, points to various texts which refer to the eschatological transformation of the heart (i.e., Ezek 36:26) without alluding to the Spirit in order to downplay the significance of the Spirit and eschatological re-creation (e.g., *b. Suk.* 52a; *Gen. Rab.* 34.14; *Num. Rab.* 15:16; *Song Rab.* 6.11.1; *Eccl. Rab.* 1.16). Ironically, there are more texts which link the creation of a new people in the world-to-come with the gift of the divine spirit: *b. Ber.* 31b; *b. Suk.* 52b; *Gen. Rab.* 14:18; *Gen. Rab.* 26:6; *Num. Rab.* 9:49; *Deut. Rab.* 6:14; *Midr. Ps.* 73:4; *Midr. Ps.* 14:6.

Summary

In the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, as well as in some Rabbinic texts, the eschatological act of giving the Spirit is consistently portrayed as an act of new creation. The anticipated (or, in the cases of 1QH^a and *Aseneth*, experienced) outpouring of the Spirit is understood to be the act of the creator God, whereby he creates for himself a new humanity enlivened by his own Spirit. First, there are explicit parallels between God's creation of humanity and his role as the giver of the Spirit (e.g., Wis. 9, *Jos. Asen.* 9, 12, *Gen. Rab.* 26:6). The one who will give his Spirit is none other than the very one who breathed the breath of life into Adam in Genesis 2:7. Second, there are strong parallels between the original, corrupted spirit (life-breath) and a new Spirit which God has or will place within his people (e.g., 1QH, 1QS, Wis., *Gen. Rab.* 14:18). The parallels imply that the new Spirit, is in fact a new life-breath and that the act of giving or "sprinkling" this Spirit upon the recipient is an act of new creation whereby the old life-breath is replaced with the Spirit of God. Third, the allusions to and explicit references of Ezekiel 36-37 imply that the eschatological gift of the Spirit, or God's eschatological purifying work by the Spirit was understood as an act of new creation. When references are made to the *act* of giving the eschatological, the metaphor of creation is consistently and primarily employed.

The Eschatological Outpouring of the Spirit: An Act Unique to Israel's God

In view of Bauckham's claim that Second Temple Judaism characterized the uniqueness of its God in terms of his identity as the creator of all things, and in view of the findings above that the eschatological act of giving the Spirit was understood as an act of the creator God whereby he creates a new humanity, it should not be surprising to find that there is no other figure who is presented as participating with or sharing in this divine activity. Turner has convincingly demonstrated no other figure in Judaism is ever

presented as the “giver of the Spirit” other than Israel’s God.⁸⁴ It is God alone who acts in this role, just as it is God alone who acted to create the world.

However, there are some texts that appear to call this claim into question. James Dunn, in particular, has highlighted texts such as 1QIsa 52:12, CD 2:12, *T. Judah* 23:4, and *Sus.* 1:44-45 (OG) to counter Turner’s claim. In addition to these texts cited by Dunn, *Joseph and Aseneth* 19:11 also challenges the legitimacy of Turner’s claim since it describes Joseph as giving the divine Spirit to Aseneth with a kiss. These texts will be analyzed in order to discern whether or not Second Temple literature limits the act of giving the divine Spirit to Yahweh alone, or whether other figures can act in this role as his appointed representatives.

The Messiah

Although early Jewish literature frequently associates the work of a future messiah(s) with the empowering presence of the Spirit (e.g., 1QSb 5:25; 11Q Melchizedek; Ps. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; *1 En* 49:3; 66:2), the question here is whether or not a messiah is ever expected to pour out the divine Spirit upon Israel. Dunn has pointed to 1QIsa 52:15 where it is said that the messiah “shall sprinkle (יִזֶה) many nations because of himself.” As noted above, the verb יִזֶה also occurs in 1QS 4:21 and depicts God “sprinkling” his people with the “spirit of truth”; a reference that is best understood as depicting the eschatological fulfillment of Ezekiel 36-37. In addition, Dunn points to CD 2:12, God “made known to them [the remnant] by the hand of his anointed ones his holy spirit” can be taken to mean that the prophets had a role in passing on or transmitting the Holy Spirit. Thus the verbal link between 1QS 4:21 and 1QIsa 52:15, in combination

⁸⁴Max Turner, “The Spirit of Christ and Christology,” in *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1982): 413; idem, “The Spirit of Christ and Divine Christology,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 422: “In Judaism the Spirit is related to Yahweh in a way that makes such “lordship” of the Spirit by a (mere) creature virtually inconceivable.”

with the notion of the prophets of old (i.e., “messiahs”) having a role in imparting the Spirit in CD 2:12, suggest an early Jewish precedence for associating a messiah with the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit.⁸⁵ In response, Turner has rightly pointed out that there is no indication that 1QIsa 52 envisions a sprinkling of the *Spirit* by the Messiah; the text does not indicate the precise way in which the cleansing will occur.⁸⁶ In other words, other than a verbal parallel, there is no textual evidence to conflate 1QIsa. 52:12 with 1QS 4:21. Furthermore, as Fatehi has noted, CD 2:12 does not imply that the “anointed ones” bestowed the Holy Spirit, but rather that the Spirit was known and experienced “by the faithful through the prophetic words of Israel’s prophets.”⁸⁷

In *T. Judah 24*, Judah prophesies that the Messiah (“the Star who will arise from Jacob”; ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ) will walk in gentleness and righteousness and no sin will be found in him (24:1-2). Moreover, “the heavens will be opened upon him to pour out the Spirit as a blessing of the Holy Father (ἐκχέαι πνεύματος εὐλογία πατρὸς ἁγίου). And he will pour the spirit of grace on you (καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχεεῖ πνεῦμα χάριτος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς)” and as a result “you shall be his sons in truth and you will walk in his first and final decrees” (24:3). The use of the verb ἐκχέω with πνεῦμα as the object suggests an allusion to Ezekiel 39:29 and Joel 3:1, and the phrase πνεῦμα χάριτος alludes to Zechariah 12:10. This passage claims that the messiah will act as giver of eschatological Spirit.

There is difficulty, however, in using *T. Judah 24* as reflecting the early Jewish expectation of the messiah’s role in pouring out the eschatological Spirit. At a minimum, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is viewed as an early Jewish text that has been interpolated by a Christian, allowing for the possibility that *T. Judah 24:3* was a

⁸⁵James D. G. Dunn, “Spirit-and-Fire Baptism,” *NovT* 14 (1972): 89-91.

⁸⁶Turner, “The Spirit of Christ,” 182.

⁸⁷Fatehi, *The Spirit’s Relation to the Risen Christ*, 80.

later Christian addition.⁸⁸ Because this verse matches the Christology of the NT Gospels and Acts, more so than the OT or other Jewish literature, a later interpolation is likely. Furthermore, Marinus de Jonge has soundly challenged the consensus view of the *Testaments of the Twelve* by arguing that the entire text is Christian; his work lessens the significance of *T. Judah* 24 for understanding early Jewish Christology.⁸⁹ However, even if one considers the passage as part of an original Jewish source,⁹⁰ reading this text as describing the messiah pouring out the Spirit is not the only way to interpret this passage. First, it is possible that the implied subject of the infinitive (“to pour out”) in the first clause is the Father, rather than the messiah.⁹¹ Second, Fatehi argues that “his” (αὐτοῦ) in the result clause refers to God rather than to the messiah, implying that the subject of “he will pour out the Spirit of grace” is also God.⁹² Third, Fatehi also detects an allusion to Zechariah 12:10 where *God* is the one who pours out a Spirit of grace.⁹³

An Angel of the Lord

The Old Greek of Susanna 1:44-45 reads as follows: *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐκείνης ἐξαγομένης ἀπολέσθαι καὶ ἔδωκεν ὁ ἄγγελος καθὼς προσετάγη πνεῦμα συνέσεως*

⁸⁸H. C. Kee, “Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *OTP*, vol. 1, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1983), 775-80.

⁸⁹Marinus de Jonge, “Once More: Christian Influence in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NovT* 5 (1962): 311-19; idem, *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, SNT, vol. 63 (New York: E. J. Brill, 1991); H. W. Hollander and M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*, SVTP (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985). See also J. Jervell, “Ein Interpolator interpretiert: Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen,” in *Studien zu den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen*, ed. W. Eltester (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1969), 30-61, who proposes that the present form of the Twelve reflects a Christian redaction, primarily in its eschatology.

⁹⁰James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, WUNT 48 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 109-12.

⁹¹In this case the interpretation is that heavens are opened so that the father might pour out the blessing of the Spirit upon the Messiah. Taking *πατρὸς* as a genitive of source supports this interpretation.

⁹²Fatehi, *Spirit's Relation*, 138-39.

⁹³*Ibid.*, 139.

νεωτέρῳ ὄντι Δανιηλ (“and behold an angel of the Lord, while she was being led away to die, and the angel, just as he was commanded, gave a spirit of insight to a young man, who was Daniel”). Subsequently the angel’s “gift” of the spirit of insight leads Daniel to speak out in defense of Susanna (1:48-51) and grants him insight into the guilt of Susanna’s malicious accusers (1:52-59). Daniel’s actions effect Susanna’s release and the execution of her accusers (1:60-62). As has already been noted, the OT and Second Temple Jewish literature associate the divine Spirit with wisdom and understanding (e.g., Deut 34:9; Isa 11:2; Wis 7:7; 9:17) so it is possible that Sus 1:44-45 is reference to an angel who acts to give the Spirit of God.

Despite the possibility of this reading, three factors suggest that Susanna 1:44-45 does not challenge the thesis of this chapter. First, this is not a reference to the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. Second, it is possible that this is not a reference to the Spirit of Yahweh. The genitive could be appositional and simply function to explain that type of “spirit” that the angel gave to Daniel—he gave him “insight.” Fatehi proposes, “One must conclude that the ‘spirit of understanding’ in the present passage most probably refers to the gift of understanding bestowed through a revelation given by an angel, rather than, specifically, to God’s Spirit.”⁹⁴ Third, the Theodotion text differs significantly with the OG in these verses: *καὶ εἰσήκουσεν κύριος τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπαγομένης αὐτῆς ἀπολέσθαι ἐξήγειρεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον παιδαρίου νεωτέρου ᾧ ὄνομα Δανιηλ* (“and the Lord heard her voice and while she was being led out to die, God awakened the holy spirit of a young child, whose name was Daniel”). Theodotion makes no reference to an angelic mediation, nor is there any reference to a giving of a new spirit to Daniel. Rather, God “awakens” the “holy spirit” (i.e., the life-breath) which already resides within the youth. According to Levison, “holy spirit” in Theodotion should be interpreted as a reference to the life-breath which was given to Daniel at birth; not as a

⁹⁴ Ibid., 134.

donum superadditum given as a “charismatic endowment.” This spirit has now been awakened by God in order to give him insight into Susanna’s plight (cf. Job 32:8-9).⁹⁵

The ambiguity of the text in OG Sus 1:44-45, as well as the significant revisions made by Theodotion, suggest caution in using Sus 1:44-45 as an example of an early Jewish text which presents a figure, other than God, as the giver of the divine Spirit.

Joseph

The text that best challenges the claim that the act of giving the eschatological Spirit was a role reserved for Yahweh alone is *Joseph and Aseneth* 19:11; however, neither Dunn nor Turner address this text. As noted above, Joseph is described as having a role in bestowing the divine Spirit to Aseneth: “And Joseph kissed Aseneth and gave her spirit of life, and he kissed her the second time and gave her spirit of wisdom, and he kissed her the third time and gave her spirit of truth.” In 8:9 the Spirit is linked with God’s new-creation work of transforming Aseneth and 19:11 is possibly the narrative fulfillment of this work. In addition, the giving of the Spirit through a “kiss” alludes to Genesis 2:7 (as well as Ezek 37:3-10), a text alluded to in 12:1 in order to identify the Lord God (see above). In her prayer, Aseneth identifies Joseph’s God as the creator God, ὁ δὸς πᾶσι πνοὴν ζωῆς (“the one who gave to all the life-breath”). The intimacy of the bestowal of the Spirit through a kiss, as well as the reference in 8:9 to the new creative work of God by his Spirit, suggests that Joseph, in 19:11, is acting in the role of giving the eschatological Spirit to Aseneth. Does this passage indicate that there is at least one early Jewish text which was comfortable presenting a figure, other than God, as acting in the new creation work of giving the divine Spirit?

⁹⁵Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 129; contra Menzies, *Development*, 55-56.

There are various ways to respond to Joseph's participation in this unique act of Yahweh; however, none of these points alone is sufficient for explaining this anomaly. Interpretation of 19:11 is heavily dependent upon one's view of the genre and provenance of the work as a whole. First, it is possible *Joseph and Aseneth* is a Christian work. Rivka Nir is the most recent scholar to counter the general consensus regarding the dating and setting of *Joseph and Aseneth*. Nir argues it is a Christian work because only in a "Christian setting can this story be understood as an integral literary and theological unit with all its symbols and metaphors. In this Christian setting Aseneth and Joseph are comprehended as symbolic and typological images: Aseneth symbolizes the church and Joseph is a prototype of Christ."⁹⁶ However, unlike the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, multiple scholars have plausibly explained the "Christian elements" in *Joseph and Aseneth* within the world of Second Temple Judaism, thus creating difficulty in ignoring this text on historical grounds alone.⁹⁷

Second, Joseph's act in 19:11 ("giving" the Spirit through the means of kissing) is different than the previous actions in chapter 8 and 12, which describe God re-creating Aseneth "by his Spirit." Thus, it is possible that Joseph is portrayed as an agent through whom God's Spirit is gifted to Aseneth, but is not himself presented as the source of the Spirit (in a way that parallels Yahweh's relation to the Spirit). Yet, in response, the possible allusion to Genesis 2:7 depicted in the imagery of "kissing," appears to present Joseph as the direct agent in the giving of this new Spirit to Aseneth.

Third, it is possible that the "spirit of life," the "spirit of wisdom," and the "spirit of truth" are not referring to the act of God re-creating Aseneth by his Spirit (as

⁹⁶Rivka Nir, *Joseph and Aseneth: A Christian Book*, Hebrew Bible Monographs 42 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012), 4. This view is also argued by Penn, "Identity, Transformation, and Authorial Intent," 179-83.

⁹⁷For a defense of a second century B.C.E date, see Christoph Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," 177-200; Chesnutt, *From Death to Life*, 65-94.

described in chaps. 8 and 12). Within the narrative, Aseneth's transformation appears to be completed before she unites with Joseph in chapter 19, since Aseneth's encounter with the angel is presented as the divine answer to Joseph's (chap. 8) and her own prayer (chap. 12). It is plausible that the symbolic elements Aseneth partakes of (e.g., the honeycomb) are the means through which God's re-creative work by his Spirit is carried out, not Joseph's kiss. Yet, this still begs the question, What s/Spirit did Joseph give to Aseneth?

Fourth, and most likely, the kissing in 19:11 is symbolic of the whole conversion process described in chapters 8-16. Penn has argued that the kissing motif in *Joseph and Aseneth* "constructs and transforms identity."⁹⁸ In fact, kissing plays a significant function in Joseph and Aseneth's first meeting:

And Aseneth's mother went up into the upper chamber and she led Aseneth to Joseph and Pentephres said to his daughter Aseneth, 'Greet your brother, because he also is a virgin as you are today and he hates all foreign women as you also [hate] all foreign men'. And Aseneth said to Joseph, 'Greetings, lord, may you be blessed by God the most high'. And Joseph said to her, 'May the God who made all living things bless you'. And Pentephres said to Aseneth, 'Go and kiss your brother'. But when she went to kiss Joseph, Joseph stretched out his right hand, put it upon her breast and he said, 'It is not proper [for] a God fearing man, who blesses with his mouth the living God and eats the blessed bread of life and drinks the blessed cup of immortality and is anointed with the blessed ointment of incorruption, to kiss a strange woman, who blesses with her mouth dead and dumb idols and eats from their table [the] bread of strangling and drinks from the cup of their drink offering of ambush and is anointed with the ointment of destruction. But a God fearing man kisses his mother and his sister from his clan and his relatives and the woman he sleeps with, who bless with their mouths the living God.

In their first encounter, Aseneth's father attempts to collapse the differences between Aseneth and Joseph and focuses on their common dislike for foreigners and their virginity. In fact, he describes them as siblings and as such requests that his daughter kiss Joseph (symbolizing their familial relationship).⁹⁹ Joseph, however, refuses the kiss because Aseneth worships foreign gods and is therefore unclean. Thus, the refusal of the

⁹⁸Penn, "Identity Transformation," 173.

⁹⁹Ibid.

kiss symbolizes that Aseneth does not belong to the covenant people of the true God. Penn likewise concludes, “Pentephres’s offering of his daughter’s kiss is an attempt of symbolic inclusion into his family. Joseph’s refusal becomes a ritual of exclusion marking the boundary between believer and nonbeliever, a distinction that is more important to Joseph than fictive, legal or biological kinship.”¹⁰⁰ Thus, when Aseneth and Joseph are reunited in chapter 19, their kiss is the physical manifestation of Aseneth’s dramatic re-creation and symbolizes Aseneth’s participation in the covenant community. It is, therefore, not the act of re-creation, but is the symbol of God’s new-creation transformation of Aseneth. Joseph does not, therefore, bestow the Spirit in the same way God did in chapters 8-12.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that, in continuity with the OT witness, the Jewish writers of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods associate the act of “giving” the Spirit with the unique identity of Yahweh. These writers develop the OT prophecies that portray this act as an act of the creator God, part of Israel’s restoration, and exclusive to Yahweh.

First, within this diverse literature the *act* of giving the Spirit is primarily portrayed as an act of the creator God whereby he creates for himself a new humanity. Whenever the Spirit is presented as the direct object of Yahweh’s action (1QS 4:20-25; Wis 9:17; *Joseph and Aseneth* 19:11, *Jubilees* 1:22-25 [?], *Gen. Rab.* 14:8; 26:6; *Deut. Rab.* 6:14; *Midr. Ps.* 14:6) or the means by which Yahweh accomplishes an action (1QH^a 5:26; 1QS 4:20-25; *Joseph and Aseneth* 8:11), creation imagery is consistently evoked. In fact, in 1QS, 1QH^a, Wisdom, and (possibly) *Jubilees*, the gift of Yahweh’s Spirit is often contrasted with the original spirit (i.e., life-breath) indicating that Yahweh’s Spirit

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 175.

is in fact a new life-breath that enables the recipient to know and obey Yahweh in a way that was impossible when the recipient was ruled by the original, corrupted spirit. The writers of this literature develop the OT pattern of presenting the act of giving the Spirit through the metaphor of creation. The consistency of the new-creation imagery in portraying the *act* of pouring out the Spirit suggests that this was the primary understanding of this eschatological act among First-Century Jews.

Second, in 1QS, 1QH^a, (possibly) *Jubilees*, and the Rabbinic texts cited above, the act of giving the Spirit is also associated with Israel's restoration. This association is made by citing or alluding to Ezekiel 36-37 and Joel 3:1-2. Although 1QS, *Jubilees*, and the Rabbinic texts show continuity with Ezekiel's vision by emphasizing the corporate nature of the outpouring on the "whole house of Israel," 1QH^a reflects a development in the tradition by highlighting an individualized fulfillment of the promise. Levison's observation regarding this development is helpful. He writes, "Ezekiel maintained this corporate tenor as he traipsed through the valley of dry bones. The gist of this vision is corporate . . . Individuals are subsumed under the image of a resurrected mass: when the breath came into them, *they lived, they stood on their feet, a very, very large crowd.*"¹⁰¹ However, regarding 1QH^a Levison observes, "In each of these hymns, the language is that of the promise made to Israel as a whole in Ezekiel 36:26-27, but its appropriation belongs to individual devotees of the covenant along the shores of the Dead Sea."¹⁰² The corporate angle aligns closer with Luke's emphasis on the fulfillment of these promises in the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles. In addition, Luke presents this act within the context of Israel's restoration in fulfillment of Joel 3:1-2, Isaiah 32:15; 44:3, and even Ezekiel 36-37.

¹⁰¹Levison, *Filled with the Spirit*, 207 (italics original).

¹⁰²Ibid., 208.

Third, the writers of this literature appear to present Yahweh as the exclusive Spirit-giver; this is not a role he delegates to or shares with any other figure. The messiah is never portrayed as acting in this role and even Joseph, who is the figure who comes closest to imitating Yahweh's role as Spirit-giver, is not presented as exactly paralleling Yahweh's role as the Spirit-giver (as Jesus does in Luke-Acts). Within the world of Second Temple Judaism, Luke's narratives are anomalies since he presents Jesus as pouring out the Spirit in the same manner that Yahweh pours out the Spirit. It is to Luke's presentation of the Spirit-giver that we will now turn.

CHAPTER 4

ISRAEL'S GOD AND JESUS THE MESSIAH: THE SHARED IDENTITY OF THE SPIRIT- GIVER IN LUKE'S GOSPEL

Introduction

One of the compelling features of Luke's διήγησις is his ability to weave together diverse christological strands into a unified narrative that unveils the particular identity of Jesus. Through various literary and rhetorical devices, including citations from and allusions to ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως καὶ οἱ προφῆται, Luke tells a unique story of one whose actions, death, and resurrection reenact the tragic drama of Israel's Scriptures (OT)¹ and, yet, simultaneously bring Israel's story to its climatic and hoped-for conclusion.² At both the narrative and story levels, the identity of Jesus is shaped by OT themes and figures such as the Isaianic Servant, the prophet like Moses, the nation Israel, the promised Son of David, the righteous martyr, and Adam, God's son. As one who is himself immersed in the OT, Luke's Jesus interprets his own ministry, death, and

¹Kenneth D. Litwak, "Israel's Prophets Meet Athens' Philosophers," *Biblica* 85 (2004): 212, demonstrates that Luke, like other Hellenistic historiographers (e.g., Polybius) built "reenactment" into his narrative: "Luke crafted his narrative to present events in Luke-Acts as reenactments of events in the Scriptures of Israel." Building on the research of G. W. Trompf, *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), Litwak claims that Luke used reenactments as a way of developing continuity between his narrative and the Old Testament.

²For studies on Luke-Acts as a continuation of the OT story, see Nils A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 153, who claims that Luke intended to write "the continuation of biblical history"; Peter Mallen, "Genesis in Luke-Acts," in *Genesis in the New Testament*, ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, LNTS 466 (New York: T & T Clark, 2012), 62. Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 19997) 52: "Luke is not introducing a *new* story, but continuing an old one, whose real 'beginning' is the LXX. He roots the coming of Jesus and the universal Christian movement in God's purpose, continuous as one divine story." Cf. Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 492, who argues that the various *Schriftallusionen* in Luke 1 shows that the history of God with his people continues in Luke's writings.

resurrection in accordance with the OT storyline and sees these previous figures as foreshadowing his own role in God's redemptive plan.³ Thus Luke's use of the OT extends beyond explicit citations;⁴ it is built into the structure of the narrative itself and, in turn, provides the hermeneutical lens through which to view the Lukan Jesus.⁵ This lens provides the appropriate filter for viewing Luke's development of Yahweh's promise to pour out his Spirit.

³Cf. Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation* (New York: Harper One, 1996), 113: "Unlike Matthew, who focuses on the fulfillment of prophetic predictions, Luke has a subtler perception of the continuity between Scripture and his own narrative. . . . Luke neither quotes these passages nor calls attention to the typology by means of any citation formula; nonetheless, the reader who knows the Old Testament background will discern how Luke has woven these motifs seamlessly into his story." See also C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 33. Regarding the use of the OT in Luke 1-2, Rowe writes, "Luke does not work from a rigid prophecy/fulfillment scheme; nor are the prefigurations in the Old Testament of character and event (e.g., Abraham, Sarah, Hannah) read in simple typological correspondence with the characters and events of Luke's time. Rather, Luke's reading of the LXX enables him to shape his story to exert pressure upon the reader by means of atmospheric resonance. The characters and events of the Old Testament are everywhere present and nowhere mentioned."

⁴For an analysis emphasizing the explicit OT citations in Luke and Acts, see Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, TU 104 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968). Holtz argues that Luke draws exclusively from the LXX and that the Book of the Twelve, Isaiah, and Psalms are the most significant for the Lukan writings. Holtz's exclusive focus on OT citations in Luke-Acts leads him to ignore the significant texts such as Pentateuch.

⁵In other words, the apologetic category "proof from prophecy" does not sufficiently explain Luke's use of the OT. This category was popularized by Paul Shubert's seminal essay, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. W. Eltester, BZNW 21 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957), 165-86, and Martin Rese's monograph, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, StNT 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969). However, the OT does not simply enhance the Lukan narrative; it shapes Luke's unique telling of the story of Jesus and his followers. The following analyses demonstrate that Luke incorporates the OT into the very structure of his two-volume narrative: David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 46-288, argues that the Lukan "travel narrative" (Luke 9:51-9:44) is shaped in light of the Exodus journey in Deuteronomy; Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*, JSNTSup 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 337-49, argues that OT Davidic Christology is programmatic for Luke's two-volume narrative; Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 141 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 27, argues that Luke uses Scripture "to design his structure of the narrative units in the life of Jesus and his followers"; David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 5, argues "the scriptural story which provides the hermeneutical framework for Acts is none other than the foundation story of Exodus as developed and transformed through the Isaianic corpus."

The complexity and depth of Luke's characterization of Jesus is evidenced by the secondary literature that has analyzed Lukan Christology. As noted in chapter 1, although some scholars have attempted to construct a controlling category to explain and unite the diverse christological threads, most are content to allow each motif to stand alone and present its particular depiction of Jesus. Nevertheless, many scholars do appeal to one general category which controls Luke's unique presentation of Jesus: *Jesus' humanity*. That is, all of these OT figures function within the narrative to present a very human picture of Jesus—a picture which many scholars see as consistent with the apparent lack of any divine Christology in Luke's Gospel, as well as in his sequel, Acts.⁶

This focus on Jesus' humanity is corroborated by the Lukan emphasis on Jesus' relationship to the Holy Spirit because this relationship corresponds with these same OT *human* figures: Jesus is the Isaianic Servant whom Yahweh has anointed with his Spirit (Isa 61:1-2; Luke 4:18-21); he is the son of David upon whom Yahweh's Spirit rests (Isa 11:1-2; Luke 3:22); he is Moses-like in the way his experience of Yahweh's Spirit becomes paradigmatic for all Yahweh's people (Num 11:29; Luke 3:22; Acts 2:1-4); he proleptically receives the eschatological Spirit promised to the nation Israel (Isa 44:3; Luke 3:22); and his conception by the Spirit (Luke 1:35) echoes the creation story of Genesis 1—Jesus is a new Adam, endowed with a new Spirit, and triumphs over Satan. It is, therefore, no coincidence that these OT figures, which Luke uses to shape the narrative identity of Jesus, are themselves intimately associated with Yahweh's Spirit: Luke's Jesus both retells and fulfills the story of these figures in his own experience of the Holy Spirit. Hans Frei proposed that Luke presents Jesus as “a climatic summing-up of that whole story. The crucial events that happened to Israel at large and constituted

⁶E.g., Christopher M. Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 137. Tuckett represents many Lukan scholars when he states, “Luke is also famous for presenting, perhaps more than any other New Testament writer, the picture of the human Jesus.” Tuckett also follows Conzelmann in his claim that the “Lukan Jesus is a figure who is very much subordinate to God” (144).

Israel as a people happen on a small scale to Jesus, but in such a way that there is now a completion or fulfillment of what was left incomplete in Israel's life."⁷

However, there is one aspect of Jesus' relationship to Yahweh's Spirit that goes beyond the experience of these OT figures. Jesus is described as the one who gives (i.e., pours out; baptizes with) the Holy Spirit to God's restored people. In fact, this experience altogether transcends the *human* category since nowhere in the OT or Second Temple Literature is any figure, other than Yahweh himself, presented as "giver of the Spirit."⁸ Although not a prevalent motif in Luke's Gospel, Luke gives it significance by placing it at the beginning (3:16), middle (11:13), and end (24:49) of his first volume. In fact, the references in 3:16 and 24:49 form an *inclusio* by bracketing the plot of his Gospel's story. As Luke's narrative continues into his second volume, this motif becomes both prevalent and prominent. For example, references to the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit occur approximately eleven times in Acts and are intricately associated with the primary theme of bearing witness to the exalted Messiah.⁹ Luke uses the literary motif of giving the eschatological Spirit to structure and advance his two-volume narrative.¹⁰

Even though the prominence of this particularly Lukan motif has not been ignored by Lukan scholars, most of the attention has been devoted to understanding Lukan pneumatology; little focus, in turn, has been given to its significance for Lukan

⁷Hans Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 128.

⁸See chap. 2, "The Giving of the Spirit and the Unique Identity of Yahweh in the Old Testament" and chap 3, "The Identity of Israel's God and the Eschatological Outpouring of the Spirit in Early Judaism."

⁹Acts 1:5, 8; 2:1-4; 2:14-41; 4:31; 8:14-24; 9:17; 10:44-48; 11:15-18; 15:8-11; 19:1-7.

¹⁰Cf. Dunn, *Christ and the Spirit*, 20-21, who argues that the distinct "epochs" of Luke-Acts are marked by Jesus' relation to the Spirit. First, Jesus' human life is created by the Spirit (Luke 1:35); second, Jesus is uniquely anointed by the Spirit (Luke 3:22; Acts 10:38); third, at his exaltation, Jesus receives power to bestow the Spirit (Acts 2:33).

Christology.¹¹ It is the burden of this chapter to demonstrate the way this motif functions to shape the narrative identity of Jesus in Luke's Gospel. In particular, this chapter will analyze the way Luke uses the giver-of-the-Spirit motif to make a claim about the relationship between Jesus and Israel's God.

Argument

One of the presuppositions guiding the thesis of this chapter (as well as the next) is that the Spirit-giver motif, like the other OT citations and allusions that describe Jesus' relationship to the Spirit, contributes to Luke's goal of unveiling the identity of Jesus for his readers. The fact that this is the first description given of Jesus by John the Baptizer (3:16), the last description the risen Jesus gives of himself in the Gospel (24:49), and the prominence this description has in Peter's Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:33) suggest the plausibility of this presupposition.¹² The question then becomes, What does this motif reveal about the narrative identity of Jesus?

In light of the conclusions reached in chapters 2 and 3, it is evident that Luke's depiction of Jesus as the eschatological Spirit-giver extends beyond the messianic expectation of the OT and early Judaism. Luke consistently applies to Jesus a role that

¹¹James D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem, Christianity in the Making*, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 221: "One of the most striking, and most neglected, of the assertions made regarding the exalted Jesus is the claim attributed to Peter that on being exalted at God's right hand, Jesus had received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit and had poured out this Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2.33). That is, it was the exalted Christ, not God himself, who had poured out the end-time Spirit."

¹²The identity-shaping function of an action is a form of "indirect characterization." See Richard P. Thompson, *Keeping the Church in Its Place: The Church as Narrative Character in Acts* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006), 18-20: "One aspect of character depiction in Greco-Roman literature is related to the prominent focus on human action. The indirect description . . . of a character through human action is the dominant means of presenting characters, both in Greco-Roman literature and in Acts. This attention on the action of characters as an indirect means of depicting them does not ignore the ancient understanding of the relation between human action and human 'character,' ἦθος. . . . By telling about the action of the literary character, the author reveals that person's ἦθος implicitly because ἦθος not only is related to the cause of action but also is *developed* through action. . . . A narrative focus on characters' actions provides little explicit information about those characters themselves; the narrative merely tells selectively about what they do. Nonetheless, the reader must actively make judgments and decisions about those characters from the information that the text provides."

was unique to the eschatological identity of Israel's God and was frequently associated with his divine identity as the creator and Israel's covenant God. As such, it is possible that Luke has shaped this motif so that the reader sees Jesus as the revelation of the unique identity of Israel's God in the act of re-creating and restoring his people. That is, Luke includes Jesus within the divine identity of the Spirit-giver. Max Turner has argued that the description of Jesus as the Spirit-giver in Acts 2:33 does in fact reveal a divine Christology. Three primary arguments support his claim: First, "Jesus has somehow achieved that 'lordship' in respect to the gift of the Spirit . . . which Joel predicates of *God*." Second, Jesus' relation to the Spirit in Acts is unparalleled by anything said in Judaism with respect to the Messiah and the Spirit. Third, the claim made in Acts 2:33 within the context of Judaism would have been understood as a claim to divinity.¹³

Chapters 2 and 3 of this dissertation developed Turner's premises by showing that the act of giving the Spirit was particular to Yahweh and integral to his identity as the creator and covenant God. Thus, in light of the OT and Second Temple Jewish literature, the claim that Jesus is the giver of the eschatological Spirit is—in and of itself—a claim that includes Jesus in the unique identity of Israel's God.

Although agreeing with both Turner's claim and premises, this chapter continues to develop Turner's thesis from a different angle. Turner focuses primarily on the historical and cultural context in which Peter's claim was made; that is, he is concerned with how the claim that Jesus is the one pouring out the Holy Spirit would have been understood by both Peter and his audience. For those whose theology was shaped by the OT and other Second-Temple writings, it is historically plausible that they would have taken Peter's statement as a claim to the divine status of Messiah Jesus. This

¹³Max Turner, "The Spirit of Christ and 'Divine' Christology," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 414. Cf. Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*, SNTSM 89 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 193-205, who includes this literary motif as part of his analysis of Jesus' divinity in Luke and Acts.

“behind-the-text” approach, however, tells us little about *Lukan* Christology, which is best determined by an analysis of the Spirit-giver motif within its literary co-texts. Does the way in which Luke articulates the identity of Jesus as the Spirit-giver reveal a divine Christology? The narrative and exegetical analyses in this chapter, as well as the next, suggest that Luke does in fact shape Jesus’ identity as the Spirit-giver in a way that reveals his divine identity.¹⁴

There are two additional ways this chapter attempts to develop further Turner’s claim. First, Turner limited his claim regarding divine Christology to the Luke’s second volume, Acts. This chapter, however, seeks to show that the unfolding of the Spirit-giver motif in Luke’s *Gospel* also reveals a divine Christology. Jesus’ “lordship” (to use Turner’s term) over the Spirit is revealed not only in Acts 2:33 but also in Luke 3:16 and 24:49. In addition, the literary pattern in Acts 2 of describing both Israel’s God (2:17) and Israel’s Messiah (2:33) as the Spirit-Giver is anticipated in Luke’s Gospel, since it portrays both Jesus, the Messiah (3:16; 24:49) and Israel’s God (11:13) as the giver of the eschatological Spirit.¹⁵ Second, in defending a divine Christology in Acts 2:33, it is not sufficient simply to note that the messianic claim in Acts 2:33 is unique or that Jesus is presented as acting in a role exclusively reserved for Israel’s God (as significant as these features are). The Lukan narrative, in fact, presents both the traditional view of Israel’s

¹⁴N. T. Wright, “Whence and Whither Historical Jesus Studies in the Life of the Church?,” in *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, ed. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), 135, provides a helpful caution for discussing Jesus’ humanity and divinity in the Gospels. He writes, “The flattening out of Christian debates about Jesus into the language of divinity and humanity represents, I believe, a serious de-Judaizing of the Gospels, ignoring the fact that the Gospels know nothing of divinity in the abstract and plenty about the God of Israel coming to establish his kingdom on earth as in heaven, that they know nothing of humanity in the abstract, but plenty about Israel as God’s true people, and Jesus as summing that people up in himself.” This chapter assumes this story-shaped understanding of divinity: Luke characterizes Jesus in terms that, within the OT storyline, are unique to the divine identity of Israel’s God in order to include Jesus within this unique (story-shaped) divine identity.

¹⁵Furthermore, the literary context in which John the Baptizer announces that the “coming one” will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire (Luke 3:16) implies as high a Christology as the literary context in which Peter proclaims that the Messiah is pouring out the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33).

God as the giver of the eschatological Spirit *and* the unique view of Israel's Messiah as the giver of the eschatological Spirit. The new "spirit" Yahweh had promised to pour out upon his people finds its fulfillment in the Lukan narrative that identifies *both* God the Father and Jesus the Messiah as the Spirit-giver. It is not that Luke has completely rejected the OT and Jewish views of the giver of the Spirit; rather he has embraced this view but is distinct in including Jesus in this role. In light of Bauckham's work on divine identity Christology, Luke includes Jesus within a role that is unique to the divine identity of Israel's God. Regarding the way in which the NT authors relate Jesus to the God of Israel, Bauckham writes:

The intention of New Testament Christology . . . is to include Jesus in the unique divine identity as Jewish monotheism understood it. They do this deliberately and comprehensively by using precisely those characteristics of the divine identity on which Jewish monotheism focused in characterizing God as unique. They include Jesus in the unique divine sovereignty over all things, they include him in the unique divine creation of all things, they identify him by the divine name which names the unique divine identity, and they portray him as accorded the worship which, for Jewish monotheists, is recognition of the unique divine identity. In this way, they develop a kind of christological monotheism which is fully continuous with early Jewish monotheism, but distinctive in the way it sees Jesus Christ himself as intrinsic to the identity of the unique God.¹⁶

This chapter (as well as the next) argues that Luke includes Jesus within the unique eschatological outpouring of the Spirit in a way that portrays Jesus as intrinsic to the identity of the unique God.

¹⁶Bauckham, "God Crucified," 19. For a critique of Bauckham's method, see Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation*, WUNT 207 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20-43. Chester argues that the category of agency best explains the development of Christology in the New Testament writings. He suggests that within the matrix of early Judaism the traditions regarding the intermediary figures (e.g., exalted angels, patriarchs, Wisdom, Logos) show an overlap between human and divine features and functions. "They also show us that the barrier between these spheres is becoming (increasingly) permeable. In a number of these traditions we also find striking portrayals of human figures, in a visionary context, being transformed into more than human appearance—at times indeed it would seem, into more than angelic form—and in some cases set alongside God in the heavenly world" (119). However, Chester himself admits that his analysis of the Second Temple literature does not "provide a sufficient explanation for the phenomenon of earliest Christology" (120). Bauckham's analysis has the advantage over Chester's in that it explains both the Jewish monotheism of Second Temple Judaism and the Christology of the NT, which operates within the matrix of Jewish monotheism. Although this dissertation builds upon Bauckham's research, it is also possible that it provides additional support to his theory.

C. Kavin Rowe has provided a helpful precedent that this argument is able to build upon. The complex way Luke presents both God and Jesus as sharing the identity of the Spirit-giver corresponds with the recent argument by Rowe regarding Luke's use of *κύριος* to identify both the God of Israel and Israel's Messiah. The argument of this chapter corresponds with Rowe's argument regarding Luke's use of *κύριος*.¹⁷ Using Rowe's language, the argument of chapters 4 and 5 can be summarized as follows: "Luke positions [the-giver-of-the-Spirit theme] within the movement of the narrative in such a way as to narrate the relation between God and Jesus as one of inseparability, to the point that they are bound together in a shared identity as [the Spirit-giver]."¹⁸ Rowe's theory best explains Luke's complex and creative use of *κύριος*; and, in this chapter, I am attempting to show that his theory has potential for explaining the complex and creative use of the Spirit-giver motif.¹⁹

To summarize: the thesis of this chapter is that Luke uses the Spirit-giver motif in his Gospel to link Jesus with Israel's God so that they both share the identity of the eschatological Spirit-giver. This chapter is structured by narrative and exegetical analyses of the individual pericopae that develop the Spirit-giver motif (Luke 3:16; 11:13; 24:49). In the attempt to interpret these passages within their narrative co-texts, as well as in light of their development of the OT promises of Isaiah, Joel, Zechariah, and Ezekiel, the following reasons will be drawn out in support of this thesis. First, the

¹⁷See chap. 1, "Introduction."

¹⁸Rowe, *Early Christology*, 27. Rowe uses the German term *Verbindungsidentität* to describe the relationship between Jesus' and God's shared identity as *κύριος*. According to Rowe, this term indicates "a shared, narratively established identity in which there is unity without confusion as well as distinction without separation" (ibid.). "[T]he sense is that of a narrative *Verbindung*, a coherent pattern of characterization that binds God and Jesus together through the word *κύριος* such that they finally cannot be separated or abstracted from one another in the story. To apprehend the identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke is to include God, and the question, Who is God in Luke?, of necessity places Jesus at the center of its answer" (Ibid., 201).

¹⁹However, unlike Rowe, I attempt to extend the analysis through both the Gospel and Acts; see chap. 5, "Israel's God and Israel's Messiah: The Shared Identity of the Spirit-giver in Acts."

verbal parallels between the texts that present Jesus and God as the Spirit-giver suggest that Luke shaped this motif in a way that purposefully presents *both* God and Jesus as participating in this act (i.e., Jesus and the Father share the identity as Spirit-giver). Second, the co-texts of both Luke 3:16 and 24:49 (in which Jesus is exclusively described as the Spirit-giver; cf. Acts 2:33) corroborate the claims that Luke uses this motif to unite the identity of Jesus with the unique identity of Israel’s God, since both co-texts contain additional overlap between the identity of Jesus and that of Israel’s God (i.e., the Spirit-giver references occur within co-texts which shape Jesus’ identity in light of the unique identity of Israel’s God).²⁰ Third, no other christological category can appropriately accommodate the descriptions of Jesus as the Spirit-giver. Fourth, as in the OT and Second-Temple literature, the act of giving the Spirit in Luke is new-exodus act (and possibly an act of new creation) and thus an act that is integral to the unique identity of Israel’s covenant God. Although not every one of these points is found in each of the three passages in Luke’s Gospel, and although some are more prevalent than others, these reasons, nevertheless, ground the thesis of this chapter and will also be developed further in the subsequent chapter on Acts. Through the Spirit-giver motif, Luke creates a shared, narratively established identity in which there is unity without confusion as well as distinction without separation between Israel’s Messiah and Israel’s God.

The “Coming One” Will Baptize with the Holy Spirit: Luke 3:16-17

ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρίῳ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ διακαθαῖραι τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.

²⁰Narrative exegesis seeks to interpret a pericope in light of where it occurs within the story. Luke Timothy Johnson, *Luke*, Sacra Pagina (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 124, writes, “Where something is said is as significant as *what* is said.” This is an appropriate description of the method employed in this chapter. This literary-critical approach is consistent with Luke’s own description of his work as “in order” (*καθεζῆς*; Luke 1:3; cf. Acts 11:2-4).

This section examines John the Baptizer’s prophecy within its narrative co-text (Luke 1:5-3:38) and against the backdrop of the OT promises regarding the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. As the initial reference to the Spirit-giver motif in Luke-Acts, this programmatic promise influences the interpretation of the subsequent promises (Luke 11:13; 24:49; Acts 1:4-5, 8), as well as the various fulfillments in Acts 2, 8, 10, 19.

John prophesies in response to the expectation of *ὁ λαός* over whether or not he is *ὁ χριστός* (3:15). John’s indirect answer (3:16-17) contains two claims, each of which compares the identity of the coming one with his own identity.²¹ Using relative clauses marked by the pronoun *ὃς*, John also illustrates each claim with a metaphor.

First, John announces, “The one stronger than me is coming.” The comparison between John and the coming one is illustrated by the metaphor of a slave/master relationship in which John describes himself as even lower than a slave: “of whom I am not worthy to loosen the strap of his sandals.” Second, John promises, “He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.”²² John uses the promise of baptism by means of the

²¹Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* (New York: Macmillan, 1966), 378, observes that John is not merely contrasting the two baptisms, but also connecting them.

²²It is a challenge to understand whether Luke’s John envisions two separate baptisms (a Spirit-baptism *and* a fire-baptism) or one baptism (a Spirit-and-fire baptism). The former would indicate that the coming one will be the one who both blesses and judges Israel and has contextual support in v. 17 with the statement that the coming one will “clean out” the threshing floor by “gathering the wheat” (blessing) *and* “burning the chaff” (judgment). In addition, Jesus’ paradigmatic experience of being “baptized with the Spirit” (i.e., blessing; 3:22) and being “baptized with fire” (i.e., judgment; 12:50) also supports a dual baptism interpretation. The latter interpretation would indicate that the coming one will purge Israel and has grammatical support in v. 16 with the use of a single verb (*βαπτίσει*), object (*ὕμᾱς*), and preposition (*ἐν*) governing both *πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* and *πυρί*. In addition, it has contextual support in 3:7-9 where judgment upon the nation is the given (“the axe is already laid at the root”), and so the baptism of the coming one will be the new-exodus deliverance from the judgment; the parallel with John’s water-baptism also suggests a single act of purging or cleansing. Although both interpretations are plausible, in what follows, I interpret John’s prophecy as a reference to a single event with dual effects: blessing (Holy Spirit) and judgment (fire). Within the Lukan narrative the former is an already experience which anticipates the “times of refreshing” (Acts 3:20); while the latter is delayed until the parousia (cf. Arie W. Zwiep, “Spirit Baptism as an Eschatological Event,” in *Christ, the Spirit, and the Community*, WUNT [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010]: 100-19). First, v. 17 is an explanation of v. 16 and appears to envision two effects: the coming one “cleans out” the threshing floor by “gathering” the wheat (blessing); but he will “burn” the

Spirit to compare the coming one with himself, who only baptizes with water (ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς; 3:16a). This promise of Spirit-baptism is illustrated with an agricultural metaphor: “whose winnowing shovel is in his hand to clean out his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his barn; but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire” (3:17). The following diagram illustrates the semantic relationship between these propositions:

Verse 16c (claim #1):	ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου,
Verse 16d (illustration #1):	οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἰμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ.
Verse 16e (claim #2):	αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·
Verse 17 (illustration #2):	οὗ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ διακαθαῖραι τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῖτον τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.

A reasonable question that is consistently asked about these verses concerns the identity of the coming one. Most Lukan scholars set up the question as follows: Is John describing Jesus or Israel’s God? The answer most often provided is that John is describing the former not the latter. There are good reasons for this answer.²³ First, John is responding to the people’s expectations regarding ὁ χριστός, a title that appropriately describes Jesus’ identity as the Davidic king who will bring salvation to Israel (1:26-38;

chaff with fire (judgment). The repetition of *πυρὶ* in v. 17 strengthens the dual-effects interpretation. Second, within the co-text of 3:2-15 the *ὑμᾶς* is not a monolithic group but consists of those who have accepted John’s baptism (i.e., the wheat) and those who have rejected John baptism (i.e., the chaff). The coming one will gather the former and judge the latter. Third, in view of its OT background, the reference to Spirit-baptism can only be understood as blessing (cf. Isa 44:3) (*contra* I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978], 146, who interprets John’s prophecy as strictly a reference to judgment). The coming one will baptize those who have responded (positively or negatively) to John’s baptism with either the Holy Spirit (i.e., he will cleanse the floor by gathering the wheat) or fire (i.e., he will burn the chaff). The coming one himself does not do the winnowing, this was John’s role (see Robert L. Webb, “The Activity of John the Baptist’s Expected Figure at the Threshing Floor,” *JSNT* 43 [1991]: 103-11). John’s baptism symbolized repentance and the avoidance of judgment; the coming one’s baptism with the Spirit effects Israel’s eschatological cleansing and promised salvation.

²³See, e.g., Richard B. Vinson, *Luke*, SHBC (Macon: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2008), 92-93.

2:1-40; esp. 2:11). Second, at the narrative level, Luke has juxtaposed John and Jesus in chapters 1-2 so that the latter is seen as greater than the former (see below). The parallels between John and the coming one appear to resume this juxtaposition between John and Jesus. Third, within the narrative, the only character who actually “comes” is Jesus (3:21-22). Therefore, this widespread answer is cogent and (to a degree) accurate.

Yet the fact that scholars routinely ask this question reveals the ambiguity that resides in John’s description of the “coming one.” The reasons for this ambiguity are as follows: first, up to this point in the narrative John has been exclusively described as the prophet who precedes the coming of the Most High; second, the language John uses to describe the coming one is language that in the OT and up to this point in the Lukan narrative is used exclusively for Israel’s God (e.g., *ἔρχεται*, *ἰσχυρός*, and *συναγαγεῖν*),²⁴ and third, as the previous two chapters have demonstrated, the act of “giving” the eschatological Spirit was particular to the divine identity, not the messianic identity. In other words, within its narrative co-text, as well as its OT background, John’s prophecy contains elements that describe both Jesus, the Messiah, and Israel’s God. Therefore, a question that better addresses the complexities of the Lukan text is one that asks, Why does Luke’s John apply to Jesus, the Messiah, terms and actions that, up to this point in the narrative (as well in the OT storyline), have been used exclusively to describe Israel’s God? The answer to this question is the thesis of this chapter: by presenting Jesus as the Spirit-giver, Luke wants his readers to see in Jesus the unique identity of Israel’s God. The first reference to the Spirit-giver occurs within a co-text that shapes Jesus’ identity in terms of Yahweh’s promise to restore his people.

²⁴Although the term “coming” is used with reference to the Messiah in the LXX (*ἔρχεται*; Hab 2:3; Dan 7:13 [Theo]) and Qumran literature (אב; 4Q252 5:3; 1QS 9:11), within the literary context of Luke 1-3 and the OT allusions to and citation of Isaiah 40, this term is used exclusively with reference to Israel’s God.

In support of the overall thesis of this chapter, the attempt will be made in this section to show that (1) Luke uniquely situates John's prophecy within his narrative so that it functions as both the culmination of his earlier descriptions of Israel's God and his earlier juxtaposition between Jesus and John; (2) Luke situates this programmatic prophecy within the framework of Israel's new-exodus restoration; and (3) Luke, in view of this restoration framework, portrays John's prophecy as the anticipated fulfillment of Ezekiel's, Isaiah's, Joel's, and Zechariah's prophecy regarding the outpouring of the Spirit. Luke uses the act of "giving" the Spirit to unite Jesus' identity with Israel's God in such a way that the reader sees Jesus as included in the divine identity of Israel's covenant God, the one who promised to re-create and restore his people.

The Lukan Co-Text of John's Prophecy

Luke 3:1-38 functions in the narrative as a transition from the birth-infancy section in chapters 1-2 to the plot that begins in chapter 4.²⁵ This transition is significant: John begins his prophetic ministry of preparing a people in accordance with Isaiah 40 (3:3-15), John identifies the Messiah as the coming one who *ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί* (3:16-17), John is arrested and imprisoned (i.e., he is apparently removed from the narrative; 3:18-20), the Holy Spirit descends upon Jesus after he and all the people had been baptized (3:21-22), and the narrator presents a genealogy that associates the beloved son, who pleases his heavenly Father, with the original "son" of God, Adam (3:23-38). Four of these five scenes contain concepts that become key motifs in the

²⁵The plot of Luke-Acts centers on God's plan to bring about the restoration of his people through the Spirit-anointed Messiah. It begins with the conflict between Jesus and the devil (4:1-13) and continues to unfold through conflict with the Jewish leaders who oppose God's anointed one and his plan. Cf. Jerry Lynn Ray, *Narrative Irony in Luke-Acts: The Paradoxical Interaction of Prophetic Fulfillment and Jewish Rejection*, Mellen Biblical Press Series, vol. 28 (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996), 9, who writes, "The plot of Luke-Acts is concerned with the events through which God's plan of salvation for all nations is brought to fulfillment. Conflict occurs in the form of Jewish opposition which threatens to thwart God's plan. The conflict becomes a clash between the divine will, as it is displayed in scripture, and the human will, as manifested in Jewish unbelief. The conflict has an ironic resolution: it is the Jewish rejection of the divine plan that actually brings about its accomplishment."

subsequent narrative and three are part of the “new exodus” theme Luke used to portray the ministry of John in chapter 1 (e.g., 1:13-17; 67-79) and will continue to use to develop the rest of his two-volume narrative.²⁶ In the ministry of John, the new exodus is symbolized, in the ministry of the Spirit-anointed servant of Yahweh the new exodus is actualized (Luke 4:18-21).

Luke 3 as the continuation and culmination of chapters 1-2. Lukan scholars have frequently interpreted chapter 3 as relatively independent from the material in chapters 1-2.²⁷ There are two common reasons for this separation. The first is literary. The historical references that begin chapter 3,²⁸ the apparent lack of the John/Jesus parallelism that structured chapters 1-2, and later references in Acts summarizing the ministry of Jesus as beginning at John’s baptism and ending with the ascension (e.g., Acts 1:22), all seem to indicate that chapter 3 represents a new section in the Lukan narrative that is to be interpreted separately from what precedes it. Second, source and redaction criticism have frequently influenced the way in which chapter 3 is related with the material in chapters 1-2.²⁹ For example, it is generally acknowledged that the material in Luke 1:5-2:52 is taken from a source unique to Luke, usually designated “L”; whereas much of the material in chapter 3:1-22 is regarded as Luke’s use and redaction of Mark and/or Q. For some scholars, the different sources indicate that chapter 3 is independent of chapters 1-2 and, they, therefore, interpret 3:16-17 horizontally in

²⁶Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 17-110.

²⁷See, e.g., Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, rev. ed., (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 293-341; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), 117-18.

²⁸John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, WBC, vol. 35a (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 144, “The synchronism of 3:1-2 marks the true beginning for Luke’s narrative after the prehistory of the infancy narratives.”

²⁹*Ibid.*, 147, “The issues of origin [of the material] and meaning are here closely intertwined.” Cf. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 118-19.

connection with Mark and Matthew,³⁰ rather than vertically in connection with its narrative co-text.³¹

Despite the reasonableness of the arguments in favor of separating chapter 3 from chapters 1-2, a few scholars have demonstrated that, from a literary point of view, chapter 3 cannot be separated from chapters 1-2. Some, like Smit and Talbert, have argued that 1:5-4:15/30 compose a single unit in which the John/Jesus parallelism of 1:5-2:40 continues into 3:1-4:15/30.³² Others have observed the continuity in themes between chapter 3 and chapters 1-2, a continuity that suggests that Luke has shaped 3:1-

³⁰For helpful analyses of John's prophecy which attempt to go "behind the text" to uncover John's original meaning see the following: Ernest Best, "Spirit-Baptism," *NovT* 4 (1960): 236-43, who argued that John originally prophesied that the coming one would baptize with wind and fire; Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, 8-22; Joseph Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), 305-08; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX)*, AB, vol. 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 473; Max Turner, *Power from on High* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 172-75; Archie W. D. Hui, "John the Baptist and Spirit-Baptism," *EQ* 71 (1999): 99-115.

³¹John the Baptizer's prophecy of the "coming one" who would baptize with the Holy Spirit is included in all four Gospels. As such, it is generally assumed that each Gospel writer interprets this tradition identically. However, since Conzelmann's application of redaction-criticism to Luke's Gospel it has been understood that Luke was not merely a collector of traditions but also an interpreter. According to Conzelmann, Luke's interpretation is provided by the overarching "literary framework" in which he situates the various traditions. In this way, one comes to understand Luke 3:16 not primarily by interpreting Mark 1:7-8 or "Q 3:16" but by interpreting it within the overarching literary framework of Luke and Acts. See Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 22-27. Ironically, Conzelmann himself considered chaps. 1-2 a foreign collection of material which did not affect his appraisal of Luke's theology (109). Redaction-critics have generally followed in Conzelmann's path by placing little weight upon the theological significance of these chapters. In contrast, literary critics have considered the opening of Luke's gospel as both hermeneutically and theologically indispensable for interpreting Luke's two volumes. Conzelmann's interpolation theory has been cogently critiqued by scholars such as Paul Minear and Joseph Tyson: Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (London: SPCK, 1968), 111-30; Joseph B. Tyson, "The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel," *Semeia* 52 (1991): 103-20. The analysis in this section employs the methodology of the literary/narrative critics by interpreting chap. 3 in relation to chaps. 1-2.

³²Joop Smit, "The Function of the Two Quotations From Isaiah In Luke 3-4," in *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maarten J. J. Menken*, ed. Bart J. Koet, Steve Moyise, and Joseph Verheyden (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 47-49. Smit argues that 1:5-4:30 compose an entire unit of three diptychs which compare and contrast Jesus and John (1:5-25/1:26-56; 1:57-80/2:1-52; 3:1-20/3:21-4:30). Cf. Charles H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," in *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H. Silberman*, ed. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (New York: Ktav, 1980), 129-30, who argues that Luke 1:5-4:15 forms a coherent unit.

22 in a way that continues the development of the characters and themes of 1:5-2:52. The position taken here is that chapter 3 marks a transition between the introductory chapters and the plot that begins in chapter 4; as such, it continues, even culminates, many of the themes introduced in the opening chapters and is also programmatic for interpreting the subsequent narrative. Completely separating chapter 3 from chapters 1-2 implies a failure to read Luke's Gospel as a διήγησις because it does not take into account Luke's "narrative logic" indicated by Luke's unique arrangement of his material. William Placher uses the term "narrative logic" to describe "The way [the narrative] begins and ends, its ordering of incidents, the manner in which its picture of Jesus emerges—these and other factors are part of the way in which the particular Gospel renders Jesus' identity, and they would be lost if we conflated all the Gospels into a single narrative."³³

The following analysis interprets John's ministry (3:4-15) and prophecy (3:16-17) in light of its narrative continuity with the descriptions of John, Jesus, and Israel's God in chapters 1:5-2:52.³⁴ It is necessary, therefore, to provide justification for this approach by showing ways the content of 3:1-22 coheres with that of 1:5-2:52. This justification will focus on a few of the intra-textual links between 3:1-22 and 1:5-2:52.

³³William C. Placher, "How the Gospels Mean," in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 36. Cf. Thompson, *Keeping the Church in Its Place*, 10, whose comment regarding the book of Acts is applicable to both of Luke's volumes: "The creative arrangement of the historical narrative, therefore, potentially focuses the reader's attention not only on the events but also on the relationship of those events. The *connection* of those historical episodes, not the episodes themselves, is the significant element of an ancient narrative such as Acts" (*italics original*).

³⁴Since most Lukan scholars view chap. 3 as beginning a new section in the narrative, only a few examples will suffice as evidence that 3:1-22 influences the development of the subsequent narrative. First, at his baptism Jesus is identified as God's son (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, 3:22; cf. 1:35; 2:49), a motif that immediately continues in the genealogy in which Adam is described as God's son (Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ; 3:38). The temptation account in 4:1-15 places Jesus' identity as God's son at the center of his battle with the devil (4:3, 9) indicating that Luke presents Jesus as a new Adam, who, unlike the first Adam, will triumph over the devil. Second, in 3:21 the Holy Spirit descends upon Jesus and in chapter 4 Jesus is described as "full of the Holy Spirit" (4:1a), led by the Spirit (4:1b), ministering in the power of the Spirit (4:14), and anointed with the Lord's Spirit (4:18). The rest of the narrative should then be read through the lens provided by these opening pericopae which present Jesus as uniquely anointed with the Spirit.

First, John's claim that God is able to raise up children for Abraham out of stones (3:8) is in harmony with the actions of Israel's God in chapter 1. Within the narrative world, John the Baptizer's claim is entirely plausible because God has previously caused life to form within an elderly, barren woman (1:5-25) and has, even more miraculously, caused life to form within a virgin (1:26-38). In chapters 1-2, Luke demonstrates that nothing is impossible for Israel's creator and covenant God (1:37); God is able to create life out of stones in order to keep his covenant promises to Abraham (cf. 1:55, 73) because he has created life from bareness and nothingness. Second, the lengthy quotation of Isaiah 40:3-5 (3:4-6) is the climax of various allusions to this new-exodus text scattered throughout the opening chapter. The reference to John as the one who will prepare the Lord's way (1:17, 76; cf. 3:4), John's association with the wilderness (1:80; cf. 3:2, 4), and the metaphor of straightening the crooked paths (1:52-53; 3:4-5) have all indirectly referred to Isaiah 40;³⁵ in Luke 3:4-6 the narrator makes this reference explicit. John's ministry (3:4-15) is the fulfillment of both Gabriel's (1:15-17) and Zechariah's (1:76-79) prophecy that he will go before the Lord to prepare his ways and, therefore, 3:2-17 cannot be appropriately understood apart from these prior descriptions. The third way Luke connects chapter 3 with the opening chapters of his narrative is through the parallels made between John and Jesus in 3:16. Throughout chapters 1-2, Luke juxtaposes John's and Jesus' miraculous conceptions and births and this juxtaposition between the two resumes in 3:16 where John himself and his water-baptism are compared with the coming one and his Spirit and fire baptism.³⁶ Fourth, the reference to Jesus as God's "beloved

³⁵Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 172. Mary highlights major transpositions that will take place with the arrival of this new stage of redemptive history: the mighty are brought down and the humble are exalted and God fills the hungry and the rich are left empty. These transpositions within the social status of human relationships mimic the great reversals of nature announced by the prophet Isaiah: every valley will be filled and every mountain made low; the crooked placed will become straight; and the rough placed will become level.

³⁶See the subsequent section on Luke 11:1-13 for further analysis of significance of Luke's juxtaposition of John and Jesus throughout Luke-Acts.

Son” (3:22) recalls the references to Jesus as “son of the Most High” (1:32) and the twelve-year-old Jesus’ own claim that God is his Father (2:49). Although chapter 3 serves to introduce the reader to motifs that Luke will develop throughout his two-volume narrative, it appears that the content of 3:1-22 develops characters and concepts introduced in chapters 1-2 by showing continuity in the identity of Israel’s God (the covenant God and creator), by bringing to a climax John’s identity as prophet of the Most High, by culminating the parallels between John and the Jesus, and by continuing the emphasis on Jesus’ identity as God’s son.

The placement of the first reference to the “giving of the Spirit” in this transition section is important for the narrative development of this motif. The reference to the coming “stronger one” who will baptize with the Spirit should be read in light of chapters 1-2 and the other references to the “coming one” for whom John is to prepare the way. In addition, as the initial reference to this prominent motif in Luke’s two-volume διήγησις, it plays a programmatic role of shaping how the reader interprets the subsequent references to the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. The placement of the first reference to the act of giving the Spirit is in itself an interpretive act by Luke and the careful reader should consider its significance within its present co-text and the way in which it shapes the subsequent narrative.

The “theological” co-text of chapters 1-2. With the rise of narrative criticism, the opening chapters of the Gospel have been awarded a prominent role in interpreting Luke’s orderly (καθεξῆς) διήγησις. In a narrative analysis the beginning is foundational and influences the way in which the story is interpreted.³⁷ As stated above, the goal of this section is to show that Luke uses John’s description of the Messiah as the

³⁷Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 52: “Narrative beginnings open up possibilities, inviting their audience to a full hearing or reading to discover its outcome.” Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, trans. Stephen Halliwell, LCL 199 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995), 55: “A whole (ὅλον) is that which has a beginning (ἀρχήν), middle (μέσον), and end (τελευτήν). A beginning is that which does not itself follow necessarily from something else, but after which a further event or process naturally occurs.”

one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit to align the identity of Jesus with the unique identity of Israel's God, thus revealing Jesus' divine identity. This claim increases in plausibility if it can be connected with research demonstrating other ways in which Luke attempts to unite Jesus and Israel's God. Although John the Baptizer's claim that the Messiah will baptize with the Holy Spirit transcends Davidic Christology in Luke 1:26-38, this role of Jesus as the Spirit-giver does correspond with what Kavin Rowe has argued is Luke's creative use of the term *κύριος* to designate both Jesus and Israel's God (cf. 1:16-17, 1:43, 1:76; 2:11, 3:4-6). Luke positions John's prophecy as the high point of his characterization of John in relation to Israel's God and Israel's Messiah. Rowe has argued that, within this co-text, Luke has already identified the Lord Messiah (*χριστὸς κύριος*; 2:11) with the Lord God (*κύριος ὁ θεὸς*; 1:16). A brief overview of Rowe's argument is necessary for establishing the proper co-text for reading 3:16-17.³⁸

Rowe's primary thesis is that "Luke positions *κύριος* within the movement of the narrative in such a way as to narrate the relation between God and Jesus as one of inseparability, to the point that they are bound together in a shared identity as *κύριος*."³⁹ For Rowe, this intentional positioning of *κύριος* is evidenced throughout the entirety of Gospel, but 1:5-3:6 sets the foundation for interpreting the subsequent references. The narrator and various characters throughout 1:5-3:6 refer to Israel's God as *ὁ κύριος* (1:6, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 25, 28, 32, 38, 45, 46, 58, 66, 68, 76; 2:9 [2x], 15, 22, 23 [2x], 24, 26, 39;

³⁸For a critique of Rowe's conclusions and method, see Arie W. Zwiep, *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*, WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 148. Based on Acts 2:36, Zwiep proposes, "It is a hermeneutical and interpretative mistake to take all the *κύριος* texts in Luke and Acts indiscriminately and suggest that both pre-resurrectional and post-resurrectional statements about Jesus' identity as Lord have the same illocutionary force. No, this is clearly a matter of context." However, Zwiep fails to appreciate the contextual nature of Rowe's argument. It is not that Rowe reads Acts 2 into the early uses of *κύριος* in Luke's Gospel, rather he reads these early uses of *κύριος* in light of their application to Israel's God in the early chapters of Luke's Gospel (see note 39 below). The context of the early chapters of Luke's Gospel suggest that the *κύριος* is a title/name for Israel's God and the fact that Luke also applies this term to Jesus, within this context, is significant.

³⁹Rowe, *Early Christology*, 27.

3:4). The frequency of these references, the interchange between κύριος and θεός,⁴⁰ and direct references to Israel’s God as κύριος ὁ θεός (1:16, 32, 68) function to establish the identity of Israel’s God as “the Lord.”

Yet, despite the clear characterization of Israel’s God as ὁ κύριος, Luke also uses this term to describe Israel’s Messiah. In 1:43 Elizabeth refers to Jesus as ὁ κύριος μου and the angel announces to the shepherds the birth of the χριστὸς κύριος (2:11). By introducing Jesus into the narrative as κύριος, Rowe concludes that within the narrative, Luke creates a shared identity between Jesus and Israel’s God—they both share the identity of ὁ κύριος. For Rowe, as well as other Lukan scholars, this shared identity as ὁ κύριος creates ambiguity of the reference of ὁ κύριος in 1:76 and 3:4-6—is John preparing the way for the arrival of Israel’s God or Israel’s Messiah? Rowe argues that 1:76 and 3:4-6 are clear developments of Gabriel’s prophecy recorded in 1:16-17; and yet, due to Luke’s introducing of Jesus into the narrative as κύριος in 1:43 the referent of κύριος in 1:76 and 3:4-6 is more ambiguous. Rowe suggests that this ambiguity is part of Luke’s “narrative-theological program.” Rowe concludes his treatment of κύριος in Luke’s use of Isaiah 40:3-5 as the climax to the theme of John’s relationship to the coming of the κύριος claiming:

The doubleness and ambiguity of the κύριος at the beginning of the narrative creates a shared identity, and the structure and movement of the story prepares us to follow the way of the Lord of Israel as his coming is embodied in the life and person of the Lord Jesus. Thus as the narrative advances and the focus shifts formally from promise to active fulfillment, we know that in the life of Jesus we can also see the God of Israel’s presence and visitation to his people.⁴¹

⁴⁰The clear identity of Israel’s God as the Lord is also strengthened by the way in which κύριος and θεός are often interchanged in these opening chapters. For example, (1) they are parallel in narrator’s opening description of Zechariah and Elizabeth: ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμφοτέροι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ/πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασιν τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι (1:6); (2) they are parallel in the opening of the *Magnificat*: Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν κύριον/καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ μου (1:46-47); (3) in 1:76 κύριος is interchanged with “Most High” (ὑψιστος): Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ/ προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ.

⁴¹Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 77.

Even if one wants to nuance Rowe's interpretation of the ambiguity of the referent of *κύριος* in 1:79 and 3:4-6,⁴² his claim is still credible: by including Jesus within the narrative identity of *ὁ κύριος*, Luke shapes his story in such a way that the reader sees in Jesus the fulfillment of Israel's God to visit and redeem his people.⁴³

This co-text sheds light upon the identity of the coming one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit in Luke 3:16. John the Baptizer's relationship to the coming one in Luke 3:15-16 should be read against the prior descriptions of 1:16-17, 1:76 and 3:4-5 in which Luke develops John's relationship to the coming *κύριος*. In other words, narratively speaking, John's announcement about a "stronger one who is coming" (3:16) continues the development of the theme of the coming *κύριος* and John's role as his preparer. Thus Rowe's observation that the, "structure and movement of the story prepares us to follow the way of the Lord of Israel as his coming is embodied in the life and person of the Lord Jesus" also applies here in John's prophecy regarding the one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit.

Luke continues the narrative development of the coming *ὁ κύριος* by describing the Spirit-giver as "coming." In addition, the other actions of the coming one (e.g., "cleansing" the threshing floor and "gathering" the wheat) link with the OT promises of Yahweh's new-exodus rescue of his people.⁴⁴ Thus the Lukan material in chapters 1-2

⁴²Although there is ambiguity, there is no explicit comment or description at the *story* level which connects the prophetic ministry of John with the coming of Israel's Messiah until 3:16-17. Rather, in 1:5-3:15, John's identity and ministry are consistently described in terms of his relationship to Israel's God. However, in 3:16-17, all the descriptions of Israel's God in chap. 1, as well as the Isa 40 quotation in chap. 3, are applied to the Messiah.

⁴³This notion of a shared identity between Jesus and Israel's God is evident not only in Luke's use of *κύριος* (as argued by Rowe), or in the development of the Spirit-giver motif (as argued by the present author), but also in various actions in which Luke portrays both God and Jesus as participating in identical roles. Both God and Jesus forgive sins (Luke 5:20-21; 7:49; 11:4; Acts 5:31), give repentance (Acts 5:31; 11:18), know hearts (Acts 1:24; 15:8), and share the divine throne (Luke 20:42-44; 22:69; Acts 2:33). In addition, Luke identifies both as *σωτήρ* (1:47; 2:11), a LXX title which is used almost exclusively for Israel's God (Judges 3:9, 15; 12:3 are the only exceptions).

⁴⁴E.g., Ezek 36-37; see chap. 2, "The Giving of the Spirit and the Unique Identity of Yahweh in the Old Testament."

provides a unique co-text for interpreting John’s prophecy. The act of “baptizing with the Holy Spirit” is particular (in the OT and Second Temple literature) to the identity of Israel’s God, but in 3:16 is applied to Israel’s Messiah. Within Luke’s story, however, this anomaly is consistent with Luke’s application of the divine name to Jesus, as well as other actions which comprise the unique identity of Yahweh in the OT (i.e., the one who will effect a new exodus).⁴⁵ The first reference in Luke’s Gospel to the Spirit-giver occurs within a co-text in which Luke demonstrates significant unity between the identity of Jesus and Israel’s God. With Rowe’s argument in mind, it is now necessary to understand the opening descriptions of John as the one who prepares Israel for the coming κύριος (1:8-17; 67-79).

For whom does John prepare the way? As noted above, when interpreting Luke 3:16-17 most Lukan scholars conclude that John is describing Jesus and not Israel’s God. Despite recognizing that chapters 1-2 present John’s identity and ministry in relation to Israel’s God, they argue that Luke has shifted his focus from John as preparer for the arrival of Israel’s God, to John as preparer for the Messiah.⁴⁶ There are strong reasons for this conclusion. First, and most significant, Luke juxtaposes John and Jesus in the opening of the narrative in a way that demonstrates Jesus is greater than John: the creation of life within barren Elizabeth is miraculous, but the Spirit-empowered conception of Jesus within a virgin is greater; John is “prophet of the Most High” (1:76),

⁴⁵Although not part of Rowe’s argument, it is significant to note that in 1:5-3:5 κύριος is used, not so much as a title for Israel’s God, but as his divine name. Richard Bauckham, “Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 168, argues that one of the key features of the one God which distinguishes him from all other reality is his personal name, YHWH. Luke’s Jesus shares the name of Israel’s God. Cf. Sigurd Grindheim, *Christology in the Synoptic Gospels: God or God’s Servant?* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2012), 118-47.

⁴⁶E.g., Smit, “The Function of the Two Quotations From Isaiah,” 49, writes, “The fact that Jesus is twice called Lord makes [the one for whom John prepares the way] ambiguous. This means that John will *also* be the precursor, who prepares the way for Jesus” (italics added for emphasis); Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 144: “Road building is treated as a metaphor for individual readiness, and the coming Lord is a messianic figure and not God himself (as originally in Isa 40:3).”

but Jesus is “Son of the Most High” (1:32); John will give knowledge of salvation (1:77; σωτηρία), but Jesus is the “horn of salvation” (1:69; κέρασ σωτηρίας). The parallelism that structures the opening chapters, prepares the reader for John’s prophecy, in which he and the Messiah are again set in parallel in a way that shows that latter is greater than the former. Second, some infer from the substitution of the personal pronoun αὐτοῦ for θεός in Luke’s quotation of Isaiah 40:3 that Luke no longer viewed John as making straight the paths of Israel’s God.⁴⁷ Third, in its immediate co-text, John’s prophecy is a response to the question about whether or not he is the Messiah. Thus, in 3:16-17 John is clearly describing the Messiah who can be none other than Jesus (cf. Luke 2:11). Fourth, some scholars suggest that John’s description of himself in comparison to the coming one is inappropriate if the coming one is Israel’s God.⁴⁸

Despite the strength of this argument, it was also noted above that this explanation does not account for the entire description of the coming one. A better explanation of John’s prophecy within its narrative co-text is that John applies to the Messiah language and actions that were earlier used to describe Israel’s God. It is not necessary to separate the descriptions of the “coming one” from the prior descriptions of the coming of Israel’s God. In fact, at the story level, John’s identity has been exclusively defined in terms of his relation to Israel’s God. It is now necessary to examine the literary parallels between 3:16-17 and prophecies regarding John.

The prophetic identity of John in 1:15-17. In the opening pericope, an ἄγγελος κυρίου appears to Zechariah and announces the “unbelievable” news that he will

⁴⁷Luke 3:4: ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ; Isa 40:3 (LXX): ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν; Isa 40:3 (MT): פּנוּ דְרָךְ יְהוָה יִשְׂרָוּ בְעֵרְבָה מְסֻלָּה לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ.

⁴⁸John states, οὐδὲ οὐκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς λύσαι τὸν ἰμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ (3:16c). Cf. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 146, “But the contrast here is between John and someone stronger than him. It is unlikely that God is meant . . . , since the comparison would be inept.” However, in Luke 2:29-33, Simeon uses the master/slave (δεσπότης/δοῦλος) metaphor to describe his relationship to Israel’s God.

have a son. In this opening announcement, John’s identity is established primarily by his relationship to Israel’s God. Gabriel declares that John (1) ἔσται μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου/ καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (1:15, 17a); (2) πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν/ ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων (1:16/17b); (3) ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον (1:17c).

These three descriptions define John’s vocation and purpose: John is described in terms of an OT prophet whose purpose is to return Israel to her God—he will prepare ὁ λαός for the arrival of Yahweh. Furthermore, Gabriel’s description of John conflates related concepts from both Isaiah 40:3 and Malachi 3:1, 23-24 (MT; 3:22-23 LXX), heightening the prophetic identity of John. John is like the prophets of old, but he also supersedes them because he is more than a prophet—he is the final prophet before the coming “day of Yahweh” (cf. Luke 7:26).

The following parallels indicate that Luke bases his opening description of John upon Malachi 3:1, 23-24 and Isaiah 40:3. First, John is described as καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου and Malachi 3:23 (MT; 3:22 LXX) announces that the coming of Yahweh will be preceded by Elijah (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ἡλιαν τὸν Θεοσβίτην πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου; הַנְּבִיאַ שְׁלֵחַ לְכֶם אֵת הַנְּבִיאַ הַנֶּבִיאַ לְפָנַי בּוֹא יוֹם יְהוָה). Second, the infinitival purpose clause in Luke 1:17b is almost identical to Malachi 3:24 MT (cf. 3:23 LXX):⁴⁹ ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα (Luke 1:17b); ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ (Malachi 3:23, LXX); הַשִּׁיב עַל-בָּנִים וְלֵב בָּנִים עַל-אֲבוֹתָם

⁴⁹The general consensus among Lukan scholars is that Luke uses the LXX; however, Richard Bauckham has argued Luke 1:16-17 agrees more with the MT Mal 3:23-24, than with the LXX Mal 3:22-23. For example, (1) both Luke and the MT use the plural “fathers” and “sons/children”; (2) the preposition ἐπὶ matches the MT עַל; and (3) the use of ἐπιστρέφω corresponds with the MT’s שׁוּב. For a full analysis of Luke’s source material in chaps 1-2, see Richard Bauckham, “The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott, JSJSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 435-87. Regarding Luke 1-2, Bauckham concludes, “There is nothing in these passages that suggests use of the Septuagint, but much that requires or suggests that the underlying biblical texts are Hebrew” (463). However, cf. Takamitsu Muraoka, “Luke and the Septuagint,” *NovT* 54 (2012): 13-15, who argues from Luke 1:58 and 15:20 that Luke draws from the LXX.

לְבִּיאָבוֹת (Malachi 3:24, MT). Third, the goal of preparing the people for the Lord (ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαόν; Luke 1:17c) matches both Malachi 3:24 (MT) and Isaiah 40:3. Malachi’s prophecy is itself a development of Isaiah 40:1-11: the coming Elijah will fulfill the conditions of Isaiah 40:3 (“prepare the way of Yahweh”) by preparing the people for Yahweh’s coming (cf. Isa 40:10-11). Malachi interprets “the way” as a metaphor describing the people, and Luke 1:17c appears to follow Malachi in this interpretation.⁵⁰

In Luke 1:16-17, John’s identity is shaped by the eschatological passages of Malachi 3:1, 23-24 and Isaiah 40:3, which announce the return of Elijah to precede the coming of Yahweh to both judge and restore his people.⁵¹ In view of these links with Isaiah and Malachi, one can conclude that John’s purpose was to prepare the way (i.e., ὁ λαός) for the arrival of Israel’s God, by helping Israel fulfill its need to “return” (שוב; ἐπιστρέφω; cf. Deut 30:2; Mal 3:7, 23 [MT 24]) to Yahweh (signified in his baptism of repentance) in order that the eschatological ingathering (קָבַץ; συναγωγή; cf. Deut 30:3; Luke 3:17) and restoration of the true people of Yahweh might occur.⁵²

⁵⁰Mal 3:24 (MT): וּפְנֵה דְרֹךְ דְּרָדְךָ לְפָנַי; Mal 3:23 (LXX): καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου; Isa 40:3 (LXX): ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου; Isa 40:3 (MT): פִּנּוּ דְרֹךְ יְהוָה.

⁵¹*Contra*, Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, JSNTSup (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1987), 59-60, 295, who argues that Luke sees John as “Elijah-like” but falls short of identifying John as Elijah, leaving room for a later eschatological fulfillment of Malachi’s prophecy.

⁵²Israel’s covenant disobedience and subsequent exile were prophesied by Moses (Deut 29:16-28). He also envisioned Israel’s restoration, whereby Yahweh would restore them by gathering (קָבַץ; συναγωγή) them from all the peoples among whom they were scattered (Deut. 30:3)—upon the condition that Israel “turns” (שוב; ἐπιστρέφω) to Yahweh (Deut 30:2). In Mal 3:7, Yahweh exhorts his people, “Return to me” (ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με; שׁוּבוּ אֵלַי), likely echoing the condition set forth in Deuteronomy 30:3. Then, in Mal 3:23 (LXX; v. 24, MT) the verb is again used with Elijah as the subject (“He will turn”): Elijah will help Israel fulfill its condition for restoration. For a helpful argument connecting Malachi 3:23/24 with Deut 30:1-3, see E. Ray Clendenen, *Malachi*, NAC, vol. 21A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004), 462. If in fact, Luke does present John as the eschatological Elijah who will help Israel fulfill her condition of returning to Yahweh (signified by his baptism of repentance), then it is no coincidence that John’s prophecy in 3:16-17 claims that the coming one will “gather” (συναγαγεῖν; cf. Deut 30:3, κύριος . . . συνάξει) the wheat into his storehouse. Those who participate in John’s baptism will participate in the eschatological ingathering of Yahweh’s people as foretold by Moses, Isaiah (11:12),

The claim that the introduction of John is shaped by Isaiah 40:3 and Malachi 3:1, 23-24 is further supported by the fact that later passages in Luke explicitly apply both texts to John (e.g., Luke 3:4:-6; 7:27). Yet the eschatological Elijah, who will prepare Yahweh’s people for his coming, is not the complete picture of John’s narrative identity in the opening chapter of Luke’s Gospel. Malachi’s own description of the eschatological Elijah draws upon Exodus 23:20 where Yahweh promises to send his angel/messenger before Israel to protect them on their way to the Promised Land.⁵³ In view of the verbal parallels between Malachi 3:1 and Exodus 23:20, Bauckham concludes, “This comparison puts Elijah in the role of God’s messenger leading the eschatological exodus of his people from the lands of their exile back to the promised land.”⁵⁴ Thus Malachi envisioned a figure who would be instrumental in a new exodus of God’s people. His work will prepare the true people of Yahweh for their longed-for ingathering and restoration, which, in Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel (see chapter 2) and Luke, are portrayed as a new exodus.⁵⁵

Jeremiah (23:3-8), Ezekiel (11:17-20; 20:27-44; 28:25; 37:1-14), Micah (2:12-13; 4:6-8), and Zephaniah (3:11-20).

⁵³As with the conflation of Isa 40:3 and Mal 3:1, the parallels between Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20 are clearer in the MT than in the LXX. Exodus 23:20 (MT): הַנְּגִי אֶנְבִי שְׁלַח מַלְאָךְ לְפָנָי לְשַׁמְרֵךְ בְּדַרְךְ; Malachi 3:1 (MT): הַנְּגִי שְׁלַח מַלְאָכִי וּפְנֵה דַרְךְ לְפָנָי.

⁵⁴Bauckham, “The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts,” 444.

⁵⁵The theme of the eschatological ingathering/restoration of Israel extends into the ministry of Jesus himself where his actions and speeches initiate the fulfillment of Yahweh’s promise to gather Israel. A few examples of the restoration/ingathering theme will be noted. First, Ferda, “John the Baptist, Isaiah 40, and the Ingathering of the Exiles,” 156, identifies the following examples: (1) Jesus tells Simon he will be “catching (ζωγράφον) men” (5:10), a possible echo of Jer 16:14-16 and God’s announcement that he will “send for many fishermen” (although the connection to Jeremiah 16 is much clearer in Mark 1:17); (2) Jesus’ summing of twelve apostles (Luke 7:12; Acts 1:2, 12-26) “either symbolizes, foreshadows, or inaugurates the reconstitution of the tribes”; (3) Jesus’ statement that he came to “seek and save the lost” (19:9-10); (4) Jesus’ promise to the apostles that they will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (22:28-30); and (5) Jesus’ lament regarding Jerusalem that he longed “to gather (ἐπισυνάγω) your children together” (13:34-35). Second, Scott Hahn, “Kingdom and Church in Luke-Acts,” in *Reading Luke*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew et al. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 305, argues that Jesus’ ministry from Galilee, through Samaria, to Judah is an attempt to restore the kingdom of David. He writes, “Jesus’ ministry follows the geographical progression of the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel: the northern tribes in the region of Galilee were taken by Assyria in 733 B.C.E., Samaria itself fell in 722 B.C.E., and

John's identity and the promised new exodus. Does Luke's own descriptions of John in chapters 1-2 employ this new exodus motif to articulate John's narrative identity? Lukan scholars, in general, have rightly concluded that they do. First, Isaiah 40:3-5 is regarded as a key "new exodus" text and is itself part of a larger co-text (chaps. 40-55) containing considerable new-exodus typology.⁵⁶ The citation of this passage in Luke 3:4-6 is the culmination of prior allusions to this text (1:17; 76) and indicate that Luke viewed the new-exodus paradigm as appropriate for interpreting John's ministry. Second, John's association with the wilderness (1:80) strengthens the new-exodus motif already in play with the allusions to Malachi and Isaiah since it was in the wilderness, following Yahweh's deliverance, that Israel became Yahweh's covenant people. Third, Zechariah's own prophecy (1:67-79) interprets John's identity in terms of new-exodus typology. It is this third point that needs to be developed further in order to get the complete picture of the way in which John's identity is characterized in relation to Israel's God in chapters 1-2. Luke records Zechariah's prayer as follows:

Blessing	⁶⁸ Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ,
Reason #1	ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ,
Reason #2	⁶⁹ καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ,
OT Allusion	⁷⁰ καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,
Explanation	⁷¹ σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς,
Purpose #1	⁷² ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν
Purpose #2	καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ,

Judah and Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. During his roughly north-to-south itinerary in Luke, Jesus gathers disciples from all of these territories until, by the triumphal entry, they have become a 'multitude' (19:37) forming the reunited kingdom of David *in nuce*." Furthermore, the restoration of the twelve tribes is also foreshadowed in Simeon's (2:25-35) and Anna's (2:36-38) acknowledgement of Jesus as the promised Messiah. Third, Bauckham, "Restoration," 458-59, writes, "Thus the roles of Simeon and Anna are complementary, representing the two aspects of the Isaianic vision of restoration. Simeon, presumably a native of Jerusalem waiting for the consolation of Israel, hails the Messiah Jesus as the one who will fulfill Israel's destiny to be a light to the nations (2:31-32). He represents the hope of the centrifugal movement of salvation out from Jerusalem to the Gentiles. Anna, a returnee from the diaspora of the northern tribes, waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem, recognizes the Messiah Jesus as the one who will fulfill Jerusalem's destiny to be the centre to which all the tribes of Israel are regathered. She represents the hope of the centripetal movement of salvation as the diaspora returns to Zion."

Explanation	⁷³ ὄρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ⁷⁴ ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ⁷⁵ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν.
Blessing	⁷⁶ Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ.
Reason	προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,
Purpose	⁷⁷ τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν,
Reason	⁷⁸ διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν,
Explanation	ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέπτεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, ⁷⁹ ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, τοῦ κατευθῆναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης.

There are two parts to Zechariah's prophecy. The first, verses 68-75, contains Zechariah's blessing of Israel's God (v. 68a), as well as the reasons why Yahweh is to be blessed (vv. 68b-75). The second, verses 76-79, contain Zechariah's blessing of his newborn son (v. 76); these descriptions define him in relation to God's visitation to and redemption of Israel. The many verbal parallels, the identical theme (i.e., the coming of Israel's God to effect salvation for his people), and the *inclusio* formed by the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι (vv. 68, 76) suggest that the two parts are mutually interpretive.⁵⁷ Therefore, John's identity ought to be interpreted in light of the visitation of Israel's God to redeem his people. With language that both recalls and develops that of Gabriel's prophecy in 1:15-17, John is described as a prophet who will prepare the way for the coming of Israel's God by giving the people knowledge of salvation (v. 77).

Zechariah's prophecy adds clarity to the identity of John. In 1:15-17 the allusions to Isaiah 40:3 and the new exodus motif were subtle; however, in verses 68-79 they are unambiguous. The text of verse 76b, προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, comes directly from Isaiah 40:3 and the structure and logic of verses 68b-75 are modeled after the original exodus story suggesting that an exodus typology provides

⁵⁶Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 111-43.

⁵⁷Garland, *Luke*, 106.

the framework for understanding the coming of Israel's God and the salvation he will provide, as well as John's identity and role.⁵⁸

It is necessary to explain the exodus imagery in the *Benedictus* in order to show the significance of this imagery for Luke's characterization of John and his relationship to Israel's God. First, the verb *ἐπεσκέψατο* and the clause *ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν* recall Yahweh's promise in Exodus 3-4 to come down and free his people from their affliction and mistreatment. In Exodus 3:8 Yahweh declares, "I have come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians."⁵⁹ In the LXX the verb *ἐπισκέπτομαι* occurs in Exodus 3:16, 4:31, and 13:19.⁶⁰ In the latter passage it is used to summarize Yahweh's redemption of his people from Egypt: *γὰρ ὥρκισεν Ἰωσήφ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ λέγων ἐπισκοπῆ ἐπισκέπεται ὑμᾶς κύριος καὶ συνανοίσετέ μου τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐντεῦθεν μεθ' ὑμῶν.* Second, Zechariah proceeds by stating that this visitation and redemption is in accordance with what God had promised through his holy prophets. In light of what has already been discussed, the holy prophets are (at least) references to Moses, Isaiah, and Malachi and their promises of a new visitation, a new redemption—a new exodus. Third, in verse 71 Zechariah defines this redemption as "salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us." The same metonymy is used in Exodus 3:8 and 14:30 to define Yahweh's redemption of his people from the hand of the Egyptians: *καὶ κατέβην*

⁵⁸Commentators have developed various theories to explain the "political redemption" implied in vv. 68b-75. For example, Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 179, contends that political redemption is in view, but that it "is delayed, because of the failure of much of the nation to respond." Garland, *Luke*, 106-07, argues instead "that Zechariah's hope for political redemption for the nation is mistaken." However, both interpretations fail to appreciate the exodus imagery which shapes Zechariah's prophecy. Zechariah is using the language of the first exodus to describe this new-exodus act of God. In addition, Zechariah himself links this *σωτηρία* (vv. 69, 77) with "forgiveness of sins" (v. 77), which reflects the new-exodus language of Isa 40:1-5 (cf. LXX Deut 30:3a) and connects this new work of Yahweh with Israel's longed-for restoration. Although Second Temple Judaism expected liberation from pagan rule as coinciding with Yahweh's restoration of Israel, it is reductionistic to describe Zechariah's prayer as reflecting *only* a political redemption.

⁵⁹LXX: *καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς Αἰγυπτίων*; MT: *וְאַרְדּ לְהַצִּילוֹ מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם*.

⁶⁰In each passage the MT uses *פָּקַד*.

ἐξελέσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς Αἰγυπτίων (Exod 3:8); καὶ ἐρρύσατο κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (Exod 14:30). In addition, Psalm 105:10 (LXX) uses almost identical wording as Luke 1:71 to describe Yahweh’s redemption of his people from Egypt: καὶ ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς μισούντων καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθροῦ.⁶¹ Fourth, as Zechariah continues in verse 72 the purpose for the Lord God visiting and redeeming his people also reflects the purpose for the original exodus. He is acting because he wants to show mercy to Israel’s forefathers and to remember his holy covenant (ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτου). This second reason is explicitly stated in Exodus 6:5 as a reason why Yahweh acted to deliver his people from slavery: καὶ ἐμνήσθην τῆς διαθήκης ὑμῶν (LXX); יְחַדְּשׁ אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם (MT). In addition, Zechariah explains that the “holy covenant” is the oath which God swore to Abraham that his descendents would be freed from their enemies to serve him without fear. Zechariah is likely alluding to Genesis 15:13-14 where God foretold to Abraham the future slavery and exodus of his descendants.⁶² The language of the original exodus is being applied by Zechariah to this new work of the Lord God who will visit and redeem his people. The fifth way Zechariah’s blessing of God is modeled after the exodus story is in the purpose Zechariah gives for why Yahweh has acted to redeem his people: ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ. The first appearance of the verb λατρεύω in the LXX occurs in connection with the exodus story (Exod 3:12). In fact, the verb is used 15 times in chapters Exodus 3-12 and in each instance it indicates the purpose of why Yahweh is acting to bring his people out of slavery (Exod 3:12; 4:23; 7:16, 26; 8:16; 9:1, 13; 10:3, 7, 8, 11, 24, 26 [2x]; 12:31).

In summary, the first half of Zechariah’s prayer is modeled after the exodus story: the act (redemption of Israel by Israel’s God), the description of the act (salvation

⁶¹וַיִּשְׁעֵם מִיַּד שׁוֹנֵא וַיַּגְאֵלֵם מִיַּד אֹיִבַי (Ps106:10, MT).

⁶²Bauckham, “Restoration,” 451: “It was in the redemption of his people from Egypt that YHWH first ‘remembered’ and fulfilled his covenant with Abraham (cf. Gen 15:13-21; Exod 2:24; 6:5).”

from the hand of their enemies), the reason for the act (in remembrance of God’s covenant with Abraham), and the purpose of act (so that Israel might serve Yahweh) employ precise language and imagery drawn from the original exodus story. For Zechariah, the God who acted in the past to redeem his people from Egypt, is acting again to redeem Israel and his son has a unique role in preparing Israel for this new exodus.

Zechariah explicitly links his son with this new-exodus work of Israel’s God using language from Isaiah 40:1-5. John will be called “prophet of the Most High” (v. 76a; *Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ*) because (*γὰρ*) he will prepare the people for the visitation of their God (v. 76b; *προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοῦς αὐτοῦ*; cf. Isa 40:3a). The means by which he will prepare the Lord’s ways is by giving the people knowledge of salvation in the forgiveness of their sins (v. 77; *τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*; cf. Isa 40:2).

At this point in Luke’s Gospel, John’s narrative identity is shaped by his relationship with Israel’s God. He is the prophet of the Most High who will prepare the way for the coming of Israel’s God—the one who acted in the past to redeem his people and is now acting in the present to fulfill his new-exodus promises to gather his people and restore them as his people. Although scholars are quick to discount the significance of this relationship (usually citing Luke’s juxtaposition of John and Jesus, as well as the reference to the Davidic Messiah in 1:69), there is no explicit evidence that Luke portrays John’s identity and role apart from the coming of Israel’s God. Thus, when John announces the stronger one who is *coming*, the reader/hearer is to interpret this in light of chapters 1:5-3:14 where John’s identity is explicitly and exclusively associated with the coming of Israel’s God to enact a new exodus.

The new-exodus framework of John’s ministry and prophecy. Despite the similarities between Luke’s depiction of John’s ministry (3:2-15) and prophecy (3:16-17)

and that of the other Gospel writers (e.g., Mk 1:2-8; Mt 3:1-12; John 1:19-34), Luke’s unique focus on the identity of John in 1:8-17, 68-79 provides a helpful co-text for interpreting his use of the material in 3:2-17. In the attempt to take seriously Luke’s description of his work as *καθεξῆς*, the new exodus/restoration theme shaping the opening depictions of John and his ministry should influence the interpretation of John’s actual ministry (3:2-15) and the eschatological restoration it symbolized and anticipated (3:16-17). This new-exodus framework continues in the actualization of John’s identity as prophet of the Most High and ministry of preparing the people for the coming of Yahweh.

First, the previous identity-shaping allusions to the new-exodus promises of Malachi and Isaiah continue to shape Luke’s depictions of John in 3:2-20: the reference to John’s ministry occurring *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* (3:2),⁶³ the description of his water-baptism as *βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (3:3; cf. 1:77), the citation of Isaiah 40:3-5 (3:4-6), and the allusion to Malachi 3:1 in John’s Elijah-like announcement of judgment (3:7-9).

Second, John’s description of the stronger one who is “coming” (*ἔρχεται*) and who will “gather” (*συνάξει*) the wheat into his storehouse provides verbal parallels with Isaiah 40 and the theophanic appearing of Israel’s God.⁶⁴ In Isaiah 40, verses 3-5

⁶³R. T. France, “Jesus the Baptist?” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 100-01, writes regarding John’s location in the wilderness: “It was natural . . . that eschatological hopes should also focus on a new exodus and a new wilderness experience, when the physical transformation of the wilderness would symbolize the new life of the eschatological Israel (Hos 2:14-15; Ezek 20:34-38; Isa 40:3; 41:18-19; 43: 19-21; 44:3-5; etc.). It was this hope which had led the people of Qumran, in obedience to Isa 40:3, to make their home in the wilderness (1QS 8:13-14; cf. 9:19-21), and Josephus records a series of would-be leaders of Israel who typically collected a following in the wilderness area around the Jordan valley in the hope of launching there the decisive movement for the restoration of Israel. ‘The wilderness’ is where you would expect the renewal of Israel to begin.”

⁶⁴The verb *ἔρχομαι* overlaps semantically with terms that—up until this point in the narrative—have been exclusively used with reference to Israel’s God: *ἐπισκοπέω* (1:68, 78), *ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου* (3:4), and John will go *ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* (1:17). The expectation so far is that John precedes the arrival of Israel’s God to enact a new exodus for his people and the language of “coming” in 3:16 overlaps semantically with these other terms.

describe the coming of Israel’s God to effect a new exodus for his people, and Luke cites these verses in the opening of chapter 3. However, these verses are part of a larger unit (40:1-11) in which verses 10-11 develop the promised theophany in verses 3-5.⁶⁵ Isaiah declares, “Behold, the Lord Yahweh is coming (אִבְיָ; ἔρχεται) in strength (קִיָּוָה; μετὰ ἰσχύος) . . . Like a shepherd, he will tend his flock in his arms and gather (סָוַם; συνάξει) the lambs on his lap” (40:10-11). The verbs ἔρχεται and συνάξει, as well as the cognate adjective ἰσχυρός, are used to describe the Spirit-giver in Luke 3:16-17 indicating that Isaiah 40—and the portrayal of Israel’s God in 40:3-5, 10-11—is applied by John to the Messiah.⁶⁶ Within this framework (especially in light of the verbal parallels to Isaiah 40:10-11), the one who follows John is the one who will directly bring about the eschatological ingathering and restoration of Israel—an act, which in the OT and Luke 1, is consistently presented as a direct act of Israel’s God.⁶⁷

Third, the new-exodus imagery helps to explain John’s message of both judgment (3:7, 9, 17) and salvation (3:3, 16, 17). Just as the original exodus story is one of deliverance (for Yahweh’s covenant people) and judgment (for Egypt), John’s ministry anticipates a new-exodus event that is one of both deliverance and judgment.⁶⁸

⁶⁵Cf. Øystein Lund, *Way metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55*, FAT 2 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 70-87.

⁶⁶Furthermore, the term “stronger one” has possible OT allusions. For example, Hans Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 167 n70, observes that the (positive) adjective ἰσχυρός is used substantively in 2 Sam 22:31 with reference to Israel’s God: ὁ ἰσχυρός ἄμωμος ἢ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ (“The Strong One—his way is blameless”; cf. 22:33) and in 22:32 the psalmist goes so far as to claim, τίς ἰσχυρὸς πλὴν κυρίου (“Who is strong except the Lord?”). Although in 3:16 the comparative functions to contrast John with the coming one, these OT echoes strengthen the interpretation for the divine identity of the coming one Klein also observes that the psalm in 2 Sam 31 is reproduced in Ps 17 (LXX) in which each instance of ἰσχυρός is replaced with θεός (Ps 17:31, 32, 33 [LXX]).

⁶⁷Cf. Jer 16:14-15; see chap. 2, “The Giving of the Spirit and the Unique Identity of Yahweh in the Old Testament.”

⁶⁸Cf. Ferda, “John the Baptist, Isaiah 40, and the Ingathering of the Exiles,” 155, who argues that John’s baptism was preparation for “the wrath that is coming” (Luke 3:7) and signaled the ingathering of the exiled of Israel, and hence eschatological restoration.”

Fourth, John’s baptism ministry is the fulfillment of Gabriel’s prophecy that he would go before the Lord “to make ready for the Lord a prepared people” (1:17) so that they can experience the eschatological restoration promised by Moses, Isaiah, Joel, and Ezekiel. In other words, the Baptizer’s ministry was “essentially ecclesial”⁶⁹—it symbolized one’s entrance into a new community (cf. 3:8). The covenantal dimension of John’s ministry is evidenced in both his speech and actions. John connects his baptism of repentance with God “raising up children for Abraham” (3:8) and his prophecy regarding the coming one announces the eschatological ingathering of the children of Abraham (3:17). The act of baptizing also signifies this restoration of Israel. R. T. France’s comment regarding John’s baptism is especially appropriate for Luke’s depiction of John’s ministry: “The movement launched by John in the wilderness . . . was then in essence a prophetic call for the eschatological renewal of Israel by gathering a repentant and forgiven ‘remnant’ from within Israel. Baptism was the rite of enrollment in this restored Israel, a mark of belonging to the true people of God.”⁷⁰ The eschatological ingathering of Israel is linked by Luke with the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit in both Luke 3:16-17 and Acts 1:12-2:4.⁷¹

Summary. This section has argued that John’s prophecy (3:16-17) should be interpreted in light of the earlier descriptions of John’s relationship to Israel’s God.

Within the narrative logic of chapters 1-3, the stronger one who is coming fulfills all that

⁶⁹France, “Jesus the Baptist?,” 99.

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Thus, both the original prophecy regarding Spirit-baptism and the fulfillment of the prophecy associate the eschatological ingathering with Spirit-baptism. Regarding the former, the new-exodus framework begun in chap 1 and continued in chap 3 implies this; while, John’s explanation of the Spirit-baptism prophecy in 3:17 makes the connection explicit (*καὶ συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῆτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ*). Regarding the latter, Luke’s placement of the appointment of Matthias (Acts 1:12-26) prior to the outpouring of the Spirit (2:1-4) suggests that the reconstitution of the twelve apostles (which symbolizes, foreshadows, and/or inaugurates the reconstitution of the twelve tribes) was necessary before the Spirit-baptism could occur.

has been anticipated with regard to the visitation of Israel's God to redeem his people. The surprise comes when the character who follows John is not Israel's God, but rather, Israel's Messiah (although Luke does prepare the reader for this surprise throughout chaps. 1-2). Through his unique shaping of chapters 1-3, Luke presents Jesus as the one in whom Yahweh has come to visit his people, he represents the arrival of Israel's God to effect a new exodus. Since Yahweh's identity in the age to come was marked by his act of restoration (cf., Jer 16:14-15), it is not adequate to claim that Jesus is presented by Luke as simply an agent *through* whom Yahweh restores his people. By portraying Jesus in terms of Yahweh's identity as Israel's deliverer, Luke is including Jesus within the unique divine identity. The attempt has been made to view John's prophecy within its narrative co-text.

Thus the first reference to the Spirit-giver occurs within a co-text where John applies to Jesus actions and descriptions which were earlier used to describe Israel's God. By placing this reference within such a co-text, Luke indicates that the *act* of giving the Spirit also functions to unite the identity of Jesus and the identity of Israel's God. First, it was shown that Luke thematically connects chapter 3 with chapters 1-2. Second, since John's ministry and prophecy are the narrative fulfillment of the promises in 1:15-17 and 1:68-79, these earlier prophecies should influence the reading of 3:2-17. Third, these earlier prophecies define John as the prophet of the Most High who will prepare the people for the coming of Israel's God to enact a new exodus. Fourth, the new-exodus and restoration theme continues into chapter 3 where Luke explicitly cites Isaiah 40:3-5 to identify John as the voice in the wilderness preparing the way (i.e., the people) of the Lord. Fifth, the new-exodus imagery and Isaianic theophany (Isa 40:10-11) are developed in John's prophecy regarding the coming one who will cleanse Israel and gather his people. Within their narrative co-text, as well as their OT background, the terms "coming," "stronger," "cleanse," "gather," all function to describe Yahweh's promise to restore his covenant people. These acts and the adjective contribute to

Yahweh's eschatological identity in the age to come. It is significant then, that the reference to the giving of the Spirit occurs within a co-text in which Luke has aligned the narrative identity of Jesus with the unique identity of Israel's God. Before concluding this section, however, it is necessary to interpret the Spirit-baptism against the OT backdrop of Yahweh's promise to pour out his Spirit.

John's Promise and the Prophets' Promise of the Outpouring of the Spirit

By portraying Jesus as the one who will effect Israel's new-exodus restoration, Luke includes Jesus within the unique identity of Israel's God. As noted in chapter 2, the act of giving the Spirit is also linked with the identity of Israel's God in the age to come and plays a significant role in Yahweh's restoration and re-creation of his people. For Luke, the act of baptizing with the Spirit is the fulfillment of the promised outpouring of the Spirit in the OT. Although this is made explicit in Acts 2:17-21, where Peter quotes Joel 3:1-5, it is more difficult to see this connection in Luke 3:16. The question this section attempts to answer is, How does John's prophecy connect with the OT promises regarding the outpouring of the Spirit? John's prophecy is likely a summary of the various references to the outpouring of the Spirit in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah. In particular, in light of the restoration context, it is possible to detect allusions to both Isaiah 44:3 and Ezekiel 36:24-27.

The syntactical and lexical differences between Luke 3:16 and the OT

Prophets. The terms βαπτίζω and πνεῦμα ἅγιόν are never used in the OT to describe the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. In addition, with the exception of Isaiah 32:15 (see chap. 2), the Spirit is consistently presented as the direct object of Yahweh's actions (i.e., "pouring out" or "giving") and not the means by which the action occurs (as in Luke 3:16: βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ). In this way, John's promise reflects some of the development of the OT promises that occurred in the Second Temple period. For

example, as noted in chapter 3, 1QH^a uses the term “holy Spirit” (רוח קודשך) to designate the new Spirit that Yahweh placed within the hymnist (8:18-20; 20:11-12). 1QS 4:20-25 is also similar to Luke 3:16 in the use of the Spirit as the means by which Yahweh will cleanse the wicked man “with a Spirit of holiness” (ולטהרו ברוח קודש).⁷² This act of cleansing *by* the Spirit is parallel with the Spirit as the object of Yahweh’s action: “He will sprinkle over him the Spirit of truth” (עליו רוח אמת ויז). This parallel is also reflected in Luke’s two-volume narrative, in which the act of baptizing *with* the Holy Spirit is juxtaposed with God pouring out the Spirit (e.g., Acts 1:5; 2:17-21) or giving the Spirit (e.g., Acts 11:14-18). For Luke, *baptizing with the Holy Spirit*, *giving the Holy Spirit*, and *pouring out the Holy Spirit* are not separate acts, but designate different ways of expressing the promised act of “giving” the Spirit.⁷³ The one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit is the one who fulfills Yahweh’s role as the Spirit-giver, an act which in the OT and Second Temple period is consistently portrayed as an act of new creation and new exodus.

Luke 3:16 and allusions to Isaiah and Ezekiel. Luke positions his first reference to the outpouring of the Spirit within the context of Israel’s restoration. The immediate co-text, in which the Spirit-giver is portrayed as “coming” (v. 16) to “clean out the threshing floor” and “gather the wheat” (v. 17), functions to place the Spirit-baptism within the framework of Israel’s new exodus. As argued in chapter 2, this is the same context Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and, possibly, Zechariah place their references to the outpouring of the Spirit.⁷⁴ In light of this restoration framework, is it possible to interpret

⁷²This use of the Spirit as the means by which Yahweh’s action is accomplished is also found in *Joseph and Aseneth* 8:11, where Joseph prays “And renew her by your Spirit” (Καὶ ἀνακαίνισσον αὐτήν τῷ πνεύματί σου).

⁷³ Dunn, “The Lord, the Giver of Life,” 17.

⁷⁴Cf. Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 9, who suggests that Luke’s Spirit-giver motif recalls the prophecies of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel; Arie W. Zwiep *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*,

John's promise as the fulfillment of the prophecies? The parallels with John's water baptism and the association of this act with Israel's eschatological cleansing and ingathering suggest possible links to both Isaiah and Ezekiel.

Isaiah 44:3 and Luke 3:16. John's own analogy between his water-baptism and the Spirit-baptism of the coming one provides a helpful starting point for understanding the meaning of Spirit-baptism in Luke 3:16-17. Although John presents the latter as greater than the former (indicated syntactically by the *μέν/δέ* construction), the use of the verb βαπτίζω, followed by a dative of means, (*ὑδατι/ἐν πνεύματι*), implies a significant similarity between the two.⁷⁵ Because John's ministry prepared for the visitation of Israel's God to redeem his people (1:68), the act of baptizing with the Spirit should be seen as, at least, *part* of that redemptive act—an act which in 1:17, 68-79, and 3:4-6 is described as a new exodus. In light of the significant function Isaiah 40:3-5 has in the opening of Luke's narrative and in light of its link with Isaiah 44:2-3, it is possible to see a connection between Luke 3:16 and Isaiah 44:2-3:

οὕτως λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας σε καὶ ὁ πλάσας σε ἐκ κοιλίας ἔτι βοηθηθήσῃ μὴ φοβοῦ παῖς μου Ἰακωβ καὶ ὁ ἠγαπημένος Ἰσραηλ ὃν ἐξελεξάμην ὅτι ἐγὼ δώσω ὕδωρ ἐν δίψει τοῖς πορευομένοις ἐν ἀνδρῶ ἐπιθήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὰς εὐλογίας μου ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου

Thus says the Lord God, the one who made you and the one who formed you from the womb: You will still be helped; do not fear, my servant Jacob and the beloved Israel whom I have chosen, because I will give water in [their] thirst to the ones who walk in dry places; I will set my Spirit upon your descendants and my blessing upon your children.

WUNT (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 107, who argues that “John's announcement connects with the OT prophecies about the outpouring of the Spirit of god ‘in the last days’ or in the near or distant future (Joel 2:28-32; Ezek 36-37; Isa 32:15; 44:3-5).”

⁷⁵This parallelism in 3:16 is consistent with the way Luke juxtaposed John and Jesus in 1:5-2:52: they are similar in many ways, yet Jesus is greater. Cf. Christian Blumenthal, “Kontinuität und Neuanfang bei Lukas Göttliches Handeln an der Zeitenwende,” *Nov T* 54 (2012): 239. Blumenthal argues for both continuity and discontinuity between the identities and missions of Jesus and John.

Not only do the new-exodus co-texts of both Isaiah 44:3 and Luke 3:16 provide a parallel between the two texts, but both texts also offer an analogy between water and the outpouring of the Spirit.⁷⁶ Within its co-text, Isaiah 44:3 envisions the transformation of the people from being “withered grass” (ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος; Isa 40:6-7) to “grass” (χόρτος) springing up in the midst of water (Isa 44:4): an act that is linked with Yahweh’s unique identity as the creator and covenant God. The notion of transformation is also implied in Luke 3:16-17 by linking Spirit-baptism with the eschatological.

Ezekiel 36-37 and Luke 3:16. Because John’s baptism *symbolized* cleansing and one’s participation in the eschatological people of God (3:3, 7-9), the act of Spirit baptism is best understood as that which brings about the eschatological cleansing and marks one as belonging to the true people of God. Luke 3:17, which illustrates Spirit-baptism of verse 16 (see above), helps to highlight this association between cleansing and ingathering with Spirit-baptism: the coming one will clean out the threshing floor (διακαθάραι τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ) and gather in the grain (συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῖτον).⁷⁷ The link between cleansing and Spirit-baptism continues in Luke’s second volume. In Acts 15:8, Peter reflects on the significance of God giving the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles (Acts

⁷⁶Luke 3:16: ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς / βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; Isaiah 44:3: δώσω ὕδωρ / ἐπιθήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου. The analogy with water is stronger in MT Isa 44:3 where the same verb, בָּטַף, is used (see chap. 2). Although James Dunn has argued that “Spirit-Baptism” is a metaphor drawn from John’s water baptism (Dunn, *Spirit Baptism*, 22), the inverse is also plausible in light of John’s claim in 3:16. That is, John saw his water baptism as foreshadowing the coming Spirit-baptism. Thus he likely chose the symbol of water-baptism because Spirit-baptism in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah are metaphorically described in terms of the pouring of water and linked with Israel’s hoped-for restoration and cleansing.

⁷⁷Some scholars have proposed a parallel between John’s baptism and proselyte baptism, the process by which a Gentile entered the community of Israel. According to France, “Jesus the Baptist?,” 99, the washing “marked the initial admission to [the] community of one who until that point lived in Gentile ‘uncleanness.’” For arguments in favor of the view that pre-Christian Judaism practiced proselyte baptism, see H. H. Rowley, “Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John,” *HUCA* 15 (1940): 313-34. Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 122-30, argues that the evidence does not support proselyte baptism before 70 C.E.; nevertheless, he believes proselyte baptism is analogous in many respects to John’s baptism. In addition to the parallels with proselyte baptism, there is also a parallel with the Qumran community’s practice of baptism to restore one who became unclean back into the community (e.g., 1QS 2:25-4:25). For a thorough treatment of this text, see Webb, *John the Baptizer*, 140-52.

10:44-48), just as he had done to the Jewish believers (cf. Acts 2:1-4). He describes the act of giving the Spirit as God “cleansing their hearts” (καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν; Acts 15:9). The association between Spirit-baptism and eschatological cleansing is suggested not only by the parallels between John’s and Jesus’ baptisms, but it is made explicit in two different passages that function to explain the act of giving the Holy Spirit (i.e., Luke 3:17; Acts 15:9).

As noted above, Luke characterizes John in terms of the eschatological Elijah and prophet of Malachi 3 and Isaiah 40. His mission is to prepare God’s people for the new-exodus work of God by helping them “return” (cf. Deut 30:3) to the Lord (signified by participating in his baptism) and in turn experience the eschatological ingathering or restoration of Israel. The book of Ezekiel contains the only OT text combining the eschatological cleansing, ingathering, and giving of the Spirit within the context of Israel’s new-exodus restoration as found in Luke 3:16-17.⁷⁸ Despite the reservations of many Lukan scholars,⁷⁹ it is plausible that John the Baptizer presents the act of the

⁷⁸Ferda, “John the Baptist, Isaiah 40, and the Ingathering of the Exiles,” 170-71. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1971), 44, who suggests that John drew on Ezekiel’s vision that God would purify his people by water in the last days.

⁷⁹Most scholars conclude that Luke does not use the language of “indwelling” or the metaphor of new creation to describe the gift of the Spirit (see chap. 1). For example, in Ezek 36-37 Yahweh consistently states that he will put (נָתַן/δίδωμι) his Spirit within Israel (ἐν ὑμῖν/εἰς ὑμᾶς; בְּקִרְבְּכֶם / בְּכֶם) and the correlative image of a new heart (36:26-27), as well as the echoes of Gen 2:7 (Ezek 37:7-10) suggest that new creation is the primary metaphor used to describe the eschatological gift of the Spirit in Ezekiel (see chap. 2). Admittedly, the prepositions ἐν or εἰς are not used by Luke to describe the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit like Ezekiel does (LXX). Luke prefers to describe the eschatological Spirit being poured out “upon” (ἐπι) (e.g., Acts 2:17; 10:45), being given to an individual or group (e.g., Luke 11:13; Acts 15:8), being received (e.g., Acts 8:15), filling an individual or group (e.g., Acts 2:4) or as a group being “baptized with the Holy Spirit” (e.g., Acts 1:5). Yet the language of “filling,” “receiving,” and “giving” surely imply “indwelling” and, furthermore, MT Ezek 39:29 summarizes the act of God placing his Spirit within his people in chaps. 36-37 with language that parallels Joel’s and Luke’s descriptions of the eschatological Spirit, indicating that, at least in one Jewish tradition, the act of God pouring out his Spirit upon his people was not viewed as distinct from God putting his Spirit within his people (שְׁפַכְתִּי אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־בְּיַת יִשְׂרָאֵל)—it is the same act presented in different ways. In addition, the association of the eschatological Spirit with the ingathering of Israel (Luke 3:17; Acts 1:12-26), cleansing (Luke 3:16-17; Acts 15:9), and life (Acts 11:18) link with Ezekiel’s promise of the eschatological Spirit and the frequent use of the verb δίδωμι with reference to the gift of the Spirit (e.g., Luke 11:13; Acts 11:18; 15:8) link Luke’s eschatological Spirit with Ezekiel’s both thematically and verbally. More connections with Ezekiel will be drawn out in the subsequent section, as well as in chap. 5.

coming one as fulfilling Ezekiel’s vision of gathering his scattered people and cleansing them by giving them a new Spirit (see chap. 2).

καὶ λήψομαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ἀθροίσω⁸⁰ ὑμᾶς ἐκ πασῶν τῶν γαιῶν καὶ εἰσάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν. καὶ ῥανῶ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ὕδωρ καθαρὸν καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν εἰδώλων ὑμῶν καὶ καθαριῶ ὑμᾶς . . . καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ποιήσω ἵνα ἐν τοῖς δικαιώμασίν μου πορεύησθε καὶ τὰ κρίματά μου φυλάξησθε καὶ ποιήσητε (LXX Ezek 36:24-25, 27).

I [the Lord] will take you from the nations, and collect you from all the lands and bring you into your own land. I will sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be cleansed from all your impurities and from all your idols, and I will cleanse you. . . . And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to obey my rules.” (36:24-25, 27)

The association between eschatological ingathering, cleansing, and Spirit-giving in Luke 3:16-17 provide intertextual links to Ezekiel. At the very least, the parallels with water-baptism suggest that the act of baptizing with the Holy Spirit is an act that creates children for Abraham (cf. 3:8), the true covenant people of God—the fulfillment of the very hope Ezekiel envisioned in 36:27; 37:4-17.⁸¹

This covenantal and new-creational aspect of Spirit-baptism is frequently discounted by Lukan scholars, who view the Lukan Spirit primarily through the category of the “Spirit of prophecy.”⁸² However, this view fails to consider the significance of Luke’s new-exodus framework in which the first reference to Spirit-baptism is placed, as well as the way in which the OT shapes his narrative (see the introduction to this chapter). If in fact, the *act* of baptizing with the Spirit is the fulfillment of Yahweh’s

⁸⁰The MT uses פְּקֹד, echoing Deut 30:3.

⁸¹Peter Mallen, “Genesis in Luke-Acts,” in *Genesis in the New Testament*, ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, LNTS 466 (New York: T & T Clark, 2012), 67, suggests that the reference to God raising up children for Abraham is an allusion to God’s identity as the creator.

⁸²For a helpful critique of this approach, see Aaron J. Kuecker, *The Spirit and the ‘Other’: Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*, LNTS 444 (New York: T&T Clark International, 2011), 1-17.

promise to cleanse and gather his people (3:17), then the consistent OT description of this *act* as the creation of a new humanity transformed to understand, obey, and know God influenced Luke’s interpretation of this act.

The OT influence on Luke is evident in his development of the restoration framework in 1:5-3:17. In Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel this restoration is repeatedly described using creation and exodus language. Although Luke clearly emphasizes the latter, the former is not excluded.⁸³ This overlap between covenant identity, creation, and empowerment is evident in Luke’s unique presentation of Jesus’ paradigmatic reception of the Spirit (Luke 3:21-22; cf. 4:1-13). For example, Luke presents Jesus’ water baptism as occurring “after all the people had been baptized” (Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν). The expectation would be that the Spirit would be given to ἅπας ὁ λαός (Isa 32:15); however, the Spirit only descends upon Jesus. Thus the Spirit-giver (3:16), becomes the Spirit-receiver and is himself marked as the true Israel, the beloved son who pleases his Father (3:22; cf. Isa 42:1).⁸⁴ However, as with the OT promises of Israel’s restoration, covenant imagery is also mixed with creation imagery in Luke 3.

⁸³It is true that throughout chaps. 1-2 the “Spirit of prophecy” category is appropriate for many of the references to the Spirit (1:15, 41, 67; 2:26-27). Ironically, however, Luke does not connect the Holy Spirit with Anna, the one character who is explicitly identified as a “prophetess” (προφήτις). But the creative activity of the Spirit is also highlighted in Luke 1:35, which echoes Gen 1:2. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 123-28 does not include Luke 1:35 in his interpretation of the Spirit in Luke.

⁸⁴David A. Höhne *Spirit and Sonship*, ANCT (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010), 97-98; Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 79. The notion of corporate solidarity between Jesus and the nation is consistent with Isaiah’s portrayal of the servant of Yahweh in Isaiah 40-55. In Isa 42:1, Yahweh states, “Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen, in whom my soul delights; I have placed my Spirit upon him (יְהוָה יָרַח לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְרוּחַ יְהוָה יָבִיט עָלָיו); ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν).” While Israel is frequently described as Yahweh’s servant and chosen one (cf. 41:8; 42:18; 44:1-5) the descriptions between the servant in 42:1-9 parallel the previous descriptions of the Davidic king in 11:1-4 and 32:1-8 and not the other descriptions of the nation of Israel. Israel is described as a blind and deaf servant (41:18-19), but the servant is one who faithfully obeys Yahweh. The close references between 42:1 and 44:3, however, suggest the possibility that the Davidic-servant’s experience of the Spirit is proleptic of restored-Israel’s experience of the Spirit. Despite the differences, Isaiah depicts many similarities between the Davidic-servant and Israel and the Spirit being place/poured out “upon” (ἐπὶ; ἐπι) each of them strengthens the solidarity between the two.

Luke is the only Gospel writer who links Jesus' reception of the Spirit with Adam.⁸⁵ In placing the genealogy after 3:21-22, and drawing Jesus' hereditary line back to Adam, "God's son," Luke portrays Jesus as a new Adam, indwelt with a new Spirit, which empowers him to resist the temptations of the devil (4:1-13). The connection Luke makes between Jesus and Adam echoes Ezekiel 37:1-14 where restored Israel is depicted as a new Adam (see chap. 2).⁸⁶ Furthermore, the creation imagery also appears in Luke's unique portrayal of the Holy Spirit descending upon Jesus *σωματικῶς εἶδεν ὡς περιστέρην* (3:22), an image that evokes Genesis 8:8-12 and possibly Genesis 1:2. Regarding the possible allusion to Genesis 8:8-12 Craig Keener writes, "In a section of Scripture . . . the dove appears as the harbinger of the new world (cf. *4 Bar.* 7:8). This renewed creation of the Genesis narrative, structurally parallel to the first creation, appears as a common prototype of the new world in other early Christian literature."⁸⁷

Summary. Although the precise language John uses in 3:16 is not found in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, or Zechariah there are similarities between 3:16 and references to the eschatological Spirit in 1QH^a and 1QS (see chap. 3). Furthermore, the new-exodus co-text, the parallel with water, the association with the eschatological cleansing and ingathering link John's prophecy with the OT prophets, especially Isaiah and Ezekiel.

⁸⁵Ilze Kezbera, *Umstrittener Monotheismus: Wahre und falsche Apotheose im lukanischen Doppelwerk*, NTOA 60 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 96.

⁸⁶See Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Spirit: On the Origin and Ministry of the Second Son of God," in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 40, who writes, "If it was by virtue of his Spirit-generation that Jesus was regarded as the 'Son of God' [Luke 1:35], then Luke likewise must have regarded Adam as 'son of God' by virtue of his generation by the Spirit (or breath) of God. In fact, this is clearly stated in Scripture [Gen 2:7]." Evans summarizes his conclusion by stating, "Luke's pneumatology not only provides the basis for understanding why he calls both Adam and Jesus sons of God; it also clarifies why Jesus was successful in facing Satanic temptation and Adam was not. Jesus' success was due to his continual reliance upon the power of the Holy Spirit" (40). Cf. George B. Caird, "Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology," in *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur*, ed. Robert F. Berkey and Sarah A. Edwards (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1982), 60.

⁸⁷Craig S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 60.

The *act* of baptizing with the Spirit is an act which cleanses Israel and restores them as God's covenant people. Jesus' paradigmatic reception and experience of the Spirit combines the covenantal, creational, and empowering aspects of the Spirit promised to Israel in Ezekiel 36-37.

Summary

The act of giving the eschatological Spirit is particular to the divine identity and is consistently linked with Yahweh's unique identity as the creator and deliverer. Although the application of this role to Jesus, in and of itself, reflects a "high" Christology (in light of the conclusions reached in chaps. 2 and 3), this assumption is strengthened in light of its placement within the co-text of Luke 1:5-3:22. Luke presents Jesus as the Spirit-giver within a unique co-text, in which he also applies to Jesus the divine name and assigns to Jesus the eschatological role of effecting Israel's new exodus (i.e., cleansing and ingathering).⁸⁸ Luke's portrayal of the act of giving the Spirit is therefore consistent with the OT picture, where this act is part of Israel's restoration (i.e., new exodus) and re-creation as Yahweh's covenant people. Jesus is presented as the identity of Israel's God, the one who promised to restore his people.⁸⁹ This initial Spirit-giver reference functions programmatically and should influence the interpretation of the

⁸⁸Although Psalms of Solomon describe the Messiah as cleansing Israel (17:29-32, 43-44; 18:4-9) there is no reference to the Messiah doing this by means of Yahweh's Spirit. Ezekiel and Isaiah explicitly connect Israel's cleansing and the outpouring of the Spirit, but Yahweh is the exclusive subject of these acts.

⁸⁹This conclusion regarding the narrative logic of Luke 1:5-3:17 coheres with the conclusions reached by Sigurd Grindheim regarding the divine identity of Jesus in the Gospels. See Sigurd Grindheim, *God's Equal*, LNTS (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011), 220. He writes, "The Jesus who emerges then is a Jesus who said and did what only God could say and do. His claims are unmatched by Jewish expectations of the Messiah, by Jewish ideas regarding the glorious characters of Israel's past, the most exalted of the angels, and even the heavenly Son of Man."

other Spirit-giver references. The act of giving the Spirit is unique to the divine identity and Luke includes Jesus within this role.

The Father Will Give the Holy Spirit: Luke 11:13

εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.⁹⁰

The goal of this section is to explain how the reference to the Father giving the Holy Spirit supports the thesis of this chapter that Luke uses the Spirit-giver motif to unite the identity of Jesus with the unique identity of Israel's God. The previous section argued that this thesis reflects *Lukan* Christology because the first reference to Jesus as the Spirit-giver occurs within a co-text in which Luke applies to Jesus the role of effecting Israel's new-exodus (a role that in light of the OT is particular to the identity of Israel's God). In 11:13, however, Jesus is not presented as the Spirit-giver; the Father is. In presenting the Father as the giver of the eschatological Spirit, Luke has united the identity of Jesus and Israel's God by presenting them both as participating in this eschatological role. Thus, in order to rightly answer the question, Who is the Lukan

⁹⁰Two text-critical issues are worth mentioning. First, a couple of manuscripts read πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν (P45^{vid}, L019) instead of πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Although the majority of manuscripts support the latter reading, Turner, *Power from on High*, 340 note 61, supports the former reading because, in his opinion, it can best explain the other variants. He argues that it is more difficult to imagine a scribe altering the familiar πνεῦμα ἅγιον to the somewhat unusual πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν. However, it is more likely that the variant πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν is due to an attempt to harmonize Luke 11:13 with its parallel passage in Matt 7:11 (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν). The majority reading also has internal support in that Luke consistently modifies πνεῦμα with the adjective ἅγιον and never ἀγαθόν. The second text-critical issue concerns the inclusion of the definite article ὁ before ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. This creates a significant difference in translation. With the definite article the text reads, “the Father, the one from heaven, will give the Holy Spirit”; without the article the text reads “the Father will give the Holy Spirit from heaven.” Although the former reading is well attested in the manuscript tradition, the latter reading also has strong support (e.g., P75, K). The reading “the one from heaven” would be an anomaly in the Lukan narrative, but finds a parallel in Luke 3:22 where the Spirit descends ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (cf. Acts 2:2). The inclusion of the article could also reflect harmonization with Matt 7:11 (ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς). There are numerous variant readings in the manuscript tradition of Luke 11:2-4 which reveal the attempt by later copyists to align Luke's Lord's Prayer and Matthew's (Matt 6:9-13). See Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 130 n30, and Robert Leaney, “The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk xi, 2-4),” *NovT* 1 (1956): 103-11. Based on the internal and external support, as well as the scribal tendency of harmonizing Luke with Matthew, the following analysis is based on reading πνεῦμα ἅγιον instead of πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν, and excludes the definite article before ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

Spirit-giver? one must respond Jesus (Israel’s Messiah) and the Father (Israel’s God). Together they share the identity of the Spirit-giver. To support this claim, this section will demonstrate that (1) the Spirit, which the Father gives, is in fact the eschatological Spirit and (2) Luke has uniquely shaped his material so that so that this act connects with and recalls Luke 3:16 where Jesus is presented as the Spirit-giver.

The Co-Text of Luke 11:13

Luke 11:1-13 contains Jesus’ extended teaching on prayer. This teaching is initiated by the disciples’ request that Jesus teach them to pray—a request prompted by Jesus’ own commitment to prayer (11:1). Luke uses the introduction in v. 1 to link this pericope with two prominent motifs in his narrative: the prayer life of Jesus and the solidarity between Jesus and his disciples. Jesus responds to his disciples with a two-part answer.⁹¹ First, he teaches about the content of prayer (11:2-4; *ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε*) and then he teaches about the motivation for prayer (11:5-13). The disciples are encouraged to request the eschatological blessings of 11:2-4 because their heavenly Father will respond to the requests of his children (11:5-12); in fact, he will even give the Holy Spirit to the ones who ask him (11:13).⁹² The repetition of the word *πατήρ* in both

⁹¹*Contra*, Hans Klein, *Das Lukas Evangelium*, 400, who divides this “Gebetsdidache” into three parts: “Der erste weist an, wie recht zu beten ist (11:2-4), der nächste macht Mut zum Gebet (11:5-10) und der dritte begründet die Ermunterung (11:11-13).” Cf. Geir Otto Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts*, LNTS 433 (New York: T & T Clark, 2011), 129.

⁹²There is also a significant textual variant in 11:2. Manuscripts 162 and 700 as well as Gregory of Nyssa (*Homily on Our Father*), Maximus the Confessor, and Tertullian (an implied reference in his debate with Marcion; *Against Marcion* 4:26) include a specific request for the coming of the Spirit: *ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρῖσάτω ἡμᾶς* (“Let your holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us”). Given the eschatological focus of the prayer (e.g., “let your name be sanctified”; “let your kingdom come”; “forgive us our sins”), this reading is best understood as a request for the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit and provides a clear link to the Baptizer’s prophecy in 3:16. The difficulty of this reading and its conceptual similarity with 11:13 make it plausible. However, due to the lack of textual witness, this reading is regarded as secondary by most Lukan scholars and textual critics: see Menzies, *Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 180-81; Jean Magne, “La réception de la variante ‘Vienne ton esprit sur nous et qu’il nous purifie’ (Lc 11, 2) et l’origine des épicleses, du baptême et du ‘Notre Pere,’” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988): 81-106; William H. Shepherd Jr. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*, SBL Dissertation Series 147 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 141; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1064; Klein, *Das Lukas Evangelium*, 405-06. *Contra* Adolf Harnack, “Über

units and the introductory clause in v. 5 (*καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς*) indicate that both units are to be read together as Jesus' response to his disciples' request.⁹³

What πνεῦμα ἅγιον will the Father give? Many scholars, who have analyzed the Lukan motif of the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit, have excluded Luke 11:13 from their analyses, often claiming that in light of the parallel with Matthew 7:11 Jesus is simply referring to God's promise to care for his people in general.⁹⁴ However, there are two reasons for taking this verse as contributing to this particular Lukan motif: First, the eschatological thrust of Luke's version of the Lord's prayer (11:2-4) sets 11:13 within an eschatological co-text; Second, the parallels between 11:13 and Luke's previous references to the outpouring of the Spirit in 3:16 and 3:22 suggest that 11:13 is a development of the motif that began in 3:16.

Max Turner has demonstrated that the birth, ministry, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus are presented by Luke against the backdrop of Israel's restoration.

einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, nebst einem Anhang über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers," in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Jahrgang 1904* (Berlin: Verlag der Königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1904), 179-208. Like Harnack, G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 170, also proposes that this variant may be part of Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer: "It also seems likely . . . that the petition, 'May thy holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us' is part of Luke's own version of the Lord's prayer." He proceeds to suggest that it is "St. Luke's own interpretation of the clause 'Thy Kingdom come,' which he found in his source" (184).

⁹³Although Luke likely shares a common source with Matthew, it is obvious that he has shaped this unit to connect with both the immediate co-text (10:1-42 and 11:14-36) and larger themes of his two-volume narrative. Therefore, caution should be employed when interpreting Luke 11:1-13 in light of Matthew (6:9-12; 7:7-11) since it is the Lukan co-text which provide the most relevant context for interpreting Luke's interpretation of this pericope.

⁹⁴E.g., Schweizer, "πνεῦμα," 409-10; Fitzmyer, *Gospel according to Luke*, 2:915-16; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, 1062-63, states, "The request is for God's presence, guidance, and intimacy. God will provide a specific good thing for his disciple. The one who walks with God should be bold and diligent in asking for such benefits. As such, the passage is not simply a blank-check request, but a blank-check request for the necessities of the spiritual life." A notable exception to this trend is Matthias Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 221-30. Wenk also notes the lack of attention this passage has received in studies on Lukan pneumatology (221).

According to Luke, God has begun to fulfill his promises to restore and renew his people Israel through the Messiah Jesus.⁹⁵ One of the primary metaphors Luke uses to describe this restoration is the exodus: in Jesus a new exodus occurs in which God brings his people out of slavery and gathers them out of exile. Turner rightly notes that, for Luke, this new-exodus typology is mediated through Isaiah 40-55, which itself contains new-exodus language to describe Israel's future restoration (see chap. 2). In addition, Luke also draws from Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Joel to describe the new age which has arrived in Jesus. The previous section demonstrated the significance of this new-exodus theme for understanding the initial presentation of John, Jesus, and Israel's God in Luke's narrative, as well as its significance for understanding the christological import of John's prophecy.

The new-exodus paradigm framing the entirety of the Lukan narrative is represented in each request of the Lord's Prayer in 11:2b-4.⁹⁶ The first request, *ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου* (11:2b), echoes Ezekiel 36:23, where Yahweh associates his restoration of Israel (cf. 36:24) with sanctifying his name among the nations (*καὶ ἁγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ μέγα τὸ βεβηλωθὲν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὃ ἐβεβηλώσατε*).⁹⁷ The second request, *ἔλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου* (11:2c), expresses the eschatological hope for God's promised rule over his people and, for Luke, this theme is integrated with the arrival of the Davidic Messiah (e.g., Luke 1:32-33; Acts 1:6-8; cf. Ezek 37:15-28).⁹⁸ The third, the request that

⁹⁵Max Turner, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness" in *Witness to the Gospel*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 344.

⁹⁶Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 223, writes, "That initial parallelism summarizes the overall prayer is strengthened by considering Jewish hopes of restoration. These three petitions [plea for bread, forgiveness, and protection from apostasy] comprise the basic Jewish hopes about the reign of God. If God will vindicate Israel and deliver her from the exile, he is to provide for her . . . , forgive her . . . , and sustain her in loyalty to God."

⁹⁷Cf. Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 131.

⁹⁸Ibid. Holmås writes, "The first two petitions are closely related as they share a fundamentally theocentric orientation. They focus on the eschatological vindication of God's name and the decisive setting up of his kingly rule, respectively." Cf. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 223, who writes, "In

the Father τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (11:3) alludes to Yahweh's daily provision of manna during Israel's forty-year wilderness wandering—an allusion that fits very well with Luke's new-exodus theme (Exod 16:1-36). Fourth, καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν (11:4a) is likely an allusion to Isaiah 40:2 where the new exodus is inaugurated by the declaration that Israel's sins have been paid.⁹⁹ Fifth, the request that the Father not lead them into πειρασμός (11:4c) also corresponds with Luke's new-exodus theme since the πειρασμός in the LXX is the place where Israel “tested” the Lord by doubting whether or not he was with them (Exod 17:7, cf. Ps 94:8 LXX).¹⁰⁰ Thus there is a clear, eschatological focus of each request of the Lord's Prayer. Each request links with the Lukan theme of Israel's restoration in general, and in some cases, a new exodus in particular. The disciples are told to pray for the actualization of God's eschatological promises.

Verse 13 functions as a conclusion to the entire pericope of 11:1-13. The reference to God as πατήρ forms an *inclusio* around Jesus' entire teaching on prayer (11:2b, 13).¹⁰¹ Therefore, the request that the Father give the Holy Spirit should also be

the Lord's Prayer the initial parallelism [‘hallowed be your name’ and ‘your kingdom come’] functions as the overall prayer, further defined by three requests.”

⁹⁹“Forgiveness of sins” is a prominent motif in the Third Gospel: 1:77; 3:3; 5:20-21, 23-24; 7:47-49; 12:10; 17:3-4; 23:34-24:47. Each reference to giving the eschatological Spirit is linked with references to forgiveness of sins: 3:3/3:16; 11:4a/11:13; 24:47/24:49. This association between the gift of the Spirit and forgiveness of sins is also found in Acts: 2:38. This association is rooted in the Old Testament promises of Israel's restoration which link forgiveness and a new Spirit (cf. Isa 43:25-44:3 and Ezek 36:24-26, 33).

¹⁰⁰The “complaining” in Exod 17, rooted in Israel's failure to trust Yahweh's promises, is paradigmatic of Israel's subsequent history up to the exile. This narrative represents the way in which Israel (as whole) lived under Yahweh's rule. Thus the request in Luke 11:4c is not a vague request that the Father keep the disciples from temptation in general; but rather, that he not lead them into the πειρασμός—the place where Israel rebelled against Yahweh by doubting his promise to be with them and care for them (Exod 3:12). Restored Israel (represented in the twelve disciples) is to pray that they do not turn out like Israel of old by doubting God's promise to care for them. This can explain why Jesus goes on to describe how God, like a father, cares for his children (11:5-13).

¹⁰¹Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 137. The verb δίδωμι and the inclusion of a specific request also link 11:13 with the Lord's Prayer in 11:2-4. Cf. Vernon K. Robbins, “From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13,” in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas

understood within the eschatological framework of Israel's restoration and new exodus. In view of the co-text of 11:2-4, Jesus' description of the Father as the Spirit-giver should be understood as a reference to God's promise to pour out his Spirit in association with Israel's renewal and restoration. The disciples are to pray for the Father to fulfill his eschatological promises, this includes the promise of the Spirit.

Not only does the immediate co-text suggest that 11:13 describes the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit, but parallels between 11:1-13 and 3:2-22 indicate that Luke has shaped 11:1-13 in a way that links it with 3:2-17 in general, and John's prophecy (3:16) in particular. Verse 13 is a development of the literary motif introduced in 3:16. This is evident in these specific parallels with chapter 3, as well as the possible allusion to the OT promise of Ezekiel.

First, the reference to John (11:1) points the reader back to chapters 1-3 where the juxtaposition between John and Jesus reached a climax in 3:16. There, Jesus' ministry is described both as similar to and as superseding John's ministry of water baptism. In 11:1 the disciples' request that Jesus teach them to pray *as* (καθώς) John taught his disciples, resumes the John/Jesus parallels that shaped the opening chapters of the narrative.

It is doubtful that the inclusion of the reference to John is unimportant for interpreting this pericope.¹⁰² Since the entire pericope (11:1-13) reflects the theological and literary creativity of the author, the inclusion of the reference to John at the heading of the story is likely intentional. Furthermore, a glance at the numerous appearances of John in Luke's two-volume narrative demonstrates that Luke purposefully inserts John into the narrative as a way of reminding the reader of John's promise in 3:16—that the

Phillips (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 213, who argues that 11:5-13 elaborates aspects of the Lord's Prayer.

¹⁰²*Contra*, Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 456, who suggests that the reference to John is insignificant for interpreting this scene. Cf. Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 129-30.

coming one will baptize with the Holy Spirit. It is necessary to provide a brief overview of the rhetorical function of John's character.

Luke's interest in John the Baptizer is evident in the opening chapters of his Gospel. No other gospel writer gives such attention and focus to the birth and ministry of John. At the discourse level, John serves an important function in these opening chapters in developing the narrative identity of Jesus: the literary parallels between John and Jesus (both continuity and contrast) and John's programmatic messianic prophecy in 3:16 are essential for understanding the Lukan Jesus. Even after his death is recorded (3:19-20), Luke includes 17 additional references to John the Baptizer.¹⁰³ Within the unfolding two-volume narrative, these 17 references likewise function to articulate the narrative identity of Jesus by paralleling Jesus' and John's respective ministries *and* by alluding back to the messianic promise of Luke 3:16. For example, in Luke 5:33 the lack of fasting on the part of Jesus' disciples is contrasted with the strict fasting of John's disciples—a contrast that functions to unveil the messianic identity of Jesus as the bridegroom (5:34-35). Additional parallels between Jesus and John occur in Luke 7:33-35; 9:7-9, 18-20; 20:1-8; and Acts 19:1-7.

Despite the significance of these parallels between John and Jesus and the way they mimic the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel, the most common function for the additional references to John is to remind the reader of the baptism ministry of John in general (Luke 3:4-22) and his messianic promise in 3:16 in particular: the coming one who is stronger than John will baptize with the Holy Spirit. Oftentimes explicit references are made to John's ministry and prophecy, as in Acts 1:5 where Jesus states Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἀγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας (cf. Acts 1:21-22; 10:34-37; 11:15-17; 13:23-25; 18:24-25; 19:1-7). In other instances the references are allusive. For example, in Luke 7:19-20 John asks Jesus

¹⁰³E.g., 5:33; 7:18-20, 24-29, 33; 9:7-9, 18-20; 11:1; 16:16-17; 20:1-8; Acts 1:4-5, 21-22; 10:34-37; 11:15-17; 13:23-25; 15:8-11; 18:24-25; 19:1-7.

σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν. The two verbs ἔρχομαι and προσδοκῶ allude to Luke 3:15-16 where John, in response to the messianic *expectation* of the people, announces to them that one is *coming* who will baptize with the Holy Spirit.

In dividing Luke's rhetorical use of John the Baptizer into these two categories, I am not suggesting that these are distinct functions lacking any overlap. As noted above, the messianic prophecy in Luke 3:16 is itself the climax of the John/Jesus parallels in Luke 1:5-3:14. Thus it is possible that a reference to John can function both to parallel Jesus and John and to point the reader back to the messianic promise of Spirit baptism. The references to John in Luke 7:18-35 are an example of this overlap. The verbs ἔρχομαι and προσδοκῶ, the 'new exodus' language, and the explicit reference to John's baptism allude to 3:4-16; and yet, much of the context functions to parallel Jesus and John.¹⁰⁴ Other examples of this "both/and" category include Acts 1:5; 11:16; 15:8-11, and 19:1-7.

Now, back to Luke 11:1-13. In light of Luke's use of John throughout his two-volume narrative it is not surprising that when John is referenced in this pericope a parallel is made between him and Jesus: κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ (11:1b).¹⁰⁵ Yet it is possible that this reference to John also functions to remind the reader of John's yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecy in Luke 3:16. Luke's unique description of the Father "giving the Holy Spirit," within a new exodus co-text, is similar to Luke's first reference to the eschatological outpouring of the Holy Spirit. At this point in the argument, it is sufficient to note that Luke 11:1-13 begins with a reference to John and concludes with a reference to giving the Holy Spirit: parallels that evoke the messianic promise of 3:16 and cohere with Luke's use of John throughout the two-volume narrative.

¹⁰⁴E.g., Mal 3:1 is quoted in Luke 7:27.

¹⁰⁵Klein, *Das Lukas Evangelium*, 404: "Jesus und Johannes werden hier parallelisiert und gleichzeitig differenziert."

Besides the eschatological co-text of 11:2b-5 and the reference to John the Baptizer, there are also both verbal and thematic parallels with chapter 3, suggesting that Luke has shaped 11:13 to contribute to his Spirit-giver motif. First, the term πνεῦμα ἅγιον itself links with 3:16. Up until 11:13, the only references to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον occur in relation to Jesus' paradigmatic experience of the Spirit (3:22; 4:1; 10:21). The narrative logic of 3:21-22 suggests that Jesus' reception of the Spirit is the proleptic fulfillment of John's prophecy in 3:16 and thus becomes paradigmatic for all of God's new humanity. The reference in 11:13 to a corporate giving of the Spirit, recalls the corporate promise in 3:16. Second, the prepositional phrase ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, indicating the place from which the Spirit is given, parallels 3:22 where the Spirit descends upon Jesus ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Third, Luke's unique shaping of Jesus' water and Spirit baptisms in 3:21-22 highlight the connection between prayer and the descent of the eschatological Spirit; Luke's unique account in 11:13 also makes a link between prayer and giving the Holy Spirit.¹⁰⁶ Fourth, it was argued above that in 3:16-17 Luke places the eschatological cleansing, ingathering, and outpouring of the Spirit within the context of Israel's new-exodus restoration and that this explicit association between these three events is found only in Ezekiel 36-37. Of the four prophets, who envision the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit, only Ezekiel uses the verb δίδωμι to describe this re-creative and new-exodus act (11:19; 36:26-27; 37:14).¹⁰⁷ It is possible, then, that 11:13 is alluding to

¹⁰⁶Luke 3:21-22a reads as follows: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεωχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. The switch to the present tense in the genitive absolute προσευχομένου suggests that the opening of heaven and the descent of the Spirit occurred while Jesus was praying: "And it happened when all the people had been baptized and Jesus had been baptized and was praying that heaven was opened and the Holy Spirit descended." Luke connects prayer and the outpouring of the Spirit through Acts (1:14-2:1; 4:23-31; 8:14-17; 9:11-17; 10:1-46; 13:1-3). Cf. Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication*, 136.

¹⁰⁷There are two likely sources for this reference to the Father "giving" the Spirit. The first is Num 11:29: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Μωυσῆς μὴ ζηλοῖς σὺ μοι καὶ τίς δώη πάντα τὸν λαὸν κυρίου προφήτας ὅταν δῶ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτούς ("Moses said to [Joshua], 'Do not be jealous for me. And who might give all the people of the Lord [as] prophets, when the Lord gives his Spirit upon them.'"). Here δίδωμι summarizes other references to the Spirit descending upon the 70 elders (e.g., the Lord "placed" [ἐπιτίθημι]

Ezekiel's eschatological promise in the use of the verb *δίδωμι* with *πνεῦμα* as its direct object.¹⁰⁸

The eschatological co-text and the verbal and thematic parallels with Luke 3:16-17, 21-22 suggest that Jesus' promise in Luke 11:13 is part of the Lukan motif. As with the requests in the Lord's Prayer, the disciples are to pray that God give the Holy Spirit in fulfillment of his restoration promises like those in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah. As the narrative progresses the reader will discover how this promise is fulfilled.

The Identity of the Spirit-Giver.

In light of the previous two chapters of this dissertation, Luke's description of the Father (i.e., Israel's God) as giving the eschatological Spirit reflects the traditional understanding of the identity of the Spirit-giver. In the Old Testament and the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, the Spirit-Giver is always Israel's God, Yahweh.

the Spirit upon the 70 elders and the Spirit rested upon them [*ἐπαναπαύομαι*]; Num 11:25 [cf. 11:17]) and looks forward to the day when Yahweh will create for himself a nation of prophets. Second, *δίδωμι* occurs in Ezek 36-37 in the context of God's eschatological re-creation of his people by giving them his Spirit (Ezek 36:26, 27; 37:6, 14). As noted in chapter 2, Joel, and likely Ezekiel, develop Moses' prayer in Numbers 11:29. Thus, while most Lukan scholars have tried to distinguish between the "Spirit of prophecy" and the "Spirit of new creation," the fact that both Ezekiel and Joel place Moses' prayer within a new-creation and new-exodus context suggests that this bifurcation is an etic rather than an emic category. Luke himself reflects this combination in connecting the eschatological Spirit with prophecy, salvation, conversion, and cleansing. As noted in chaps. 2 and 3, within the OT and Second Temple literature the *act* of giving the Spirit is consistently portrayed as a new creation or new exodus, while the *effects* of this act are varied. The consistent focus on Israel's restoration and new exodus as the co-text for these references to the outpouring of the Spirit suggests that Luke's portrayal of the Spirit-giver flows within this stream. For an alternative argument regarding the source of 11:13, see J. Lionel North, "Praying for a Good Spirit: Text, Context and Meaning of Luke 11:13," *JSNT* 28 (2005): 167-88. North prefers the reading *πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν* in Luke 11:13 and argues that Luke draws from Ps 143:10 and Neh 9:20. However, this interpretation does not cohere with the eschatological co-text of 11:1-13.

¹⁰⁸In Acts, the act of "giving" (*δίδωμι*) is found in statements which summarize "pouring out" or "baptizing with" the Holy Spirit. This is seen, for example, in Acts 11:15-17 when Peter recounts the outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius' household (10:44-48). In 10:45, the Jewish believers who witness this event are amazed because the Holy Spirit was "poured out" (*ἐκχέω*) even on the Gentiles; in 11:16 Peter describes the event in terms of John and Jesus' promise (Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5): "John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit; and in 11:17 Peter concludes by summarizing this act as God giving (*δίδωμι*) the gift of the Spirit.

Luke's description in 11:13 corresponds with this literature. In Luke's Gospel, two characters are now identified as having the role of pouring out the eschatological Spirit: the Messiah (3:16) and the Father (11:13). In the previous section, it was observed that the first reference to the Spirit-giver occurs in a co-text in which Luke unites the identity of Jesus to the unique identity of Israel's God by presenting him as the one who will effect Israel's new exodus (cf. Jer 16:14-16). Now, in portraying the Father as the Spirit-giver, Luke further unites the identity of Jesus and the identity of God: they are both identified as the Spirit-giver. It is not the case that Luke presents Jesus as a subordinate agent (e.g., a prophet) through whom the Father gives the Spirit; rather, he presents both Jesus and the Father as "giving" the eschatological Spirit.

Jesus Promises to Send the Spirit: Luke 24:49

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς·
ὁμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δυνάμιν.

The final reference in Luke's Gospel to the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit occurs at the end of the story. Although Luke's second volume continues the narrative, the unique material in Luke 24 provides a fitting conclusion to his first volume. Many scholars have emphasized the "gaps" in the Gospel account that serve to link Luke's story of Jesus with his story of the early church; yet others have noticed the way in which the ending of the Gospel employs closural strategies that brings resolution to Luke's *πρῶτον λόγον*.¹⁰⁹ For example, Mikeal Parsons has demonstrated the presence of

¹⁰⁹Within the overall scope of Luke's two-volume narrative it is more accurate to state that chap. 24 provides both a fitting conclusion of the Gospel story and linkage with the story to come in the *δεύτερον λόγον*. For a helpful analysis of the narrator's closural strategies, see Mikael Parsons, "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53," *Society of Biblical Literature 1986 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 201-23. Parsons demonstrates that through the literary strategies of circularity and parallelism the ending (the Resurrection narrative in general and 24:50-53 in particular) resolves the tensions of the major plot strategies of Luke's narrative (222). Nevertheless, Parsons acknowledges the "gaps" which remain unfilled and thus pave the way for the story of Jesus' followers in Acts. Gaps such as Jesus' departure, the mandate to witness, and the gift of the Holy Spirit help to link Luke's story of Jesus with his story of the early church. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 832, who writes "The Evangelist has incorporated into the final chapter of the

the “closural strategies” of *circularity* and *parallelism* which the narrator uses to resolve the tensions of the major plot strategies of the narrative.¹¹⁰ A brief overview of these devices will be provided.

Building upon the work of Mariann Torgovnick, Parsons argues that *circularity* occurs when “the ending of a novel clearly recalls the beginning in language, in situation, in the grouping of characters, or in several of these ways.”¹¹¹ Circularity is present in Luke 24 in the following ways. First, at the beginning of the narrative, the priest, Zechariah, is unable to bless the people; at the end of the narrative Jesus, in Levitical fashion, blesses his disciples.¹¹² Second, the setting of the narrative begins in Jerusalem, in particular, the temple (1:5-25; 2:22-38; 2:41-52); the setting at the end of the narrative is also Jerusalem, with a particular emphasis on the disciples blessing God in the temple (24:52-53).¹¹³ Third, at the beginning of the story the narrator emphasizes the righteous and godly quality of the main characters (e.g., Zechariah, Elizabeth, Mary, Joseph, Anna, Simeon); at the end of the narrative the disciples have “replaced the pious persons of Israel found in the early chapters of the Gospel. The disciples are the ones who are continually (24:53), obediently (24:49) and joyously (24:52) in the temple

Gospel both retrospective summaries and interpretations of the Third Gospel and prospective intimations of the shape of the story to come.”

¹¹⁰Mikael Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*, JSNTSupp 21 (Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1987), 65-113; idem, “Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53,” *Society of Biblical Literature 1986 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 201-23. Parsons borrows the terms *circularity* and *parallelism* from Mariann Torgovnick, *Closure in the Novel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981).

¹¹¹Torgovnick, *Closure in the Novel*, 13.

¹¹²Parsons, “Narrative Closure and Openness,” 205; Charles Talbert, *Reading Luke* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 233.

¹¹³Parsons, “Narrative Closure and Openness,” 206.

blessing God.”¹¹⁴ Using the device of circularity, the narrator ends the narrative where he began.¹¹⁵

According to Parsons, the term *parallelism* describes the relationship between the ending and the middle of a narrative work.¹¹⁶ He demonstrates that major story lines are resolved in the resurrection narrative in general and the ascension narrative in particular.¹¹⁷ The following motifs are resolved in the final chapter: First, various conflicts that function to advance the plot find their resolution in chapter 24. These include the meal-time conflicts, the disciples’ misunderstandings, and the temple and synagogue confrontations. Second, the theme of promise and fulfillment, which also moves the plot forward, finds a resolution. Put simply, “Prior to Luke 24 all of the Scripture references which fall into the prophecy-fulfillment schema are predictive”; however, in chapter 24 all of the scripture references (except one) are fulfilled and refer back to earlier events in the story.¹¹⁸ Third, the journey motif, which occupies the heart of Luke’s narrative (9:51-19:44), is finally resolved in Jesus’ departure to heaven (24:51).¹¹⁹

In light of the way the Lukan narrator brings the first volume to a fitting end—by reminding the reader of the story’s beginning and resolving key themes—it is not

¹¹⁴Ibid.

¹¹⁵Two other examples include (1) the use of an angel to announce the miraculous births in chapter 1 and the use of angels to announce the miraculous resurrection in chap. 24 and (2) Luke’s reference to the “events fulfilled among us” (τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων) and Jesus’ claim that “all the things written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms must be fulfilled” (δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως καὶ προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ).

¹¹⁶Torgovnick, *Closure in the Novel*, 13, states that parallelism occurs “when language, situation, or the grouping of characters refers not just to the beginning of the work but to a series of points in the text.”

¹¹⁷Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus*, 77.

¹¹⁸Ibid., 87.

¹¹⁹Ibid., 92-93.

surprising to find a reference to the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit (24:49). The placement of this motif at the beginning, middle, and end of the narrative demonstrates its significance; for despite its relative scarcity, the narrator has incorporated these references at key moments in the story.

Using Torgovnick and Parson's categories, the inclusion of this motif at the end of the narrative is part of the narrator's closural strategy of parallelism: it refers not just to the beginning of the work, but to a series of points in the text. Nevertheless, the promise in 24:49 also represents a "gap" in the narrative that functions to point the reader to the second volume where this literary motif finds its fulfillment. Interpreting 24:49 as part of the narrator's "closural" strategy allows one to link this reference to the τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου, which Jesus promises to send his disciples, with the other references to the Spirit-giver in Luke's Gospel. This section attempts to support the thesis of this chapter that Luke uses the Spirit-giver motif to unite the identity of Jesus with the unique identity of Israel's God by showing that (1) the final reference to the Spirit-giver is designed to link with the previous references in 3:16 and 11:13, thus confirming the claim in the previous section that Luke presents both Jesus and the Father as the Spirit-giver, and (2) that the co-text of Luke 24:36-53, like the co-text of 3:16, reveals an additional attempt to include Jesus within the divine identity.

Luke 24:49 in Light of 3:16 and 11:13

In Luke 24:49, the terms "promise of my father" and "power" are metaphors for the eschatological gift of the Spirit. In Luke 1:35 δύναμις is used interchangeably with πνεῦμα ἅγιον and in Acts 1:4-5 τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς is explicitly identified with the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 2:33, 39).¹²⁰ In its immediate co-text Jesus' promise is associated with the disciples' task of testifying to his death and resurrection and

¹²⁰*Contra*, Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*, 204, who argues that δύναμις is mediated by the Spirit but is not equivalent to it.

proclaiming repentance and forgiveness of sins for all the nations (24:47-48). The disciples will be empowered for their task of bearing witness to the risen Messiah.

The term “promise of my father” has two possible references. The first is the OT and Yahweh’s promise to pour out his Spirit upon his restored people (Ezek 36-37; 39:29; Isa 32:15; 44:3; Joel 3:1-2). The reference to the Scriptures (τὰς γραφάς) and the disciple’s hermeneutical lesson in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and Psalms (24:44-45) suggests that the eschatological sending of the Spirit was part of the instruction the disciples received. In addition, the prepositional phrases ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς and ἐξ ὑψους are likely allusions to Isa 32:15-20 where the outpouring of the Spirit is associated with Israel’s restoration.¹²¹ As the narrative unfolds in the second volume it becomes even clearer that the “promise” is the eschatological gift of the Spirit which Luke regards as having been fulfilled at Pentecost. Peter’s Pentecost sermon makes this explicit as he cites Joel 3:1-2 and interprets it as being fulfilled by the exalted Jesus who having received τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου has poured it out upon his people (Acts 2:33).¹²² Thus, in Luke 24:49, Jesus explains that he himself is the giver of the eschatological gift of the Spirit that the Father had promised his restored people.

The second source is the Lukan narrative itself. In the Lukan story there are two previous promises relating to the Spirit: 3:16 and 11:13.¹²³ John’s promise in 3:16 that the “coming one” will baptize with the Holy Spirit is programmatic for the Lukan narrative and is frequently cited and alluded to throughout the two-volumes (see previous sections). This promise is explicitly identified as “the promise of the Father” in Acts 1:4-5. Nevertheless, this term also strengthens the argument in the previous section that

¹²¹Turner, “The ‘Spirit of Prophecy’ as the Power of Israel’s Restoration and Witness,” 345.

¹²²John H. Sieber, “The Spirit as the ‘Promise of My Father’ in Luke 24:49,” in *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit*, ed. Daniel Durken (Collegville, MN: Liturgical, 1979), 274.

¹²³Sieber, “The Spirit as the ‘Promise of My Father,’” 276.

11:13 is part of the literary motif of the gift of the Spirit. In 11:13 the subject of the giving is not Jesus, but “the Father.”

In light of the connection both sources have to the immediate co-text, as well as to the overall Lukan narrative, there is no reason to choose one over the other. Jesus promises to send the Holy Spirit, an act that will bring to fulfillment the other promises regarding the “coming one” (3:16)¹²⁴ and the “Father” (11:13), as well as Yahweh’s OT promises to restore his people by giving them a new Spirit. Jesus identifies himself as the Spirit-giver; a claim corresponding to the Baptizer’s promise in 3:16, but not conflicting with the promise in 11:13.¹²⁵

The resurrection narrative reveals a continuity between the identity of the pre-resurrection Jesus and the post-resurrection Jesus: John the Baptizer initially describes the Messiah as the Spirit-giver; the Jesus’ final description of himself concerns his role as the Spirit-giver.¹²⁶ Although the death of the Spirit-giver threatened the fulfillment of this promise, the Risen One is able to guarantee its fulfillment. And as the Risen One, he has the authority to guarantee the fulfillment of this speech act (i.e., promise).¹²⁷ Jesus is

¹²⁴Klaus B. Haacker, “Der Geist und das Reich im Lukanischen Werk,” *NTS* 59 (2013): 330.

¹²⁵Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke’s Christology*, 131; Alan J. Thompson, *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus*, NSBT 27 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), 127.

¹²⁶Cf. Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 187-89, who argues that Cleopas and his companion’s claim that “the Lord was raised (24:33-34; ὁ κύριος) recalls the first reference to Jesus as ὁ κύριος in 1:43. Rowe writes, “Within the purview of Luke’s narrative, it would cut entirely against the grain to think that the resurrection effects a change such that Jesus as κύριος is now something or someone he was not before. The resurrection, to the contrary, guarantees the continuity of the self-same κύριος through rejection and death” (188-89).

¹²⁷For a compelling and exegetically illuminating application of speech-act theory to Lukan Christology, see Anthony C. Thiselton, “Christology in Luke, Speech-Act Theory, and the Problem of Dualism in Christology after Kant,” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 453-72. Thiselton writes, “On the basis of examples such as these it can readily be seen that the relation between perlocutionary language, on the one hand, and illocutionary speech-acts on the other, is radically different for christology. The language not only of verdict (‘your sins are hereby forgiven’) but also of *promise* and *gift* depends for its operative effectiveness on the self-commitments, authority, and status of the speaker” (463). Thiselton concludes by stating, “His acts, and especially his speech-acts, ‘show’ themselves in the public domain on the stage of historical life. What

the one who will send what was promised by the Father in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah, as well as what was promised in Luke 11:13: The Father will give the Spirit to the ones who ask him.

Divine Identity Christology in Luke 24:36-53?

So far in this section the attempt has been made to link Jesus' promise in Luke 24:49 with the OT promises of Yahweh, as well as the promise in Luke 11:13 where the Father is presented as the Spirit-giver. The intra-textual links with 11:13 suggest that Luke has connected 24:49 and 11:13, further uniting the identity of Jesus and the Father in their particular role as the Spirit-giver. Now, it is necessary to consider whether there are any references within the co-text of Luke 24:36-52 that also show evidence of the Lukan attempt to include Jesus within the divine identity. As in the above study on 3:16, the Lukan co-text is essential for understanding the christological significance of the Lukan Spirit-giver motif. As in 3:16, the co-text of 24:36-53 supports the claim that the Spirit-giver motif functions to unite Jesus' identity with the unique identity of Israel's God. This is revealed in the fact that Luke concludes his Gospel with a reference to the disciples worshipping Jesus (v. 52).

After Jesus promises to send the "promise of the Father" (i.e., to clothe the disciples "with power from on high"; v. 49), Luke records that Jesus led them to Bethany, blessed them (εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς), and that, while he was blessing them (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτούς), he was "taken up"¹²⁸ into heaven (ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; vv. 50-51). In verse 52 the subject switches from Jesus to the disciples and the narrator states that they worshiped Jesus: Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ

could be nearer to the heart of christology than that Jesus begins to change the world in accordance with the divine word of promise, and that his speech and his acts 'make themselves manifest' as the speech and acts of God?" (472).

¹²⁸BDAG, s.v., "ἀναφέρω."

μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης (“And they, having worshiped him, returned to Jerusalem with great joy”).¹²⁹

In Luke’s Gospel, there are two other uses of the verb προσκυνέω, both of which occur in the temptation story (4:1-13). In view of the particular uses of this term, it is possible to conclude that the act of worshipping Jesus in 24:52 is an act that responds to Jesus’ divine identity. In the second temptation, the devil claims to have been given all authority and offers it to Jesus (δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν; v. 6), if Jesus will worship him (ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ; v. 7). In response, Jesus cites Deuteronomy 6:13, a text that reserves the act of worship for Yahweh alone: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.¹³⁰ In claiming that “all authority” of the world’s kingdoms had been given to him, the devil is claiming to participate in the unique divine identity: in the OT and Second Temple literature Yahweh alone is the sovereign ruler of all reality and this act distinguishes him from all others. The devil, therefore, claims for himself a role that is particular to Yahweh alone.¹³¹ Ironically, however, the devil’s logic is sound. If in fact he is included within the divine identity, then he is worthy of worship. In refusing him worship, Jesus undermines the devil’s premise: he does not participate in Yahweh’s sovereign rule over the world.

Therefore, in view of the way in which the act of worship is linked with the unique identity of Israel’s God, as well as the way in which Jesus excludes all others from receiving worship, the disciples’ worship of Jesus is most plausibly a response to

¹²⁹This reference to the disciples worshipping Jesus is absent from the Western ms. D.

¹³⁰In the co-text of Deut 6:13, Yahweh’s identity is articulated in terms of his act of deliverance from Egypt: “then take care lest you forget Yahweh, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery” (Deut 6:12).

¹³¹This claim is made explicit in Luke’s account. Matthew simply records the devil’s offer to give Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and their glory (ταῦτά σοι πάντα δώσω; Matt 4:9); Luke highlights the devil’s claim that all the authority of the kingdoms of the world and their glory had been given to him.

their recognition of his divine identity.¹³² Although not specifically addressing Luke 24:49, Bauckham’s argument regarding the worship of Jesus in various NT texts appears to cohere with Luke’s reference to worship being given to Jesus (especially in light of the uses of the exclusive uses of *προσκυνέω* in connection with the divine identity in Luke 4:6-7). Bauckham writes,

Examination of New Testament texts which offer theological rationale for the worship of Jesus thus confirms our argument. Worship is given to Jesus precisely as recognition of characteristics of the divine identity which were regarded in Second Temple Judaism as distinguishing the uniqueness of the one God. The worship of Jesus serves to focus in conceptuality, as well as making most obvious in religious practice, the inclusion of Jesus in the unique identity of the one God of Jewish monotheism. It was not only the natural religious response of Jewish Christians to the status they perceived the exalted Jesus to have and to the role he played in their religious experience and life. It was also reflectively understood in the context of Jewish monotheistic understanding of God.¹³³

The disciples respond to Jesus with the type worship that, within the Lukan narrative, is reserved for Yahweh alone and is offered in response to the recognition of Yahweh’s divine identity.¹³⁴ Therefore, Luke concludes his Gospel narrative by presenting Jesus as acting in role that is unique to Israel’s God (v. 49) and as receiving the type of worship

¹³²In view of Luke’s closural strategy, as observed above by Parsons, it is possible that the use of *προσκυνέω* 24:52 is another example of *circularity*.

¹³³Richard Bauckham, “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,” in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila and Gladys S. Lewis, JSJSup (Boston: Brill, 1999), 69. Cf. idem, “The Worship of Jesus in Early Christianity,” in *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008), 151: “In time it became clear that the practice of the worship of Jesus in the context of Jewish monotheism constituted both a christological principle—that Jesus is such that he can be worshipped—and a theological (Trinitarian) principle—that god is such that Jesus can be worshipped.” However, Bauckham, “The Worship of Jesus in Early Christianity,” 131, does not develop the significance of Luke’s rare, but purposeful use of the term *προσκυνέω* when he writes, “Whereas in Mark and Luke the gesture of obeisance to Jesus, is probably no more than a mark of respect for an honoured teacher, Matthew’s consistent use of the word *proskunein*, and his emphasis on the point, show that he intends a kind of reverence which, paid to any other human being, he would have regarded as idolatrous.” Surely, in view of Luke 4:6-7 and the co-text of Luke 24:49, Luke’s use of *προσκυνέω* is more than respect for an “honoured teacher.”

¹³⁴This claim is strengthened in the narrator’s final statement that the disciples *καὶ ἤσαν διὰ παντός ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν* (“and they were continually in the temple blessing God; v. 53). The structure of vv. 52-53 appears to put Jesus (*αὐτόν*) in parallel with “God”:

Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης καὶ ἤσαν διὰ παντός ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν

that was exclusively reserved for Israel's God.¹³⁵ It is plausible that Jesus' claim to be the Spirit-giver helped to contribute to the disciples' recognition of the characteristics of the divine identity in Jesus.

Conclusion

Chapters 2 and 3 concluded that the act of giving the eschatological Spirit is presented in the OT and Second Temple literature as part of Yahweh's unique identity in the age to come and consistently linked with his particular roles of the creator and redeemer. No other figure in the OT or Second Temple literature is ever presented as sharing or participating in this role and, therefore, like the acts of creation, salvation, and sovereignty, it is particular to Yahweh's divine identity. Therefore, the Lukan emphasis on Jesus' participation in this eschatological act *in and of itself* implies an inclusion of Jesus within the unique divine identity (especially in light of Bauckham's articulation of divine identity Christology). However, this chapter has attempted to investigate this topic further in order to discover whether or not Luke uses this motif to unite Jesus' identity with the identity of Israel's God (like he does with the term *κύριος*, as argued by Kevin Rowe). It was proposed in the introduction to this chapter that the christological significance of this motif for Luke is revealed in the co-texts in which Jesus is presented as the Spirit-giver, in the fact that both Jesus and the Father are portrayed as participating in this act (it is therefore not simply agent Christology), and in the fact that Luke uses intra-textual and inter-textual links that relate the three Lukan references to each other and to the OT promises of Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah. In uniquely portraying both Jesus and God as acting in role of Spirit, Luke is not presenting Jesus as simply an

¹³⁵Cf. Steve Walton, "'The Heavens Opened': Cosmological and Theological Transformation in Luke and Acts," in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*, ed. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough, LTS 355 (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 66. Walton argues, "Luke explicitly states that after Jesus ascended, 'they worshipped him' (Luke 24:52). Since for Jews worship is to be given to God alone, Jesus is here being placed alongside YHWH as an object of worship. His entry into heaven is thus different from those of Elijah or Enoch, for his entry follows his resurrection."

agent through whom Yahweh gives the Spirit, but is presenting Jesus as giving the eschatological Spirit in a way that parallels God's giving of the Spirit.¹³⁶

The first section argued that the literary motif of "giving" the eschatological Spirit is part of Luke's christological agenda of including Jesus (i.e. the Messiah) in the identity of Israel's God. It is not that Luke simply applies to Jesus this role, which was reserved for Yahweh alone, he places this promise within a co-text that applies to Jesus other aspects of the divine identity: he is the one who will effect Israel's new exodus. The correlation of the Spirit-giver promise with the new-exodus theme reveals Luke's development of the promises of Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Joel—all of whom place the gift of the Spirit within the context of Israel's new-exodus restoration. However, for Luke, the act of baptizing with the Spirit is not simply part of the eschatological restoration, it is an act that effects the eschatological cleansing and ingathering of Israel (3:17) and as such, it is an act of both new creation and new exodus (as in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and possibly Zechariah).

In Luke 11:13, Luke also places the Spirit-giver motif against the backdrop of Israel's new exodus, but this time he presents the Father as the one who gives the Spirit. The parallels with 3:16-17, 21-22, as well as the eschatological co-text, suggest that this act of giving the Spirit is not distinct from 3:16 and indicates that Luke presents both Jesus and Israel's God as the Spirit-giver. This shared identity as the Spirit-giver thus unites Jesus with the identity of Israel's God.

The final reference to the Spirit-giver occurs in 24:49, a passage in which Jesus identifies himself as the Spirit-giver (i.e., the one who will send the promise of the Father, the one who will clothe the disciples with power). The intra-textual links with 11:13, and the likely OT background, function to show that Jesus is the one who fulfills the promise of the Father to give the Spirit (11:13), as well as Yahweh's promise in the

¹³⁶*Contra*, Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 274.

OT to pour out his Spirit on his restored people. In response to Jesus divine identity (of which the promise to send the Spirit likely plays a role), the disciples offer worship to Jesus, an act which in the context of the Lukan narrative is reserved for Yahweh alone.

Thus Luke uses the Spirit-giver motif to create “a shared, narratively established identity in which there is unity without confusion as well as distinction without separation” between Jesus and Israel’s God.¹³⁷ Jesus is distinct from the Father, yet they both share the divine identity of the Spirit-giver such that the reader of Luke’s Gospel sees in Jesus the identity of Israel’s God, the one who promised to pour out his Spirit. This thread of divine Christology in no way conflicts with the Lukan emphasis on Jesus’ humanity: he is both the Spirit-giver and the Spirit-receiver.

¹³⁷Rowe, *Early Christology*, 27.

CHAPTER 5

ISRAEL'S GOD AND JESUS THE MESSIAH: THE SHARED IDENTITY OF THE SPIRIT-GIVER IN ACTS

Introduction

In his Gospel, Luke presents both Jesus and the Father as the giver of the eschatological Spirit. The previous chapter argued that, in accord with Kavin Rowe's analysis of the term *κύριος*, the Spirit-giver motif functions to unite Jesus and Israel's God so that they share in the identity of the Spirit-giver. The previous analysis also coheres with Richard Bauckham's hermeneutic of divine identity Christology: Luke includes Jesus within the identity of Israel's God by attributing to him the unique role of the Spirit-giver.¹ As noted in chapter 4, Max Turner has argued for a divine identity Christology in Jesus' role in the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2:33.² This chapter will also attempt to further develop Turner's thesis by analyzing the Spirit-giver motif in Luke's second volume. As with Luke's Gospel, the *act* of giving the Spirit in Acts has been associated primarily with Lukan pneumatology; therefore, as with the previous

¹For studies on Lukan Christology in Acts, see C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 159-85; C. Kavin Rowe, "Acts 2.36 and the Continuity of Lukan Christology," *NTS* 53 (2007): 37-56; G. Stählin, "Τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apostelgeschichte 16:7)," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honor of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 229-52; J. Dupont, "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2:33," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 219-28.

²Max Turner, "The Spirit of Christ and Christology," in *Christ the Lord*, ed. Harold H. Rowdon (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1982), 168-90; idem, "The Spirit of Christ and 'Divine' Christology," in *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 413-36; idem, *Power from on High*, JPTSUP 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 267-317.

chapters, this chapter's focus on Christology will overlap with pneumatology. A brief comment on pneumatology in Acts is necessary before proceeding with the argument.

The Language of Giving the Eschatological Spirit

In Luke's Gospel, the eschatological act of "giving" the Spirit is described in diverse ways: (1) *αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί* (3:16), (2) *ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν* (11:13), and (3) *ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς* (24:49). It was concluded in the previous chapter, that despite the variety of terms, Luke links all three texts to each other, indicating that he is describing the same eschatological event: the fulfillment of Yahweh's promise to pour out his Spirit in order to restore his covenant people as an act of new exodus and new creation (Joel 3:1-2; Isaiah 32:15; 44:3; Ezekiel 36-37; Zechariah 12:10).

In Acts, a variety of terms is also employed by Luke to describe the *act* of "giving" the gift of the Spirit: (1) the language from Luke 3:16 of "baptizing" with the Spirit (*ὁμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ*; 1:5; 11:16), (2) the language from Luke 11:13 of "giving" the "gift" of the Spirit (*δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός*; 11:17; 8:18; 15:8), and (3) the language of Joel 3:1 (LXX) of God "pouring out" his Spirit (*λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα*; 2:17, 33; 10:45). In addition, Luke sometimes describes the outpouring of Spirit not from the perspective of the giver, but from the perspective of the ones receiving the Spirit: (1) the language of receiving the gift of the Spirit (*λήμψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*; 2:38; 1:8; 8:17, 19; 10:47; 19:2) and (2) the language of "being filled with the Spirit" (*ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου*; 2:4; 4:31). And lastly, Luke also presents the Spirit as the subject of the verb (rather than the object): (1) the Spirit "falls" upon groups of believers (*ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον*; 10:44; 8:16), and (2) the Spirit "comes upon" believers (*ἦλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτούς*; 19:6; 1:8).

The diverse ways Luke describes these eschatological events, the diverse metaphors used to describe the Spirit (e.g., *δύναμις*, *δωρεά*, *ἐπαγγελία*), and the various OT texts cited and alluded to, should caution the reader of Acts from collapsing Luke's Spirit-language into one controlling category. For example, some scholars have attempted to fit all of Luke's references to the eschatological Spirit under the categories "Spirit of prophecy" or "Spirit of empowerment." Although it is true that Luke emphasizes the effects of empowerment and prophecy upon the recipients of the Spirit (e.g., Acts 1:8; 2:17-21), these do not conflict with his emphasis on the Spirit's life-giving role in Israel's restoration (i.e., salvation; cf. e.g., 2:40, 47). As noted in chapters 2 and 3, in the OT and Second Temple literature, the prophetic and empowering effects of the Spirit are not separated from the overarching framework of Israel's restoration, which is consistently described as a new exodus and new creation. In addition, chapter 4 demonstrated that Luke's unique placement of John's prophecy regarding the "coming one" highlights the significance of the new exodus framework for understanding the act of giving the eschatological Spirit. The caution provided by James Dunn is helpful: "the action of the Spirit cannot be so neatly separated into distinct categories—that life-giving and empowering are two aspects of the same action of the Spirit, since both are aspects of the same Spirit, aspects of, as we might say, the Spirit's character, outworkings of the Spirit's presence."³

Argument

This chapter argues that the descriptions of Jesus as the Spirit-giver function in Acts to bind Jesus' identity to that of Israel's God. Thus, in Acts, Luke continues to develop his Spirit-giver motif in a way that parallels the function of this motif in his

³James D. G. Dunn, "'The Lord, the Giver of Life': The Gift of the Spirit as both Life-Giving and Empowering," in *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*, ed. I. Howard Marshall et al. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012), 2-3. Dunn uses the term "vitality" to capture the life-giving and empowering effects of the Spirit in Luke-Acts.

Gospel. There are three reasons that will be established to support this claim. First, the pattern that was observed in Luke’s Gospel—that of describing both Jesus and the Father as sharing the identity of Spirit-Giver—continues in Acts 2 where both Israel’s God and Jesus are portrayed as “pouring out” the eschatological Spirit. Second, the explicit reference to Jesus as the Spirit-giver (2:33) occurs within a co-text in which Luke presents Jesus as participating in other aspects of the unique divine identity (as in Luke 3:16 and 24:49). Third, later references to the Spirit-giver (e.g., 11:17) put “God” as the subject of the action; however, these references contain allusions to both Luke 3:16 and Acts 2:17, 33 suggesting that the term “God” (in these co-texts) includes both Jesus and the Father—the two characters who uniquely share the role as the eschatological Spirit-giver. The thesis of this chapter will be developed by an analysis of Acts 2, as well as the subsequent references to the Spirit-giver. In addition, this chapter will address two objections to the thesis by examining Jesus as the “receiver” of the Spirit (Acts 2:33) and the apostles’ apparent role as “Spirit-givers” (8:14-24).

The Shared Identity of the Spirit-Giver: Acts 2:1-40

The longed-for fulfillment of the narrative promise of Luke 3:16; 11:13; 24:49; and Acts 1:4-11 finally arrives during Pentecost when tongues like fire appear to the disciples and they are filled with the Holy Spirit (2:1-4). Peter explains to the crowd, which gathers in response to the mighty noise and the bizarre behavior of these Spirit-filled Jews, that what has taken place is the fulfillment of Joel’s prophecy: *καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν* (Joel 3:1, LXX). At the narrative level, Peter’s sermon is set against the backdrop of Israel’s new-exodus restoration (see below), a co-text that coheres with Peter’s own allusion to Israel’s restoration in the reference “all the house of Israel” (*πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ*; Acts 2:36; cf. Ezek 37:11). Although this sermon develops both Davidic and Mosaic Christologies, these christological categories do not conflict with the

divine Christology also evident in the sermon.⁴ This section attempts to demonstrate that Peter's/Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver in Acts 2:33 reveals a divine Christology because (1) he portrays both Jesus and Israel's God as acting in this unique role; (2) he connects this act with other aspects of the divine identity (e.g., Jesus sharing the divine throne); and (3) in its OT context, the act of pouring out the Spirit in Joel 3:1-5 is Yahweh's new-creation and new-exodus act of deliverance (see chap. 2), and in Peter's sermon the *act* of giving the Spirit is an act of *ὁ κύριος* whereby he inaugurates his promised restoration and re-creation of Israel. Against the backdrop of the OT, as well as the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, this act is unique to Israel's God in the age to come and Luke presents Jesus as participating in this role (i.e., *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*).

The Spirit-Giver and Israel's Restoration

Luke makes the outpouring of the Spirit motif both popular and prominent in his *δεύτερον λόγον*. The latter claim is demonstrated by the concentrated references in the opening of Acts, as well as by the fact that the fulfillment of this promise advances the narrative plot by enabling the disciples to bear witness to the exalted Messiah in Jerusalem (2:1-41), Judea and Samaria (8:9-25), and the ends of the earth (10:44-48; 19:1-7). As in his *πρῶτον λόγον*, Luke sets this motif against the backdrop of the hope for Israel's restoration. This is first evident in 1:8 where Jesus, responding to the disciples' question about when he will restore (*ἀποκαθιστάνεις*) the kingdom to Israel (1:6), repeats his promise (Luke 24:49) that the disciples will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon them (*ἀλλὰ λήμψετε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*; Acts 1:8).⁵ In addition, Luke's placement of the reconstitution of the twelve (1:12-26), prior to

⁴For studies which highlight the divine Christology of the Pentecost sermon, see Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, JSNTSup 12 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 156-87; Douglas Buckwalter, *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*, SNTS 89 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 173-205; Rowe, "Acts 2.36 and the Continuity of Lukan Christology," 37-56.

the outpouring of the Spirit (2:1-4) also functions to connect the gift of the Spirit and the fulfillment of Israel's restoration. Dietrich Rusam has helpfully noted that the placement of Pentecost immediately after the selection of Matthias (1:12-26) shows Luke's intent of linking the outpouring of the Spirit and Israel's restoration (symbolized by the twelve). Rusam observes,

Ebenso dient die Nachwahl des Matthias zum zwölften Apostel der Vorbereitung auf Pfingsten. Die Einmaligkeit von Pfingsten bewirkt die Einmaligkeit der Komplettierung des Apostelkreises, m.a.W.: Nur wegen der Geistverleihung an Pfingsten in Jerusalem musste die Zwölfzahl der Apostel wieder hergestellt werden.⁶

The restoration motif continues into Luke's portrayal of the first fulfillment (2:1-42). First, the narrator provides a list of "all the nations under heaven" (ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν; 2:5) from which the Jews staying in Jerusalem had come. These "godly men" heard the sound of the Spirit's descent on the disciples (2:2-4) and gathered together to discover what had occurred. The Jews depicted here are most likely from the Diaspora and represent the various lands to which the Jews had been dispersed.⁷

Second, Peter's exhortation to "the whole house of Israel" (πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ) to repent (2:36, 38) and to be baptized in the name of Jesus "for forgiveness of your sins" (2:38; cf. Isa 40:1-2) parallels the restoration theology present in the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel and the descriptions of John the Baptizer. In Luke 1-3, repentance (signified by participation in John's baptism) is followed by the promise of Spirit-baptism, which is the eschatological cleansing and ingathering of Israel (i.e., new exodus;

⁵Klaus B. Haacker, "Der Geist und das Reich im Lukanischen Werk," *NTS* 59 (2013): 336-45.

⁶Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, BZNW 112 (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 287-88; Jürgen Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 34-36. Cf. Thomas E. Phillips, *Acts within Diverse Frames of Reference* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 2009), 135: "God created God's people in Genesis through the twelve tribes of Israel. God created God's people in Acts through the twelve apostles."

⁷Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Sacra Pagina, vol 5 (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 47.

3:16-17). Peter's logic is similar: he commands the whole house of Israel to repent (signified by being baptized in the name of Jesus) and promises that they will receive the gift of the Spirit, which is described as the fulfillment of God's promise to restore his people (ὕμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν; v. 39). Richard Bauckham helpfully links the ending of Peter's Pentecost sermon with the eschatological ingathering. He writes,

In the form of Peter's preaching the twelve apostles commence their task of reconstituting the renewed Israel of the regathered twelve tribes. Appropriately, Peter's sermon ends with a proclamation to "the whole house of Israel" (Acts 2:36; cf. Lev 10:6; Num 20:29; 1 Sam 7:2-3; 2 Sam 6:5; Jer 9:26; 13:11; Ezek 3:7), a term which naturally encompasses all twelve tribes, in the Diaspora as well as in Jerusalem, and which readily suggests restoration (Ezek 20:40; 36:10; 37:11, 16; 39:25; 45:6). In Ezekiel 37, the term is associated with the reunification of the southern and northern tribes and their restoration to the land (37:15-22), as well as the giving of God's Spirit to revive and restore his people (37:14; cf. 39:29) and with the rule of the new David (37:24-25). Accordingly, in Acts 2 Israelites from the whole Diaspora return to God ('repent': Acts 2:38) and receive from the Davidic Messiah, enthroned in heaven, the promised gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:33, 38-39), which is not yet the 'restoration of all things' (Acts 3:21) but is the earnest of it.⁸

The restoration backdrop frames the Pentecost account and is helpful for interpreting the act of pouring out the Spirit in 2:17, 33.⁹ First, the act of pouring out the Spirit is the fulfillment of God's promise to restore his people: it is the act of the "coming one" who will baptize with the Spirit in order to cleanse and gather Israel to himself (Luke 3:16-17; cf. Acts 1:5). The allusions to the covenant ceremony of Exodus 19 and the citation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) also indicate that this act of restoration is the creation of a new people (i.e., a nation of prophets)—a people identified not by the Law, but by the

⁸Bauckham, "Restoration," 473. There is an already/not yet tension in Luke's restoration theology: the restoration of Israel that begins at Pentecost (2:1-39), extends to the Samaritans (8:4-25), and incorporates the Gentiles (10:34-48; 11:1-18) is the first-fruits of "the restoration of all things" (ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων; 3:21). The link between the restoration of Israel and the restoration of "all things" is also found in Isa40-66 where Israel's re-creation and restoration (chaps. 40-55) is portrayed as foreshadowing or anticipating the creation of a new heaven and new earth (65:17; 66:22).

⁹The significance of the restoration theme (i.e., new exodus) for Luke's Gospel was observed in chap. 4, "Israel's God and Israel's Messiah: The Identity of the Spirit-Giver in Luke's Gospel." In Acts, its significance is evident not only by the concentrated references in the opening chapters, but by its placement at the end of the narrative. To the Jews who visit him in Rome, Paul declares, "It is because of the hope of Israel (τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ) that I am bound with this chain" (28:20; cf. 26:6-7).

presence of the Spirit.¹⁰ Second, although Peter explicitly cites the fulfillment of one OT text (i.e., Joel 3:1-5), the allusions to the restoration prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel suggest that he did not see a conflict between Joel and these other eschatological promises.¹¹ The outpouring of the Spirit is the fulfillment of what was envisioned by Joel, Isaiah, Ezekiel, and likely Zechariah. Alan Thompson rightly notes the following connection between the references to the outpouring of the Spirit and the restoration context of Acts 1-2:

With descriptions of the Holy Spirit as ‘the promise,’ allusions to the prophetic hope of the Spirit in Isaiah, a direct quotation from the prophecy in Joel introduced as spoken by God about ‘the last days,’ together with language that recalls Ezekiel’s prophecy for ‘the whole house of Israel,’ Luke is emphasizing in a variety of ways that the pouring out of the Holy Spirit is to be understood as the fulfillment of God’s promise for the last days.¹²

¹⁰Cf. Jacques Dupont, “La nouvelle Pentecôte (Ac 2,1-1): Fête de la Pentecôte,” *AsSeign* 30 (1970): 30-34; Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 38; G. K. Beale, “The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1,” *TynBul* 56 (2005): 73-102; Alan J. Thompson, *One Lord, One People: The Unity of the Church in Acts in Its Literary Setting*, LNTS 359 (New York: T & T Clark 2008), 83-88. Thompson writes, “Just as the law was given to a people characterized by unanimity under the rule of God, so the Holy Spirit was given by the ascended Lord Jesus to a people characterized by unanimity under his rule” (88).

¹¹By citing Joel 3:1-5 within a co-text that alludes to Ezekiel’s and Isaiah’s prophecies, Luke parallels the Rabbis, as discussed in chap. 2. Allusions to Isaiah include the following: (1) the alteration of Joel’s *μετὰ ταῦτα το ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* (Acts 2:17; cf. Isa 2:2), (2) Peter’s reference to “this crooked generation” (*ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης*; Acts 2:40; cf. Isa 40:4; Luke 3:5), and (3) the reference to the “forgiveness of sins” (Acts 2:38; cf. Isa 40:1-2; Luke 3:2-3). Allusions to Ezek 36-37 include the following: (1) reference to *πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ* (Acts 2:36; cf. Ezek 37:11; 39:25 [MT]) and (2) the association of the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2:1-4 with a “great sound” and “wind” (*ἦχος ὡσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας*; Acts 2:2; cf. Ezek 37:7 [MT], 9).

¹²Alan J. Thompson, *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus: Luke Account of God’s Unfolding Plan*, NSBT 27 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), 129. *Contra*, Turner, *Power from on High*, 351-52, who argues that Luke does not develop his pneumatology in terms of Ezek 36, but in terms of Joel 3:1-5. Turner notes that this dichotomy is found in the works of Lukan scholars such as Lampe, Schweizer, Haya-Prats, Stronstad and Menzies. All of the scholars listed by Turner attempt to collapse Luke’s pneumatology into the category “Spirit of Prophecy” and see a disconnect between Ezekiel’s and Joel’s vision of the eschatological outpouring. However, in light of the conclusions reached in chaps. 2 and 3, the likely allusion to Ezek 36-37 in Luke 3:16-17 (see chap. 4), and the association in Acts between the Spirit and the effects of repentance, salvation, cleansing, conversion, and prophecy, this dichotomy is unwarranted and does not adequately explain the Lukan narrative.

Third, because the act of giving the Spirit is presented as the fulfillment of God's promise to restore his people, this act is linked with the unique identity of Israel's God as the one who will redeem and re-create them in the age to come (e.g., *καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται*).¹³ The fact that Luke includes Jesus within the identity of the Spirit-giver reveals a divine Christology: Jesus is portrayed as acting in a way characteristic of Israel's God in the age to come. However, the co-text of chapter 2 also contains evidence that Luke shapes his presentation of Jesus as the Spirit-giver in order to unite him to the unique divine identity.

Both Israel's God and Jesus Are the Spirit-Giver

The text in Acts 2:17 differs from the LXX of Joel in two ways.¹⁴ First, *μετὰ ταῦτα* is replaced with *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, emphasizing the eschatological significance of the Spirit's arrival.¹⁵ Second, Peter inserts *λέγει ὁ θεός* so that the agent of

¹³E.g., Jer 16:14-15. Cf. Phillips, *Acts within Diverse Frames of Reference*, 130-42, who observes new-creation imagery in Acts 1-2 through his intertextual reading of Genesis 1-12 and Acts 1-7. His essay "considers how three soteriological themes (i.e., creation, sin and its curse, and creation of God's people) play a central role in the narratives of Gen 1-12 and Acts 1-7 and how reading these narratives intertextually can enhance one's appreciation for the evocative power of these themes in Genesis and for their distant echoes in Acts" (130).

¹⁴V. 18 also contains a significance difference with the addition of the clause *καὶ προφητεῦσουσιν* at the end of the verse. This addition indicates the significance of the prophetic effects of the Spirit upon the new people of Yahweh. As the section on Joel 3:1-5 argued in chapt. 2, Joel's prophecy envisions the creation of a nation of prophets. For a study on the textual differences between Acts 2:17-21 and Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) from the perspective of discourse analysis, see Steven E. Runge, "Joel 2:28-32a in Acts 2:17-21: The Discourse and Text-Critical Implications of Variation from the LXX" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA, 18 November 2007), 1-9.

¹⁵James D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, Christianity in the Making, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009), 166; Haacker, "Der Geist und das Reich," 329-31. Cf. John B. Polhill, John, *Acts*, NAC, vol. 26 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 2001), 109, who states, "Joel's prophecy was originally given after a locust plague had ravaged the land, creating a severe famine. Joel called the people to repentance, promising the restoration of their prosperity and going on to foresee the coming of the Day of the Lord, the dawn of the messianic age, when the Spirit would be poured out on all of Israel. Peter could not miss its applicability to Pentecost. Joel began his prophecy by saying 'and afterward.' Peter's version refers more specifically to 'in the last days,' reflecting his conviction that the messianic age had already dawned in the resurrection of Christ, that we are indeed already living in the final days of God's saving history."

the outpouring is clearly identified as God. The clear attribution of the role of Spirit-giver as a result of a Lukan redaction is parallel to Luke 11:13 where Luke alters his source text in order to explicitly identify the God of Israel as the giver of the Spirit.

As his *Pfingstbericht* continues, Peter identifies Jesus as the Spirit-giver in a way that parallels the description of God as Spirit-Giver in 2:17. In Acts 2:33c Peter declares that Jesus ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο [τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου; 2:33b] ὁ ὑμεῖς καὶ βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε. God and Jesus are both subjects of the verb ἐκχέω that have the Spirit as its direct object. For Luke, they both share the role of Spirit-giver. Max Turner, who has developed the christological implications of Acts 2:33c (see chaps. 1 and 4) has observed that Peter's claim in 2:33, "relates the Spirit to Jesus in the same way as to God, the Father, himself."¹⁶ This pattern was also observed in chapter 4, where Luke's Gospel portrays *both* the Father and Jesus as "giving" the promised Spirit.

The Act of the Spirit-Giver within the Co-text of Peter's Sermon

There are two additional claims in Peter's sermon that support the thesis that Luke shapes his Pentecost account in way that reveals the shared identity between Jesus and God as the Spirit-giver. First, Peter claims that Jesus is ὁ κύριος (e.g., 2:36). As with the initial reference to Jesus' role as the Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16), Acts 2:33 is situated within a larger co-text in which Luke has again emphasized the shared identity of Jesus and God as κύριος. Rowe has observed that in Acts the ambiguous uses of κύριος increase once Jesus is exalted to the right hand of the Father.¹⁷ He writes, "From the perspective of the Christian community . . . , Jesus' 'location' in heaven tightens, as it were, the

¹⁶Turner, *Power from on High*, 277.

¹⁷E.g., the first ambiguous use of κύριος appears in 1:24 in the disciples' prayer regarding Judas's replacement (σὺ κύριε καρδιογνώστα πάντων ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα). While up until this point in the narrative prayer as always been addressed to the Father (Lord God), the reference to Jesus as κύριος in 1:21 and the use of the verb ἐκλέγομαι (cf. 1:2) suggest the risen Jesus as the referent; furthermore, in Acts 2 Israel's God is identified five times as κύριος (2:20, 21, 25, 34, 39) and Jesus is identified as κύριος two times (2:34, 36).

Verbindung between God and Christ in their acting as κύριος, for the work of the Father and the Son in heaven appears from earth to be undifferentiated.”¹⁸ The christological significance of designating Jesus as κύριος increases in light of Peter’s quotation of Joel 3:1-5 where in verse 5 κύριος is not simply a title for Israel’s God but represents the divine name (cf. 2:39). Acts 2:38 (βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν) provides a parallel to Peter’s quotation of Joel 3:5 in Acts 2:21 (πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται). For Luke, those who will be saved (Joel 3:5) are those who receive “the forgiveness of sins” and the “promise of the Spirit”; this is why the narrator summarizes Peter’s promise in verses 38-39 with the command, “Be saved (σώθητε) from this crooked generation” (2:40).¹⁹ Thus, to be baptized in the name of Jesus the Messiah is parallel with calling upon the name of the Lord.

¹⁸Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 201. Cf. Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, 184, who writes, “From the point of view of the community . . . the work of Jesus seems completely identical with that of the Father, therefore both can be designated as ‘Lord’ and can be represented as the instigator of the saving events which the community now experiences.” *Contra*, Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*, JSNTSupp 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 142: “Though Luke’s use of the title for both Jesus and God may at times imply Jesus’ equality or identity with God, the present context seems to suggest (primarily, at least) *messianic* lordship, that is, the universal authority that Jesus the Christ possesses by virtue of his status at God’s right hand.” Strauss fails to acknowledge that the actions of Jesus, the Lord, go beyond messianic expectation and reflect a role that was reserved for Yahweh alone. Jesus is not simply on the Davidic throne, ruling over Israel, he has been exalted to share the very throne of God himself and his sovereign rule over all reality. In addition, by attributing to Jesus the role of Spirit-giver, Luke assigns to Jesus a role that was particular to the identity of Israel’s God in the age to come (see chap. 2). Davidic Christology cannot explain Jesus pouring out the Spirit, sharing the divine throne, and receiving the divine name. This is better explained as an unveiling of Jesus’ divine identity.

¹⁹This parallel between Acts 2:17-21 (Joel 3:1-5) and Acts 2:38-39 is strengthened by the verb προσκαλέω in v. 39. At the end of Joel 3:5 (LXX), which Peter does not quote, Joel describes those who will be saved as a “remnant” who escape the coming wrath καθότι εἶπεν κύριος καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται (“just as the Lord said and the ones who have good news preached to them, whom the Lord has summoned”). In Acts 2:39 Peter declares ὑμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (“For the promise is for you and your children and for all who are distant, whomever the Lord our God might summon”). Those who receive the Spirit because they repent and are baptized are the fulfillment of the eschatological remnant envisioned by Joel: they are the ones the Lord God has summoned.

Second, Peter’s claim that Jesus shares God’s throne goes beyond Davidic Christology and functions to include Jesus within God’s unique sovereignty over all things. The exaltation of Jesus τῆ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς (Acts 2:33a) and the use of Psalm 110:1 [LXX 109:1] as Scriptural proof for this claim (Acts 2:34-35; cf. Luke 20:41-44) indicate that Luke shapes Acts 2:14-41 in such a way as to include Jesus in the unique identity of Israel’s God. As noted, Bauckham has argued that within Second Temple Jewish literature Yahweh’s unique identity is articulated in the claim that he is the sole ruler of all things.²⁰ Although God employs servants to assist him in this role, none of these creatures are ever described as sharing in his rule. “[T]he participation of other beings in God’s unique supremacy over all things is ruled out, in the case of . . . [his] sovereignty over the cosmos, by placing them in strict subordination as servants, excluding any possibilities of interpreting their role as that of co-rulers.”²¹ The claim that Jesus is exalted to the right hand of God reveals that Jesus is sharing in God’s sovereign rule, he is participating in the unique divine sovereignty.

Outside of the New Testament, the writers of the Second Temple Jewish literature do not cite or allude to Psalm 110:1 and nowhere is it ever applied to any exalted heavenly figures (angels or patriarchs)—not even the Messiah.²² This implies that Luke’s narrative presentation of Jesus transcends traditional christological categories,

²⁰Richard Bauckham, “Christ Crucified,” 9.

²¹Ibid., 11.

²²Ibid., 22. Bauckham acknowledges the *Testament of Job* (33:3) as the possible exception; however, its use there is very different from that found in the New Testament. In Luke’s Gospel, Jesus cites Psalm 110:1 in 20:42-43 and alludes to it in 22:69. It is the latter reference that leads to the charge of blasphemy against Jesus and ultimately to his execution. For an analysis of the charge of blasphemy in 22:69 against the backdrop of the Second Temple period, see Darrell Bock, “The Son of Man and the Debate over Jesus’ ‘Blasphemy,’” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 181-91. Bock concludes, “It is now easier to see why Jesus’ reply that the son of Man would be seated at the right hand of the Father is blasphemous to Jewish ears. It was *worse* than claiming that he had the right to go into the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem The remark offended both God and the high priest as God’s appointed representative of the people” (188).

like Davidic Christology. Although much of Peter's sermon does reflect Davidic Christology and Jesus' exaltation *does* fulfill God's promise to set one of David's descendents on the Davidic throne (Acts 2:30-32), the description of Jesus as sharing in the unique rule of God, goes beyond traditional Messianic expectation.²³

Mark Strauss has persuasively argued for the unity of Peter's argument in Acts 2:22-36, a unity that is built primarily around two Davidic quotations prophesying about his future descendent, the Messiah.²⁴ Peter employs Psalm 16:8-11 [LXX 15:8-11] to show that David spoke beforehand about the resurrection of the Messiah (Acts 2:25-28) and Psalm 110:1 [LXX 109:1] to support his claim regarding the Messiah's exaltation at God's right hand (2:33-35). Both of these Psalms are linked by the identical phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν μου and the word κύριος (Acts 2:25, 34). This emphasis on Davidic Christology leads Strauss to conclude that "Luke's primary christological purpose" is on Jesus' status as the messianic king, not on his identity as God's co-regent.²⁵ However, this conclusion is unwarranted for two reasons. First, Strauss does not appear to consider the christological significance of the claim that Jesus shares the throne of God. As noted above, Bauckham has demonstrated that God's act of ruling his creation is an aspect of his unique divine identity, thus to include Jesus within this role is to include him within the very identity of God. Second, Strauss operates from the assumption that there is a separation between Davidic and Divine Christology in Luke's narratives. That is, he sees

²³The failure of Davidic Christology to explain the entirety of Luke's narrative presentation of Jesus is foreshadowed in Luke 20:41-44 where Jesus himself claims that the Messiah is more than David's son and uses Psalm 110:1 [LXX 109:1] to support this claim. Chap. 4 also noted that Davidic Christology cannot explain Luke's application to Jesus Yahweh's role of effecting the new exodus through the act of baptizing with the Holy Spirit (Luke 3:16-17).

²⁴Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah*, 131-47. For an insightful, intertextual reading of the Psalms quotations in Acts 2:14-36, see David P. Moessner, "Two Lords 'at the Right Hand'? The Psalms and an Intertextual Reading of Peter's Pentecost Speech (Acts 2:14-36)," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Philips (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 215-32.

²⁵*Ibid.*, 144.

an either/or choice as to whether Luke is presenting Jesus as the Davidic Messiah or the divine Lord, when in fact, for Luke, it is both/and. Jesus is identified in terms of Davidic Christology: he is David's son who receives the throne of his father (Luke 1:32; Acts 2:30-31); his ministry from Galilee, through Samaria, to Judah is the attempt to restore the kingdom of David;²⁶ and in his resurrection and exaltation he fulfills the promises of David (Acts 2:25-35). Luke's Jesus is also identified in terms that go beyond any description of David or the Jewish expectations of a Davidic Messiah: he is united to God in his identity as *κύριος*, in his role as co-sovereign, and in his act of pouring out the Holy Spirit. The latter descriptions are best explained as Luke's attempt to include Jesus within the unique identity of Israel's God.²⁷

Subordinate Christology? Jesus as the Spirit-Receiver in Acts 2:33

Within the context of the OT and the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, Luke's depiction of Jesus as the giver of the eschatological Spirit (Acts 2:33) is an anomaly. Chapter 2 demonstrated that this role was particular to Yahweh's divine identity in the age to come and was consistently linked with his particular roles of creator and redeemer. The literature of the Second Temple period (chap. 3) continues to portray this act as unique to Israel's God and does not attribute this role to any other figure. (Even in *Joseph and Aseneth*, where Joseph appears to have a role in bestowing the Spirit to Aseneth, this act is portrayed as different than God's act.) Thus in portraying Jesus as pouring out the eschatological Spirit in the same way that God pours out the Spirit, Luke attributes to the Messiah a role that was unique to the divine identity of Israel's God. Thus far, the argument regarding Acts 2:33 has been that in portraying both Jesus and the

²⁶Scott Hahn, "Kingdom and Church in Luke-Acts," in *Reading Luke*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 305.

²⁷The paradox of this both/and approach accords with Luke 3:16-22 where Jesus is portrayed as both the Spirit-giver and the Spirit-receiver.

Father as the Spirit-giver, Luke has united the identity of Jesus with the identity of Israel's God in their shared role as the Spirit-giver. This is evident in the fact that both God and Jesus are portrayed as the Spirit-giver, and by the fact that Luke incorporates this motif into a co-text in which he has attributed to Jesus other key aspects of the divine identity (e.g., sovereign lordship and the title/name *κύριος*). Davidic Christology cannot account for this theological development.

One may object to this thesis (as well as the argument in chap. 4) by countering that Luke does not portray Jesus as sharing the unique divine identity of the Spirit-giver, but rather, as the agent *through* whom Yahweh fulfills his promise to pour out his Spirit as an act to restore and re-create his people. In the opening of the Pentecost sermon, Peter identifies Jesus as a man (*ἄνθρωπος*) through whom God did mighty deeds, wonders, and signs (2:22). He was the anointed agent through whom God healed the sick, exorcised demons, and raised the dead; Jesus, is the agent in God's (the primary agent) plan to restore his people. Does this "agent Christology" best explain Luke's presentation of Jesus as the Spirit-giver? Is he simply the anointed one through whom God gives the eschatological Spirit to his people? Some scholars believe this is the case and point to the fact that in Acts 2:33 Jesus is presented as the Spirit-receiver, before he acts as the Spirit-giver.²⁸ This reception of the Spirit appears to support a subordinistic Christology, which many scholars view as incongruous with a divine Christology.

When did Jesus receive the Spirit? Peter's sermon (2:14-36) is rhetorically structured so as to move his hearers to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus (2:37-40). Peter exposes their need for (eschatological) repentance by demonstrating that as a people (*Ἰσραηλιῖται; πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ*) they had opposed God by rejecting and crucifying the Messiah. Peter's argument recounts the various stages of the life of Jesus as revealed

²⁸E.g., Christopher M. Tuckett, *Christology and the New Testament* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 144, argues that the act of "receiving" the Spirit in 2:33 emphasizes Jesus' subordination to God.

in Luke’s Gospel²⁹ (his Messianic ministry of restoration [v. 22], his death [v. 23], his resurrection [vv. 24-32], and his exaltation [vv. 33-34]) and shows that each stage was approved by God, consistent with the OT’s promises regarding the Davidic Messiah, and ultimately part of God’s plan—despite the ignorant attempt of the people to thwart it. Peter’s argument reaches its climax in verse 36 where he contrasts the action of the people toward Jesus with the action of God toward Jesus: ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.³⁰

The main action in verse 33 (ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὃ ὑμεῖς καὶ βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε) is modified by two participial clauses: (1) τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς, and (2) τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς. Syntactically, these clauses can either indicate a temporal or a causal relationship to the main clause (e.g., “After being exalted . . . and after receiving the promise . . . , he has poured this out” or “Since he was exalted . . . and since he received the promise”). In either case, there appears to be an association between the exaltation and the receiving: Jesus received the promise of the Father at the same time he was exalted.

However, the reader of Luke’s Gospel has already been informed that Jesus received the Spirit at his baptism: καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτόν (Luke 3:22).³¹ The Spirit’s descent upon Jesus to identify him as the Son of God and to empower him for his Messianic mission is paradigmatic for the disciples’, Samaritans’, and Gentiles’ experience of the eschatological Spirit, which

²⁹The birth narrative is excluded from Peter’s sermon.

³⁰V. 36 should be interpreted as a summary of Peter’s entire argument and not just the exaltation. God made him Lord and Messiah by doing mighty works through him, by having him crucified, by raising him from the dead, and by exalting him to his right hand to share his divine identity as Israel’s Lord. Ps 110:1 suggests that David’s Lord did not become Lord at the exaltation, but was already Lord before being exalted; this interpretation coheres with the narrative logic of Luke’s Gospel.

³¹In the phrase, τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, the genitive is in apposition with the “promise” indicating that the promise is or consists of the Holy Spirit.

throughout Acts is described as their reception of the Spirit (cf. 1:8; 2:38; 8:15, 17, 19; 10:47; 19:2). Is it possible, then, that Peter is referring to Jesus' "reception" of the Spirit at his baptism and not a new reception that occurred at his exaltation? The advantage of this interpretation is that it coheres with Peter's exhortation to "all the house of Israel" in verse 38: "Repent . . . and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Peter's hearers would receive the promise of the Spirit (cf. v. 39) in the same way that the (now) exalted Jesus had received the Spirit at his baptism, they will follow in the new way inaugurated by Israel's Messiah.

The descent of the Spirit upon Jesus is certainly paradigmatic for the way in which the disciples, Jews, Samaritans, and Gentiles receive the Spirit, and yet it is doubtful that verse 33 is referring to Luke 3:23. The structure of the sermon (i.e., moving in chronological stages), the logic of the verse, and the particle *τέ*, suggest that the receiving occurred with the exaltation. Why then did Peter/Luke use *λαμβάνω* to describe Jesus' "heavenly" reception of the Spirit when, in light of the entire Luke-Acts narrative, this verb would be an appropriate summary of Jesus' Spirit-baptism? The language of "receiving" is probably used to echo Moses receiving the Law on Sinai. As noted above, Luke's shaping of the Pentecost story (2:1-41) contains allusions to Exodus 19. As such, it is plausible that along with shaping Jesus' identity in terms of the unique identity of Israel's God *and* in terms of Davidic Christology, Luke *also* shapes Jesus' identity in terms of Moses' reception and giving of the Law at Sinai.³²

³²See, e.g., Johnson, *Acts*, 46, who comments regarding Acts 2:1-4, "So thoroughly does Luke use the Moses story elsewhere . . . , that it would be surprising if the use of sound and fire and languages here did not allude to the Sinai event. In fact, as we shall see, Luke has the short reference to the giving of the law through Moses in the Stephen speech (Acts 7:38) exactly match the description given by Peter of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33). Moses 'received living words to give to us'; Jesus 'received the Holy Spirit, poured out this thing you see and hear.'" This Moses typology is strengthened in Acts 3:22-26 by Peter's identification of Jesus as the promised prophet like Moses. Cf. Dupont "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2:33," 219-28.

Jesus receives the Spirit in order to pour out the Spirit. In light of the Mosaic Christology alluded to in verse 33, and Peter's earlier references to God doing mighty deeds *through* Jesus, is it best to interpret Jesus' act of pouring out the Spirit as that of an agent *through* whom God is pouring out the Spirit? Or, to put it another way, doesn't the fact that Jesus must receive the Spirit in order to pour it out suggest that Jesus is subordinate to the Father? Although affirming Luke's Mosaic Christology (as with the Davidic Christology mentioned above), I do not believe that the concept of "agent" can fully explain Luke's description of Jesus as the Spirit-giver and the fact that Jesus had to "receive" the Spirit does not support a subordinistic Lukan Christology. First, verse 33 does not imply that God was pouring out the Spirit *through* Jesus, it presents Jesus pouring out the Spirit in the same manner in which Israel's God is presented as pouring out the Spirit in 2:17-18. For Peter, Jesus is the one who pours out the Spirit, just as Luke 3:16 and 24:49 promised he would do. In Acts 8:14-18, Luke describes "agents" through whom the Spirit comes and there the preposition *διὰ* is used (see next section). The language in verse 33 connects Jesus' act of giving the Spirit with that of God's act of giving the Spirit (vv. 17-18) and not the later descriptions of the apostles as agents *through* whom the Spirit is given. If Luke wanted to describe Jesus as the one *through* whom God poured out the Spirit, he certainly could have done this (as he did in 2:22). Claiming that Jesus is simply an agent or subordinate of Israel's God who is the direct giver of the Spirit does not account for the actual language used to describe this activity: Jesus is the one who gives/pours out/baptizes with/sends the Spirit in a way that parallels God the Father's giving/pouring out the Spirit in the OT and within the Lukan narrative itself. They share the role and identity of the Spirit-giver.

Second, Bauckham's argument regarding divine identity Christology is a better explanation of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver in verse 33. As discussed in chapter 4, according to Bauckham, the NT authors unveil a divine Christology by including Jesus within the unique identity of Israel's God; that is, by ascribing to Jesus

actions which were particular to Yahweh’s divine identity. For Bauckham, these acts included (but are not limited to) the act of creation, redemption from Egypt, and sovereignty. It was argued in chapter 2 that the act of giving the Spirit was particular to Yahweh’s divine identity in the age to come and that it was consistently linked with his role as the creator and redeemer; Luke, in Acts 2:33, connects it with the role of divine sovereignty.³³ Jesus is acting in a way that, within the Lukan co-text, as well as in the OT, would identify him as the revelation of Israel’s God.

Peter’s Summary of Pentecost in Acts 5:31-32

It was argued above that the language of Acts 2:33 suggests that Jesus pours out the Spirit in a way that parallels Yahweh pouring out the Spirit in Acts 2:17 (Joel 3:1-2, LXX). In addition, within a co-text that portrays Jesus as sharing the divine throne and receiving the divine name/title, the act of giving the Spirit functions to unite Jesus with Israel’s God (to use Kavin Rowe’s terminology) or to include Jesus within the unique identity of Israel’s God (to use Richard Bauckham’s terminology). This interpretation is strengthened in view of Peter’s summary of the Pentecost event in Acts 5:31-32:

τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα
 ὑψώσεν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ [τοῦ] δοῦναι
 μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν
 ἁμαρτιῶν. καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν μάρτυρες
 τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ
 ἅγιον ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν
 αὐτῷ.

God exalted him [Jesus] to his right hand as leader and savior in order to give repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins. And we are witnesses of these things, as well as the Holy Spirit, whom God gave to the ones who obey him.

In his testimony before the Sanhedrin (v. 27), Peter, speaking on behalf of the apostles (v. 29), provides a summary of his Pentecost sermon.³⁴ He begins by contrasting

³³ Cf. Steve Walton, “‘The Heavens Opened’: Cosmological and Theological Transformation in Luke and Acts,” in *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*, ed. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough, LTS 355 (New York: T & T Clark, 2008), 67. Walton writes, “The Spirit . . . in Acts 2:33-36 is the executive power of the exalted Jesus, by which he exercises his sovereignty over the world.”

³⁴ Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 232.

the action of God toward Jesus with the action of the Jewish leaders: “The God of our fathers raised Jesus, whom you killed by hanging him on a tree” (v. 30; cf. 2:36). Peter proceeds by stating that God exalted Jesus in order that he (i.e., Jesus) might give repentance and forgiveness to Israel (v. 31). Peter concludes by asserting that he, the other apostles, and the Holy Spirit are witnesses of this event (v. 32a). Using a relative clause, Peter describes the Spirit as the one “whom God gave to those who obey him” (v. 32b). This snapshot of his *Pfingstbericht* portrays “God” as the one who gave the Spirit. However, the reader of Acts 2 is aware that both Israel’s God (i.e., Yahweh) and Jesus are the Spirit-giver at Pentecost. It is possible that in 5:32 Peter affirms the former’s role in this act, but is now excluding Jesus from the role of Spirit-giver. However, this interpretation does not cohere with the narrative development of this motif in Luke-Acts. By describing both Jesus (Luke 3:16; 24:49; Acts 2:33) and the Father (Luke 11:13; Acts 2:17) as the Spirit-giver, a narrative reading of 5:32 leads to the conclusion that the term “God,” in Acts 5:32, should include both Jesus and the Father. Through his Spirit-giver motif, Luke has included Jesus within the unique identity of Israel’s God, the one who gives the eschatological Spirit. This conclusion is supported by the two subsequent references to the Spirit-giver; both of which cite “God” as the explicit subject but do so in a way that includes Jesus within the divine identity of the Spirit-giver.

The Continued Inclusion of Jesus within the Divine Identity of the Spirit-Giver: Acts 11:17 and 15:8

Although Luke clearly views the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Samaritans (8:14-17), Gentiles (10:44-48), and followers of John the Baptist (19:1-7) as identical with the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Jews in Acts 2 (cf. 10:47) and as a fulfillment of John’s prophecy in Luke 3:16 (cf. 19:5), each ‘mini’ Pentecost differs slightly from the original. The main difference, in light of the present thesis, is the lack of any explicit subject of the outpouring. In Acts 8 and 10, the Spirit is the subject of passive verbs (*δίδοται*, 8:18; *ἐκκέχυται*, 10:45) and in chapter 19, the Spirit is the subject of the verb:

ἦλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτούς (19:6).³⁵ The paradigmatic role that Acts 2 has in shaping these subsequent outpourings suggests that the reader should understand both God and Jesus as the agents of the outpourings. This claim is further strengthened by the fact that in explaining the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles, Peter, on two occasions, states “God” as the subject of this act (11:17; 15:8). However, the Lukan context suggests that Jesus should be included in the identity of “God,” the Spirit-giver. This section attempts to show that when Peter summarizes the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles, he does so in a way that includes Jesus within the divine identity.

Acts 11:15-18

ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαι με λαλεῖν ἐπέπεσεν
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτούς ὡσπερ
καὶ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ.

ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου
ὡς ἔλεγεν· Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν
ὔδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ
θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν πιστεύσασι ἐπὶ τὸν
κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐγὼ τίς ἤμην
δυνατὸς κωλύσαι τὸν θεόν;

Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἠσύχασαν καὶ
ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες· ἄρα καὶ
τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς
ζωὴν ἔδωκεν.

When I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell upon them as upon us in the beginning. But I remembered the word of the Lord when he said, “Indeed John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit. If then God gave the same gift to them as also to us who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, then what power was I to oppose God?” But when they heard these things they were silent and glorified God saying, “Then also to the Gentiles God has given repentance for life!”

Peter summarizes the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles by concluding, “God has given the same gift to them as [he gave] to us who believed in the Lord Jesus the Messiah” (v. 17; cf. 5:32). Within the scope of Luke’s two-volume narrative, there are strong reasons for interpreting the term “God” as including both Israel’s God (i.e., the Father) and Israel’s Messiah, Jesus. That is, the identity of the Spirit-giver is none other than Israel’s God, but Luke has developed this motif in such a way that both Jesus and the Father participate in this eschatological role. First, Peter alludes to Acts 2:1-4 when

³⁵The Spirit is also the direct object of the verb λαμβάνω (8:15, 19; 10:47; 19:2). This combination is also part Luke’s ‘gift-giving’ metaphor for describing the outpouring of the Spirit.

he compares the descent of the Spirit upon the Gentiles with the filling of the disciples with the Spirit (“the Holy Spirit fell upon them as upon us in the beginning”). As noted above, this filling is explained in terms of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) and Peter’s explanation that both God and Jesus have poured out the Spirit. The one who gave the Spirit to the disciples in the beginning, the same one who gave the Spirit to the Gentiles.

Second, Peter alludes to Luke 3:16 and the Spirit-baptism effected by the Messiah. Although Peter is quoting Jesus, and not John, Jesus’ promise in Acts 1:5 is itself a reference to John’s promise in Luke 3:16 (cf. 19:4).³⁶ Thus, the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles is itself a fulfillment of John’s promise that the coming one (i.e., the Messiah) will baptize with the Holy Spirit. In other words, in order to explain God’s act of giving the Spirit to the Gentiles, Peter cites texts in which Jesus is portrayed as the Spirit-giver.

Third, not only are Jesus and Israel’s God united in the act of giving the Spirit, but Luke portrays both as also “giving repentance” (δίδωμι; 5:31; 11:18). In 11:18, when the church responds to Peter’s report, they declare that “God has also given repentance to the Gentiles.” In 5:31 (see above), Peter claimed that God exalted Jesus in order that he [Jesus] might give repentance and forgiveness of sins to Israel.³⁷ In 5:31-32, the act of giving repentance and forgiveness is associated with the act of giving the Holy Spirit. So also, in 11:18 the act of giving repentance that leads to life is also associated with God giving the gift of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the reference to the Spirit-giver in 11:17 is placed within a co-text in which God’s act of giving repentance alludes to Jesus’ act of giving repentance.³⁸ As in Acts 2:33, the co-text also supports a divine-Christology

³⁶Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 364; Robert W. Wall, *The Acts of the Apostles*, in vol. 10 of *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), 169.

³⁷Cf. Wall, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 169, who argues that 11:18 alludes to 5:30-32.

³⁸In describing the effects of the gift of the Spirit as “life” (ζωή), Peter implies that the act of giving the Spirit is an act of new creation. The phrase “in the beginning” (ἐν ἀρχῇ; v. 15) to refer to the Pentecost event and the allusion to Luke 3:16 also strengthen the new creation imagery in this text.

interpretation of the Spirit-giver motif. The allusions to Acts 2:17, 33 and Luke 3:16, which describe Jesus as the Spirit-giver, imply that Jesus is included within the divine identity of the Spirit-giver in Acts 11:17.

Acts 15:8-9

At the Jerusalem Council (15:1-21), Peter again summarizes the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles in Acts 10:44-48. He states, “And God, the heart-knower testified to them, by giving the Holy Spirit just as also to us; and he made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith” (*καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν τῇ πίστει καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*; 15:8-9). The emphasis in Peter’s statement, just as in 11:15-18, concerns the similarities between the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Jews and the Gentiles. God acted toward the Gentiles in the same manner that he acted toward the Jews: he gave them the Holy Spirit. Unlike 11:15-18, there are no clear references to previous texts in the Lukan narrative, suggesting that the divine Spirit-giver in 15:8 includes Jesus. However, there are two possible connections. First, the parallel between *δοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* and *καθάρισας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν* suggests that the act of giving the Spirit is an act of cleansing. This association between the Spirit and cleansing also occurs in Luke 3:16-17 where the parallels with water baptism and the association with the eschatological cleansing (v. 17) imply that the act of giving the Spirit is an act of eschatological cleansing (cf. Ezek 36). It is possible, then, that Peter alludes to John’s promise that the coming one will baptize with the Holy Spirit. Second, the only other use of *καρδιογνώστης* occurs in Acts 1:24 where the apostles pray to *κύριος*, the heart-knower of all. It is likely that *κύριος*, in 1:24, refers to Jesus, since in Acts chapter 1 the term is used exclusively with reference to him (e.g., 1:6, 21). Thus, as in 11:15-18 (noted above), the act of giving the Spirit in 15:8 occurs within a co-text in which “God” is described in terms that was previously used to describe Jesus; just as in

11:18, “God” is described with an action that in 5:31 had been used to describe Jesus (i.e., giving repentance).

Summary

In the final references to the Spirit-giver, it is possible that Luke includes Jesus within the term “God.” This is seen most clearly in 11:15-18 where previous references to Jesus’ role as the Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16; Acts 2:33) are incorporated into Peter’s statement that “God” gave the Spirit to the Gentiles. Furthermore, this reference occurs within a co-text which describes “God” (11:18) in terms that were previously used to describe the exalted Jesus (5:31). In addition, the reference in 15:8 contains possible allusions to earlier texts that were used to describe Jesus. Within the world of the narrative, Luke has described both Jesus and Israel’s God as the Spirit-giver and in so doing has united them in such a way that the former is now included in the identity of the latter. Therefore, when the reader comes across references to “God” the Spirit-giver (5:32; 11:18; 15:8) he cannot help but associate Jesus with that divine role.³⁹ However, it is still possible that, for Luke, the act of giving the Spirit is not unique to the divine identity and therefore contains little christological significance. The final section of this chapter will address Acts 8:14-17, in which the Peter and John have a role in the outpouring of the Spirit.

³⁹That the narrative motif of the Spirit-giver has functioned to unite Jesus and Israel’s God so that they share the identity of the Spirit-giver is corroborated by the reference in 16:7 to the Holy Spirit as the “Spirit of Jesus” (τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ). This description parallels other references to the Spirit in relation to Israel’s God: τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ (8:20); πνεῦμα κυρίου (8:39); ὁ πνεῦμα κυρίου (5:9). Cf. Stählin, “Τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apostelgeschichte 16:7),” 252, who argues, based on 16:7, “The work of the Lord Jesus and God’s work are an indissoluble unity. The same is true with regard to the work of the Spirit and Christ’s work. Within this frame there is no room for conceptions of a consequent subordination, either with regard to the Spirit or with regard to Christ. Rather there is a close cooperation of Κύριος and spirit which is, in the most concentrated form, expressed by the unique phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ.”

The Apostles and Disciples as Spirit-Givers?

Jesus is the paradigm for ministry in Acts. The ministry inaugurated by Jesus is transferred to the apostles who, in turn, reenact much of what Jesus did in Luke's Gospel.⁴⁰ Just as Luke shaped his narrative of Jesus with various OT Spirit-anointed figures, so Luke shapes his narrative of the apostles and disciples with the Spirit-anointed figure *par excellence*. A few examples of this solidarity between Jesus and members of the Way will suffice: Stephen's arrest, trial, and death recall Jesus' arrest, trial, and death since both Stephen and Jesus allude to Daniel 7 and the Son of man at the right hand of God (Luke 22:69; Acts 7:54); Jesus commits his Spirit to the Father (Luke 23:46) and Stephen commits his Spirit to Jesus (Acts 7:59), and Jesus and Stephen forgive their executioners (Luke 23:34; Acts 7:60). Also, much of Paul's ministry and persecution is recounted in a way that recalls Jesus' ministry and persecution. For example, the Jews in the temple cry out against Paul, *αἶρε αὐτόν* (21:36), as the chief priests and rulers cried out against Jesus, *αἶρε τοῦτον* (Luke 23:18) and the Roman authorities agree that Paul is innocent (e.g., 25:25; 26:32), as Pilot repeatedly acknowledged Jesus' innocence (Luke 23:4, 14, 20).⁴¹ In addition, there are general parallels between Jesus in the Gospel and the disciples in Acts: like Jesus, the disciples receive and are empowered by the Holy Spirit; like Jesus, the disciples perform signs and wonders (i.e., physical healings, raising the dead, exorcisms), which testify to their God-appointed mission and message; like

⁴⁰E.g., compare Luke 4:1-13 where Jesus "was led by the Holy Spirit in the wilderness" (*ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*; 4:1) and came into conflict with the devil (4:2) and Acts 13:4-12 where Saul and Barnabas are "sent out by the Holy Spirit (*ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*; 13:4) where they come into conflict with a false prophet named, Bar-Jesus, whom Saul refers to as a "son of the devil" (*υἱὲ διαβόλου*; 13:10)

⁴¹C. K. Barrett, "Imitatio Christi in Acts," in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994), 254-55. Richard Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament* (New York: T & T Clark, 1996), 122, writes, "Many of the miracle stories in Acts deliberately mirror the Gospel's account of Jesus's deeds. To cite one particularly dramatic example, Peter's raising of Dorcas from death (Acts 9:36-43) closely recapitulates Jesus' raising of the daughter of Jairus (Luke 8:40-42, 49-56)."

Jesus, the apostles teach with authority (e.g., Acts 1:15-22; 2:14-40); like Jesus, the disciples preach repentance, forgiveness, and the kingdom of God.⁴² Thus Luke intentionally shapes his story of the early church in a way that shows that through them all that Jesus had begun to do and teach is continuing (Acts 1:1).

It has been the argument so far that the act of pouring out the eschatological Spirit was an act unique to God alone and, in fact, because of the consistent new creation and new exodus metaphors used to describe this act, it was an act that functioned to identify the unique divine identity in the age to come. This is the consistent view in the OT and Second Temple literature. In Luke's presentation of Jesus as the Spirit-giver, he too presents the role as unique to the divine identity, but includes Jesus within this unique identity so that the reader sees in Jesus the fulfillment of Yahweh's promises to restore his people. Part of the legitimacy of this claim rests upon the premise that no other figure is ever presented as giving the Spirit as Yahweh (and now Jesus) are presented. However, in light of Luke's *imitatio Christi* motif in Acts, it is not surprising that Luke presents apostles (8:14-17; 19:1-7)⁴³ and a disciple (9:10-18)⁴⁴ as having a role in the outpouring of the Spirit. This section will focus primarily on 8:14-17 since the description of Peter and John's role in the Spirit's coming is closer to the description of God as Spirit-giver and the conclusions made regarding this pericope help to understand the role Ananias and Paul have in the coming of the Spirit in 9:10-18 and 19:1-7 respectively. This section will argue the following claim: Although Peter and John are

⁴²The solidarity between the disciples and Jesus was foreshadowed in at least two instances in Luke's Gospel. First, when Jesus sent out the twelve and gave them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases (9:1-6). Second, when he sent out the seventy-two, to whom he gave authority "to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy" (10:1-20).

⁴³In 8:14-17 the Holy Spirit comes to the Samaritans through Peter and John praying and laying their hands upon the believing Samaritans. In 19:1-7, the Holy Spirit comes upon the former disciples of John the Baptist when Paul lays his hands on them.

⁴⁴In Acts 9:10-18 the text implies that the Spirit came upon Saul when Ananias laid his hands on him (cf. 9:12, 17).

presented as having a role in the outpouring of the Spirit in Samaria, they are not presented as the direct/primary givers of the Spirit, but rather the agents through whom God gives the Spirit. As such, their actions do not undermine the thesis, but rather serve to support it since Peter and John are not described as giving the Spirit in the same way as God and Jesus give the Spirit.

Peter and John's Role in the Pentecost at Samaria

In his Gospel, Luke showed a special interest in the Samaritans. He alone records Jesus traveling among the Samaritan villages on his way to Jerusalem (9:51-56), the story of the thankful Samaritan leper (17:11-19), and the parable of the good Samaritan (10:29-37). In Acts 8, Philip extends the disciples' witness of Jesus into Samaria because of the great persecution (*διωγμὸς μέγας*) that arose against the Jerusalem church (8:1). The programmatic texts of 1:8 and 2:38-39 converge in this episode as Philip bears witness to the risen Messiah (*ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν*; 8:5) and the promise of the eschatological Spirit is given to those who are "far off" (*πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν*; 8:14-17). In addition, the new exodus theme continues to develop as the Samaritans are now gathered into the restored people of God in fulfillment of God's promise to unite "all the house of Israel" (i.e., the twelve tribes) under the leadership of the Davidic Messiah (Ezek 37:14-28). David Ravens has observed the significance of the Samaritans for Luke's restoration theme:

The Israel theme continues after the ascension with the first act of the apostles, the election of Matthias. He completes the twelve who will judge the twelve tribes (1.21-26; cf. Luke 22.30) but the fact that he is never mentioned again shows that his sole function is to complete the number of judges. The obvious point that the twelve tribes must include the ten northern tribes has not been sufficiently emphasized by commentators. Yet the twelve tribe theme was sufficiently important to Luke for him to have apparently invented a new word, *δωδεκάφυλον* (Acts 26.7). . . . Luke's stress on the twelve tribes makes it quite clear that the restoration of Israel cannot be confined to the tribe of Judah alone and it is for this reason that the Samaritans take on the importance that they have for Luke. The

Samaritans are a stepping stone to the Gentile mission because there is a theological imperative to show signs of the healing of the old division of Israel. Hence the success attributed to Philip's mission before the Gentile mission can begin.⁴⁵

The narrator explains that the people of Samaria listened to Philip proclaim the Messiah (8:5) when they heard and saw the signs (σημεῖα) which he did (8:6). Through Philip's ministry to the Samaritans, the unclean spirits (πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα) departed and the paralyzed and lame were healed (8:6). Thus Philip imitates Jesus' ministry as described in Luke's Gospel (e.g., Luke 5:18-24; 7:21-23). Philip's ministry is effective and the Samaritans believe Philip concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Messiah (περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 8:12a). As a result, both men and women are baptized (8:12b). Yet the Holy Spirit does not immediately descend upon these believing Samaritans.

One of the key questions for Lukan scholars concerns the "delay" in the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Samaritans, Why did they not receive the Spirit immediately when they believed and were baptized? It is certainly possible to read Acts 2:38-39 as implying that the gift of the Holy Spirit should come immediately with repentance and baptism.⁴⁶ The question concerning the "delay" in the Spirit's coming is valid and important; yet, it is not the focus of this section.⁴⁷ Rather, this section concerns

⁴⁵David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*, JSNTSup 119 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 97.

⁴⁶μετανοήσατε, [φησὶν,] καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ λήψετε τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Polhill, *Acts*, 217, observes, "That the Samaritans had not yet received the Holy Spirit . . . is certainly not the usual pattern in Acts. Normally the receipt of the Spirit was closely joined to baptism as part of the normative experience of conversion and commitment to Christ (cf. 2:38)." Polhill, however, also notes that there is no set pattern presented in Acts: "Sometimes the Spirit is connected with the laying on of hands, sometimes not. Sometimes coming of the Spirit precedes baptism. Sometimes it follows" (218). The relationship between "belief" and the gift of the Spirit is strengthened in 11:18 where the participle πιστεύασιν modifying ἡμῶν can be translated as either (1) "us, who believed," (2) "us, when we believed," or (3) "us, after we believed." In the third option (cf. NASB, NET), there is not much difference between the disciples' reception of the Spirit and the Samaritans reception of the Spirit: they both received the Spirit after they believed and there appears to be a delay between the two.

⁴⁷The narrator alludes to a problem by stating that the Samaritans had "only" (μόνον) been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia:

the means by which the Samaritans receive the Spirit and whether or not the coming of the Spirit in 8:17 calls into question the claim that the act of giving the Spirit is unique to the identity of Israel's God:

Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀπόστολοι ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σαμάρεια τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, οἵτινες καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν ὅπως λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον· οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. τότε ἐπετίθεσαν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐλάμβανον πνεῦμα ἅγιον (Acts 8:14-17).

When the apostles in Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them, who, having come down, prayed for them in order that they might receive the Holy Spirit. For he had not yet fallen upon anyone, but they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid hands upon them and they received⁴⁸ the Holy Spirit.

There are two items of note. First, Peter and John pray *in order that* Samaria might receive the Holy Spirit. The narrator clearly links the coming of the Spirit with the prayer of the apostles indicating that the Spirit-baptism was in response to their prayer. Although Luke associates prayer and the eschatological Spirit throughout his two-volume narrative (e.g., Luke 3:21; 11:13; Acts 1:14 [?]; 9:10-19), this is the first explicit instance where the Spirit comes in response to prayer. Second, in connection with prayer, the Spirit comes upon the Samaritans due to the apostles laying their hands upon them. Peter and John have a role in pouring out the Holy Spirit upon the Samaritans.

There are various reasons for concluding that Luke presents John and Peter as imitating Jesus in his role as Spirit-Giver, which would in fact suggest that, for Luke, the act of giving the Spirit is not an exclusively divine function. First, the pattern of Jesus receiving (Luke 3:21; Acts 2:33) and then pouring out the Spirit (Acts 2:33) is possibly

Westminster Press, 1970), 55-68, has argued that there was something deficient in the Samaritan's response to the gospel: their belief was only intellectual and did not consist of true faith. Support for this view is the character Simon who, although believing and being baptized (8:13), appears only interested in the miraculous power of Simon, Peter, and John. Dunn also suggests that the apostles came to Samaria to remedy the problem of the Spirit's absence (*The Acts of the Apostles*, Narrative Commentaries [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996], 102). However, other than Simon, there is no reason to doubt the sincerity and genuineness of the Samaritans' response to Philip's preaching.

⁴⁸The imperfect verbs in v. 17 are likely ingressives.

being imitated by Peter and John, who, like Jesus received the Spirit (Acts 2:1-4) and now have a role in the outpouring of the Spirit. Second, the parallel context between 8:14-18 and 2:14-39 suggest that Luke is portraying Peter and John as Spirit-givers. Luke, in Acts 8:14-17, highlights the authority of the apostles (represented by Peter and John) as those who were appointed to rule over restored Israel (cf. Luke 2:28-30) and the context of Acts 2, highlights the authority of Jesus as the one who shares God’s divine throne and as Messiah rules over the house of Israel. Third, Simon the magician (8:9, 13, 18-24)⁴⁹ infers from the apostles’ action that they have the power to give the Holy Spirit. In fact, he himself wants this same authority “in order that on whomever I lay [my] hands, he might receive the Holy Spirit” (8:19).⁵⁰ Fourth, the language of v. 18 connects the apostles’ action with other references to God “giving” (δίδωμι; Luke 11:13; Acts 11:17; 15:8) in a way that suggests that Peter and John “gave” the Holy Spirit in the same way that God and Jesus do. The narrator states, “But when Simon saw that the Spirit *had been given* through the laying of hands, he offered them money” (ιδὼν δὲ ὁ Σίμων ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδεται τὸ πνεῦμα, προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα). The giving of the Spirit to the Samaritans is done *through* the apostles laying hands upon them. Fifth, this role is not an anomaly in Acts. Luke presents Ananias as having a role in Paul being filled with the Spirit⁵¹ and the Holy Spirit comes upon disciples of John the Baptist when Paul lays his hands on them (καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου τὰς χεῖρας ἦλθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ’ αὐτού; 19:6). It is possible that Luke’s emphasis on the solidarity

⁴⁹Luke does not actually use the term “magician” (μάγος) to describe Simon. Rather, Simon is one who practiced magic (μαγεύω; 8:9) and magical acts (μαγεία; 8:11).

⁵⁰δοτε κάμοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ὡς ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας λαμβάνη πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Peter rebukes Simon for supposing that he could purchase τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ with money (8:20). The metaphor of gift-giving is used with reference to the outpouring of the Spirit in Luke 11:13; Acts 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17.

⁵¹Ananias states that the Lord (ὁ κύριος) sent him, “in order that you might receive sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit” (ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πλησθῆς πνεύματος ἁγίου). The text implies that both of these acts occurred through the laying of hands upon Saul (9:12).

between Jesus and the disciples extends to the role of Spirit-giver. Like Jesus, the disciples received the Spirit (identifying them as the restored people of God), are empowered by the Spirit for their task of bearing witness to the risen Messiah, and pour out the Spirit upon those who believe and are baptized in the name of Jesus.

Peter and John as Agents through Whom God Gives the Spirit

Despite the strength and plausibility of the above argument, it is not likely that Luke is presenting the apostles/disciples (Peter, John, Ananias, and Paul) as giving the eschatological Spirit in the same way that Israel's God and Israel's Messiah are presented as giving the Spirit. There are similarities, nevertheless, there are also significant differences. These differences support the thesis that the act of giving the Spirit is unique to the identity of Israel's God and that Luke presents Jesus as included within this unique identity. First, the apostles are not presented as having the direct power to send the Spirit (even though Simon infers this). Simon's interpretation of the apostles' role is clearly mistaken because the Spirit is a gift given by God and not a power one can manipulate (8:18-20).⁵² Second, that the apostles' role in the coming of the Spirit is secondary and not primary is indicated by the fact that they prayed for the Spirit to come. This indicates that God alone is the primary giver of the Spirit and that the apostles' prayers and laying of hands are the means through which he gives the Spirit. Third, grammatically, the apostles are never the subject of the giving (as are both God and Jesus in 2:17, 33) and the passive verb (*δίδονται*) in verse 18 should be understood as a divine passive (cf. Acts 1:5).

Peter and John are the prophet-like agents through whom God gives the Spirit to the Samaritans and are not presented as acting as Spirit-givers. Luke presents Peter, John, Ananias, and Paul as agents through whom the Spirit is given and in so doing helps

⁵²Polhill, *Acts*, 219-20.

the reader to see the significance of his descriptions of Jesus as Spirit-giver. Jesus is not an agent (like these apostles/disciple) through whom God gives the Spirit, he is the subject of the act, the one who baptizes with, sends, and pours out the Holy Spirit—this is an act unique to the identity of Israel’s God and Luke includes Jesus within this divine identity.

An Old Testament Precedent for Peter and John’s Role?

Isaiah 32:15, 44:3, Zechariah 12:10, and Joel 3:1-2 present no intermediary as having a role in the outpouring of the eschatological Spirit.⁵³ A close parallel in Second Temple literature is the giving of the Spirit of life to Aseneth through Joseph’s kiss (see chap. 3). The only possible OT parallel to Peter and John in Acts 8 is Ezekiel’s role in the sending of the Spirit to animate the dry bones (Ezek 37:1-10). Although it is most likely that Luke’s recording of this event is designed to show continuity between the work of God in Samaria and his work in Jerusalem through the twelve (including the role of the twelve in judging the twelve tribes of Israel),⁵⁴ a couple of conceptual parallels with Ezekiel 37:1-10 are worth noting.

Against the backdrop of Israel’s restoration, the ingathering of the Samaritans through the cleansing work of the Spirit completes *in nuce* Yahweh’s promise to restore the whole house of Israel (cf. 2:36, πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ) by giving them a new Spirit. As noted above, the term “all the house of Israel” also occurs in Ezekiel 37:11-14 where Yahweh explains to Ezekiel the vision of the dry bones (37:1-10): καὶ ἐλάλησεν κύριος

⁵³For another possible OT parallel with Acts 8:14-17, see Deut 34:9. The narrator links the presence of the S/spirit of wisdom upon Joshua with Moses laying hands on him: καὶ Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυη ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος συνέσεως ἐπέθηκεν γὰρ Μωυσῆς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτόν.

⁵⁴Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 148. Cf. Dunn, *Acts of the Apostles*, 111: “The point is partly theological: the fact that the Spirit comes through the ministry of the apostles ensures the continuity with Jerusalem and with the beginnings in Jerusalem; this remains a fundamental factor in Christian identity.”

πρός με λέγων υιὲ ἀνθρώπου τὰ ὅσα ταῦτα πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραηλ ἐστίν.⁵⁵ Although there are no verbal parallels between Acts 8:4-24 and Ezekiel 37:1-14 there are a couple of conceptual parallels that *may* help to explain John and Peter’s role in the coming of the Spirit. First, there is a “two-stage” process in both Ezekiel 37:7-10 and Acts 8:12-17. As noted in chapter 2, Ezekiel presents the re-creation of the bones as occurring in two stages (cf. Gen 2:7): (1) sinews join the bones together and flesh covers them—and yet they lacked a new life-breath/Spirit (καὶ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς; 37:8) and (2) then the life-breath/Spirit comes into the re-formed bodies and gives them life (37:10). The two-stages⁵⁶ in Acts 8:12-17 are marked by (1) the Samaritans believing and being baptized—and yet the Spirit had not yet fallen on any of them (οὐδέπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός; 8:16) and (2) the Spirit is then given to the Samaritans (8:17-18).

Second, in both texts there is an agent(s) through whom the Spirit comes. Ezekiel himself has a significant role in the Spirit coming into the bones, since it is through his prophecy that God gives the new life-breath: “I prophesied just as he commanded me, and the breath came into them” (καὶ ἐπροφήτευσα καθότι ἐνετείλατό μοι καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα; 37:10). As noted above, Peter and John also have a significant role in the Spirit’s descent upon the Samaritans. They came to Samaria in order that the Samaritans might receive the Spirit (ὅπως λάβωσιν πνεῦμα ἅγιον; 8:15) and the Spirit was given through the laying of their hands (διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων; 8:18). In addition, Luke portrays the apostles as prophets. Luke Timothy Johnson has rightly observed: “in Acts, all believers are given the Spirit, but Luke uses stereotypical imagery which in the biblical parlance is unmistakably prophetic.”⁵⁷

⁵⁵Ezek 37:15-28 indicates that “all the house of Israel” in 37:11 refers to the restoration of the northern and southern tribes under the Davidic king.

⁵⁶Polhill, *Acts*, 218, states that the Samaritan experience occurred in “two stages”—although, he does not make any connection to Ezekiel. I am not arguing in support of Menzies that the Samaritans are saved and then receive the gift of the Spirit as a *donum superadditum*. In Ezekiel 37, the two-stage restoration indicates the new-creation reality of the restoration: it is the creation of a new humanity.

The lack of verbal parallels with Ezekiel 37 make it doubtful that Luke shaped his Samaritan story by the two-stage re-creation of the dry bones in Ezekiel 37.

However, Ezekiel's significant role in the coming of the Spirit does provide a precedent for the role the apostles have in the giving of the Spirit to the Samaritans. Although the Spirit came *through* Ezekiel's prophecy, the ultimate source of the Spirit is none other than Yahweh.

Summary

In Acts 8, the apostles are clearly agents, like Ezekiel, *through* whom God gives the Spirit. They do not give the Spirit in a way that parallels Jesus' or the Father's act of giving the Holy Spirit. In depicting the apostles as agents through whom the Spirit comes, one can see the significance of Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver. If he wanted to portray Jesus as an agent through whom God gave the Spirit, he certainly could have done this. However, he presents Jesus as giving the Spirit in a way that parallels Israel's God giving the Spirit (Acts 2:17, 33). He unites Jesus to the identity of Israel's God by portraying them both as the Spirit-giver.

Conclusion

The Spirit-giver motif continues in Luke's second volume where it also functions to unite the identity of Jesus and the identity of Israel's God. The promised outpouring of the eschatological Spirit is fulfilled in Acts 2 where both God (Acts 2:17) and Jesus (Acts 2:33) are presented as the Spirit-giver. This dual presentation of the

⁵⁷Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 12. Johnson argues that the Elijah/Elisha story (2 Kgs 2:9-22) provides a helpful parallel for understanding the apostles' prophetic identity. Just as Elijah had to depart in order for Elisha to receive his prophetic spirit (2 Kgs 2:9), so Jesus had to depart in order for the apostles to receive his Spirit (31). In the ascension episode in Acts 1:10-11, Johnson observes Luke's emphasis on Jesus ascending "while the disciples are staring into heaven" (ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πορευομένου αὐτοῦ) and suggests another parallel with the Elijah story: "Before Elijah departed, he was asked by Elisha for a double portion of his prophetic spirit. Elijah told him this was a hard request, but that if Elisha *saw him departing*, then he would receive the gift; if he did not, then he would not receive it" (31; italics original).

Spirit-giver coheres with Luke's Gospel in which both Jesus and the Father are portrayed as the eschatological Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16; 11:13; 24:49). Yet, not only is Jesus included in the divine identity of the Spirit-giver in Acts 2:33, but this reference occurs within a co-text in which Luke presents Jesus as participating in other aspects of the divine identity (e.g., divine sovereignty and the divine name). The parallels between God and Jesus "pouring out" the Spirit, as well as the reference to Jesus sharing the divine throne and the divine name, align with the reference in Luke 3:16 where the Spirit-giver promise is placed within a co-text that includes Jesus within other aspects of the divine identity (i.e., Israel's covenant God, the deliverer). Against the background of the OT, the Jewish Second Temple literature, and Luke's Gospel, this description of Jesus is best explained as reflecting a Lukan divine Christology.

The Spirit-giver motif does not end in Acts 2:33, although there are no other explicit references to Jesus giving the eschatological Spirit. In Acts 5:31, 11:17, and 15:8 "God" is the sole subject of the "giving." However, in light of the way in which Luke has developed this motif through the orderly (*καθεξῆς*) unfolding of the two-volume narrative, it is plausible, that in these texts the term "God" includes both Jesus and Yahweh. The argument was made that in 5:31 and 11:17 Peter clearly refers to Acts 2:1-41 and Luke 3:16 in order to explain the act of "God" giving the Spirit. In both Acts 2:1-41 and Luke 3:16 Jesus, the Messiah is portrayed as the Spirit-giver.

The final section of this chapter argued that the act of giving the Spirit, within the Lukan narrative, is an act reserved for God alone. Although Peter and John have a significant role in the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Samaritans (8:14-17), they are not portrayed as Spirit-givers in the same way that God and Jesus are portrayed as the Spirit-giver. Rather, they are the agents through whom the Spirit was given, in a manner similar to that of Ezekiel who was an agent through whom God caused the Spirit to come into the dry bones. The description of Peter and John as agents through whom God gave the Spirit supports the thesis of this chapter: Jesus is not portrayed as a subordinate,

through whom God gives the Spirit; rather, he is depicted as acting in a role that is unique to Israel's God. The reader of Luke-Acts sees in Jesus the revelation of Israel's God, the Spirit-giver.

The analyses presented in chapters 4 and 5 regarding the relationship between Jesus and God and their shared identity as the Spirit-giver reflect what Kavin Rowe has termed a *Verbindungsidentität*. According to Rowe, this term indicates “a shared, narratively established identity in which there is unity without confusion as well as distinction without separation.”⁵⁸ This narrative *Verbindung*, revealed by the Spirit-giver motif, demonstrates a narrative relationship between Jesus and Israel's God, which Rowe describes as follows:

[There is] a coherent pattern of characterization that binds God and Jesus together through the [act of giving the Spirit] such that they finally cannot be separated or abstracted from one another in the story. To apprehend the identity of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke [and Acts] is to include God, and the question, Who is God in [Luke-Acts]?, of necessity places Jesus [the Spirit-giver] at the center of its answer.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Rowe, *Early Christology*, 27.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, 201.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Modern scholars have interpreted Lukan Christology in a variety of ways. Since Conzelmann, most have considered Luke's Christology as primarily "low"; that is, scholars have concluded that Luke emphasizes Jesus' humanity and subordination to the Father. This "low Christology" is strengthened by the fact that Luke shapes the narrative identity of Jesus by various human characters from the OT: Jesus is the prophet like Moses, the Davidic Messiah, the Isaianic Servant of Yahweh, a new Adam, and a new Israel. Luke presents Jesus as the climax and fulfillment of humanity's and Israel's story and his relationship to the Holy Spirit accentuates this perspective. Jesus receives the Spirit (Luke 3:22) in a way that human figures in the past received the Spirit and his reception of the Spirit becomes a paradigm for the way in which God's new humanity experiences the Spirit's presence. Although in agreement regarding the significance of Jesus' humanity in Luke-Acts, as well as the way in which Luke shapes Jesus' narrative identity in light of these human figures, this dissertation has attempted to address a gap in Lukan scholarship regarding Jesus' relationship to the Holy Spirit.¹ Luke does not merely portray Jesus as receiving the Holy Spirit, he portrays him as the giver of the Spirit and does so in a way that reveals a divine Christology. The motif of Jesus as the Spirit-giver does not conflict with, but rather complements Luke's emphasis on Jesus as the Spirit-receiver.

¹As J. R. R. Tolkien commented almost 80 years ago, "The dwarf on the spot sometimes sees things missed by the travelling giant[s] ranging many countries." J. R. R. Tolkien, "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 22 (1936): 247.

Summary

Chapter 1 stated the thesis of the work and provided a history of research highlighting representative studies on Lukan Christology—with a particular focus on their portrayal of Jesus as the Spirit-giver. Although Turner and Buckwalter have both used the Spirit-giver motif to support a divine Christology in Luke-Acts, it was concluded that, despite their compelling efforts, more work was needed in order to discover the significance of this motif throughout the entirety of the two-volume narrative and in light of the OT background which exclusively portrays Yahweh as the Spirit-giver.

Building upon Bauckham's notion of divine identity, chapter 2 argued that the prophetic texts depicting Yahweh as the giver of the eschatological Spirit do so in a way that link this *act* with Yahweh's unique identity as Israel's God. In the books of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah, the act of giving the eschatological Spirit is associated with Yahweh's identity as the creator and covenant God; that is, the act of giving the Spirit is consistently portrayed as an *act* of new creation and new exodus. Although the effects of the act are varied, the act itself is presented as the act whereby the creator and covenant God re-creates and restores his people. The creation and exodus metaphors, which the authors use to describe this act, function to link this act with Yahweh's eschatological identity in the age to come. The association of this act with the divine identity is further strengthened in light of the fact that (1) no other figure is ever portrayed as pouring out the eschatological Spirit and (2) both Joel and Ezekiel connect this act with Israel's knowledge of Yahweh in the age to come. The giving of the eschatological Spirit is presented as so characteristic of Israel's God that when Israel experiences it they will say, "That's him all right!"

Chapter 3 continued to use Bauckham's notion of divine identity by analyzing the way in which the *act* of giving the Spirit functions in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. By examining texts from Qumran, *Joseph and Aseneth*, *Wisdom*, *Jubilees*, *2 Maccabees*, and the *Sibylline Oracles* this chapter argued that the act of giving

the Spirit was viewed as unique to Israel's God (no other figure is presented as acting in this role) and it is consistently presented as an act of new creation (thus associated with Yahweh's unique identity as the creator). In briefly examining the Rabbinic literature, this chapter also demonstrated that the conclusions reached regarding the text of early Judaism were coherent with the interpretation of the Spirit-giver in later Judaism. In commenting on Ezekiel 36-37 and Joel 3 the Rabbis consistently portray the act as that of a new creation and even find parallels between this eschatological act and Genesis 2:7. In the religious world in which Luke lived, and moved, and had his being, the *act* of giving the Spirit was considered particular to the divine identity.

In light of the conclusions reached in chapters 2 and 3, the christological significance of Jesus as the Spirit-giver almost becomes self-evident. Outside of the NT in general, and Luke's two-volume narrative in particular, no figure other than Israel's God is ever presented as the Spirit-giver. Yet Luke, on three occasions, explicitly identifies Jesus as the Spirit-giver. Although it is possible that Luke uniquely develops this theme in order to incorporate it into a subordinistic Christology, the narrative development of this motif does not suggest this. Rather, the narrator's unfolding of the Spirit-giver motif is best explained as evidence of a divine Christology. Chapters 4 and 5 attempted to demonstrate this claim.

Building upon the research of Kavin Rowe, chapters 4 and 5 demonstrated that Luke uses this motif to unite Jesus and Israel's God so that they share the identity of the Spirit-giver (as Rowe argued regarding Luke's use of *κύριος*). Building upon the research of Richard Bauckham, these chapters also demonstrated that Luke uses this motif to include Jesus within the divine identity. By applying the role of Spirit-giver to Jesus in Luke 3:16, the reader sees in Jesus the revelation of the divine identity because Luke structures the opening of his narrative in such a way that Jesus, the Messiah is portrayed as acting in ways characteristic of the divine identity. In attributing to Jesus a role that

was consistently presented as so characteristic of Israel's God in the age to come, the reader of Luke's Gospel cannot help but say, "That's him all right!"

As the narrative progresses, however, it is not simply that Luke unites Jesus and the Father in their shared identity as the Spirit-giver, or that he includes Jesus within the divine identity, it is plausible that in Acts 5:31 and 11:17 (and possibly 15:8) the term "God" now includes both the Father and Jesus. In Peter's summary of both the Jewish Pentecost in 2:1-41 (5:31-32) and the Gentile Pentecost in 10:44-48 (11:15-18; 15:8-9) he simply notes that "God" gave the Spirit. Yet in 2:1-41 both God and Jesus were portrayed as giving the Spirit, and in 11:15-18 Peter describes this act with references to earlier texts in which Jesus is presented as the Spirit-giver (Luke 3:16; Acts 2:33). The movement of the narrative from Luke 3:16; 11:13; 24:49; Acts 2:17, 33 to Acts 5:31; 11:17; and 15:8 reveals the divine identity of Jesus, the Spirit-giver.

Implications

If correct, there are at least two implications this thesis has for Lukan Christology. First, when the identity-shaping significance of Jesus' role as Spirit-giver is appropriately considered and not subsumed under the "controlling Christologies" of modern scholars, one must reconsider the conclusion that Lukan Christology is *exclusively* a low, subordinistic, or exclusively human Christology; the Christology presented in Luke-Acts is *also* a divine Christology. Kavin Rowe, Douglas Buckwalter, and Max Turner have paved the way for reassessing Lukan Christology. It is hoped that this study has helpfully followed in their steps.

Second, once this motif is adequately analyzed within the narrative and allowed to contribute to the overall portrait of Jesus in Luke-Acts, I believe it complements the Lukan picture of Jesus as receiver of the Spirit. In this way, both motifs have an identity-shaping function and provide readers with a helpful paradigm for understanding Lukan Christology. Through the motif of Jesus as giver of the Holy Spirit

Luke identifies him with Yahweh, the God of Israel, and in his description of Jesus as a receiver of the Holy Spirit Luke identifies him with humanity, in particular Yahweh's people Israel and Adam. Thus, as Luke narrates the story of Jesus he does so in such a way as to demonstrate that in Jesus humanity's story with God is brought to a climax *and* that in Jesus God's story with his people is simultaneously brought to a climax. Luke narrates the story of Jesus as the story of Israel/Adam *and* as the story of God, he narrates the story of one who is both receiver and giver of the Holy Spirit, he tells the story of the one who is both man and God.

Third, because the topic of this dissertation has overlapped with studies on the holy Spirit in the OT, Second Temple literature, and Luke-Acts, the conclusions reached here have implications for pneumatology in general and Lukan pneumatology in particular. This dissertation has demonstrated that whenever the literature describes the eschatological *act* of giving the Spirit it portrays it as an act of new creation and new exodus. The OT and Second-Temple literature employ no other metaphor to explain this divine activity. Thus, the detection of new exodus and new creation in Luke-Acts does not reflect the attempt to read Paul into Luke-Acts, but rather reflects the attempt to read Luke-Acts within the context of the OT and Second Temple literature. Luke clearly places the act of giving the Spirit within the new-exodus framework of Israel's restoration, but new-creation elements are not lacking. First, Luke places Jesus' own experience of the Spirit within the context of Israel's restoration and in connection with Adam, God's son. Second, various verbal descriptions of the effects of the Spirit as "life" and "cleansing" allude to the new-creation effects of Ezekiel 36-37 and Isaiah 44. Third, the allusions to Isaiah and Ezekiel in Acts 2 suggest that a false dichotomy has been established separating Joel and Ezekiel. Fourth, the allusions to Exodus 19 in Acts 2 and the eschatological cleansing in Luke 3:17 indicate that the gift of the Spirit is an act that creates a new-covenant people: God's new humanity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Elizabeth. *The Book of Joel*. In vol. 8 of *New Interpreters Bible*. Edited by David L. Petersen, 301-26. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Ahn, Gregor. "Monotheismus und Polytheismus als religionswissenschaftliche Kategorien?" In *Der eine Gott und die Götter*, ed. M. Oeming and K. Schmid, 1-10. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 82. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2003.
- Allen, Leslie C. *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. Loeb Classical Library 199. Translated by Stephen Halliwell. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Augustine, *De Trinitate*. In *Sancti Aurelii Augustini: Books 13-15*. Edited by W. J. Mountain. Corpus Christianorum, vol. 16. Turnholti: Typograph Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1968.
- _____. "The Holy Spirit as the 'Undiminished Giver': Didymus the Blind's *De Spiritu Sancto* and the Development of Nicene Pneumatology." In *The Holy spirit in the Fathers of the Church*, ed. D. Vincent Twomey and Janet E. Rutherford, 57-72. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2010.
- Avemarie, Friedrich. *Die Taufenzählungen der Apostelgeschichte: Theologie und Geschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Baer, Hans von. *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926.
- Barrett, C. K. "Imitatio Christi in Acts." In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 251-61. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- Bartholomew, Craig G., Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, eds. *Reading Luke*. Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Barton, John. "Imitation of God in the Old Testament." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 35-46. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Bauckham, Richard. "Biblical Theology and the Problems of Monotheism." In *Jesus and*

the God of Israel, 60-106. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

_____. "God Crucified." In *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 1-59. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

_____. *Jesus and the God of Israel*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

_____. "Monotheism and Christology in Hebrews 1." In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North, 167-85. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.

_____. "Pentecost." <http://richardbauckham.co.uk/uploads/Sermons/Pentecost.pdf>. Accessed on February 18, 2011.

_____. "Reading Scripture as a Coherent Story." In *The Art of Reading Scripture*, ed. Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays, 38-53. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

_____. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." In *Restoration*, ed. James M. Scott, 435-87. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement*. Boston: Brill, 2001.

_____. "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, 43-69. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement*. Boston: Brill, 1999.

Baum, Armin D. "Lk 1,1-4 zwischen antiker Historiografie und Fachprosa." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 101 (2010): 33-54.

Baumgärtel, Friedrich. "Spirit in the OT." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 359-67. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.

Baumgarten, Joseph. "Purification and the Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees." In *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, 3-10. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

_____. "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions." *Revue de Qumran* 13 (1988): 199-213.

Beale, G. K. "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 1." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 73-102.

_____. "The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56 (2005): 63-90.

_____. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

_____. *The Temple and the Church's Mission*. *New Studies in Biblical Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

- Bergler, Siegfried. *Joel als Schriftinterpret*. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum 16. New York: Peter Lang, 1988.
- Best, Ernest. "Spirit-Baptism." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960): 236-43.
- _____. "The Use and Non-Use of Pneuma by Josephus." *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959): 218-21.
- Betz, Otto: *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
- Beuken, Wim. *Isaiah II*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leven: Peeters, 2000.
- Bieder, Werner. "Spirit in Judaism." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 367-75. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.
- Block, Daniel. "Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit: Reflections on Ezekiel xxxix 21-29." *Vetus Testamentum* 37 (1987): 257-70.
- _____. "The Prophet of the Spirit: The Use of *RWH* in the Book of Ezekiel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32 (1989): 27-49.
- Blumenthal, Christian. "Kontinuität und Neuanfang bei Lukas: Göttliches Handeln an der Zeitenwende." *Novum Testamentum* 54 (2012): 236-57.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 1:1-9:50*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.
- _____. *Luke 9:51-24:53*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1996.
- _____. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- _____. "The Son of Man Seated at God's Right Hand and the Debate over Jesus' 'Blasphemy.'" In *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 181-91. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- _____. *A Theology of Luke and Acts: God's Promised Program, Realized for All Nations*. Biblical Theology of the New Testament Series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Boers, Hendrikus. "Jesus and the Christian Faith: New Testament Christology Since Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 450-56.
- Borgman, Paul. *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Bourke, Joseph. "Le Jour de Yahvé dans Joël." *Révue biblique* 66 (1959): 191-212.

- Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002.
- _____. *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- _____. *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian*. 2nd ed., rev. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Rev. ed. The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Brown, Schuyler, “‘Water-Baptism’ and ‘Spirit-Baptism’ in Luke-Acts.” *Australasian Theological Review* 59 (1977): 135-51.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Isaiah 1-39*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- _____. “Monotheism.” In *Reverberations of Faith: A Theological Handbook of Old Testament Themes*, 137-39. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- _____. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Bryan, Raymond. “Joel.” In *The Minor Prophets*, ed. Thomas Edward McComiskey, 239-313. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 1998.
- Buckwalter, H. Douglas. *The Character and Purpose of Luke’s Christology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Burchard, Christoph. “Joseph and Aseneth.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth, 177-247. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- _____. *Joseph und Aseneth: Kritisch Herausgegeben*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- _____. “Küssen in *Joseph and Aseneth*.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 36 (2005): 316-23.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Caird, George B. “Jesus and Israel: The Starting Point for New Testament Christology.” In *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur*, ed. Robert F. Berkey and Sarah A. Edwards, 58-68. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1982.
- Carley, Keith W. *Ezekiel Among the Prophets: A Study of Ezekiel’s Place in Prophetic Tradition*. Studies in Biblical Theology 2nd Series 31. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1975.

- Carroll, John T. *Luke: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.
- Casey, P. M. *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- Charles, Ronald. "Une Lecture Narrative de *Joseph et Aséneth* À la Lumière du Motif de la 'Nouvelle Creation.'" *Science et Esprit* 63 (2001): 73-84.
- Cheng, Ling. *The Characterisation of God in Acts: The Indirect Portrayal of an Invisible Character*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2011.
- Chesnutt, Randall D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement 16. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Chester, Andrew. *Messiah and Exaltation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 207. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Chevallier, Max-Alain. *L'Esprit et le Messie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires De France, 1958.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Cho, Youngmo. *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2005.
- Chouinard, Larry. "Gospel Christology: A Study of Methodology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 21-37.
- _____. "Gospel Christology: A Study of Methodology." In *New Testament Interpretation and Methods: A Sheffield Reader*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans, 65-81. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Clements, Ronald E. *Isaiah 1-39*. The New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980.
- _____. "Monotheism and the God of Many Names." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 47-59. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Clendenen, Ray E. *Malachi*. New American Commentary 21A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2004.
- Conrad, Edgar W. "Forming the Twelve and Forming Canon." In *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, ed. Paul L. Redditt and Aaron Schar, 90-103. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 325. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte Der Zeit*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 17. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1993.

- _____. *The Theology of St Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- Cook, Johann. *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?* *Vetus Testamentum Supplements*, vol. 69. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *A Commentary Upon the Gospel according to St. Luke*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. Oxford: University Press, 1859.
- Dahl, Nils A. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 139-58. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Dahlberg, Bruce T. "On Recognizing the Unity of Genesis." *Theology Digest* 24 (1976): 360-67.
- Darr, Katheryn Pfisterer. *Ezekiel*. In vol. 6 of *New Interpreters Bible*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, 1074-1606. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001.
- Dapaah, Daniel S. *The Relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005.
- Davies, Gwynne Henton. "Holy Spirit in the Old Testament." *Review and Expositor* 63 (1996): 129-34.
- Davila, James R. *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *Novum Testamentum Supplements*, vol. 68. New York: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- _____. "Of Methodology, Monotheism and Metatron." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, 3-18. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement*. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- De Young, Marinus. *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 63. New York: E. J. Brill, 1991.
- _____. "Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs." *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962): 311-19.
- Dell, Katharine J. "God, Creation and the Contribution of Wisdom." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 60-72. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Delling, Gerhard. "ΒΑΙΤΤΙΣΜΑ ΒΑΙΤΤΙΣΘΗΝΑΙ." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1958): 92-115.
- Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. *New Studies in Biblical Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003.

- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 141. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951.
- Dillard, Raymond B. "Intrabiblical Exegesis and the Effusion of the Spirit in Joel." In *Creator, Redeemer, Consummator*, ed. Howard Griffith and John R. Muether, 87-94. Greenville, SC: Reformed Academic Press, 2000.
- Dozeman, Thomas B. *Numbers*. In vol. 8 of *New Interpreters Bible*. Edited by David L. Peterson, 3-268. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Drury, John. "Luke, Gospel of." In *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. R. J. Loggins and J. L. Houlden, 410-14. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Narrative Commentaries. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- _____. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.
- _____. "'Baptized' as Metaphor." In *Baptism, the New Testament, and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 294-310. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- _____. *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Christianity in the Making, vol. 2. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- _____. *Christ and the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. "Christology as an Aspect of Theology." In *The Future of Christology/Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, ed. by Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks, 202-12. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. *Christology in the Making*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- _____. *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making, vol. 1. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.
- _____. "'The Lord, the Giver of Life': The Gift of the Spirit as Both Life-Giving and Empowering." In *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian Theology*, ed. I. Howard Marshall, Cornelis Bennema, and Volker Rabens, 1-17. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2012.
- _____. "The Making of Christology." In *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 437-52. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

- _____. *The Partings of the Ways*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 2006.
- _____. "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 81-92.
- Dupont, J. "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2:33." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley, 219-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Dupont, Jacques. "La nouvelle Pentecôte (Ac 2,1-1): Fête de la Pentecôte." *Assemblées du Seigneur* 30 (1970): 30-47.
- Edwards, Matthew. *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 242. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2. Translated by J. A. Baker. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- Elbert, Paul. "Acts 2:38 in Light of the Syntax of Imperative—Future Passive and Imperative—Present Participle Combinations." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 75 (2013): 94-107.
- _____. "Genesis 1 and the Spirit: A Narrative-Rhetorical Ancient Near Eastern Reading in Light of Modern Science." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 15 (2006): 23-72.
- Elgvin, Torleif. "Jewish Christian Editing of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." In *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, ed. Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, 278-304. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.
- Emerton, J. A. "A Note on the Hebrew Text of Proverbs i. 22-3." *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968): 609-14.
- Ernst, Joseph. *Johannes der Täufer*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989.
- Evans, Craig A. "Jesus and the Spirit: On the Origin and Ministry of the Second Son of God." In *Luke and Scripture*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 26-45. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- _____. "The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon." In *Luke and Scripture*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, 212-24. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Fabry, Heinz-Joseph. "רוח." In *TDOT*, vol. XIII. Edited by Johannes G. Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Translated by David E. Green, 365-402. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Fatehi, Mehrdad. *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Feiler, Paul Frederick. "Jesus the Prophet: The Lucan Portrayal of Jesus as the Prophet Like Moses." Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986.
- Ferda, Tucker S. "John the Baptist, Isaiah 40, and the Ingathering of the Exiles." *Journal*

for the Study of the Historical Jesus 10 (2012): 154-88.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke (I-IX)*. Anchor Bible, vol. 28. New York: Doubleday, 1981.

_____. "The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. Joseph Verheyden, 165-84. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Flender, Helmut. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

_____. "Further Reflections on a Divine and Angelic Humanity." In *New Perspectives on Old Texts*, ed. Esther G. Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru, 185-98. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, vol. 88. Boston: Brill, 2010.

_____. "The Worship of Divine Humanity as God's Image." In *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*, ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, 112-28. *Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement*. Boston: Brill, 1999.

France, R. T. "Jesus the Baptist?" In *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 94-111. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.

Franklin, Eric. *Christ The Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1975.

Frei, Hans W. *The Identity of Jesus Christ*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

_____. *Theology and Narrative: Selected Essays*, ed. George Hunsinger and William C. Placher. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Frevel, Christian. "YHWH und die Göttin bei den Propheten: Eine Zwischenbilanz." In *Der eine Gott und die Götter*, ed. M. Oeming and K. Schmid, 49-76. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 82. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2003.

Ganzel, Tova. "The Descriptions of the Restoration of Israel in Ezekiel." *Vetus Testamentum* 60 (2010): 197-211.

Garr, W. Randall. *In His Own Image and Likeness: Humanity, Divinity, and Monotheism*. *Culture and History of the Ancient Near East*, vol. 15. Boston: Brill, 2003.

Gamberoni, Johann. "Die Geistbegabung im Alten Testament, Besonders nach Joel 3,1-5." In *Die Gabe Gottes*, ed. Paul Nordhues and Heinrich Petri, 9-44. Paderborn: Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1974.

Garland, David E. *Luke*. Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts and Richard B. Hays, eds. *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Learning and Relearning the Identity of Jesus from Luke-Acts." In *Seeking the Identity of Jesus*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays, 148-66. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- Gero, Stephen. "The Spirit as a Dove at the Baptism of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976): 16-35.
- Gile, Jason. "Ezekiel 16 and the Song of Moses: A Prophetic Transformation?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): 87-108.
- Gladd, Benjamin L. "The Last Adam as the 'Life-Giving Spirit' Revisited: A Possible Old Testament Background of One of Paul's Most Perplexing Phrases." *Westminster Theological Journal* 71 (2009): 297-309.
- Goldingay, John. *Isaiah*. New International Biblical Commentary 13. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.
- _____. "Was the Holy Spirit Active in Old Testament Times? What Was New about the Christian Experience of God?" *Ex Auditu* 12 (1996): 14-28.
- Gourgues, Michel. "Esprit des commencements et esprit des prolongements dans les Actes: note sur le 'Pentecôte des Samaritaines' (Actes viii, 5-25)." *Revue biblique* 93 (1986): 376-85.
- Green, Joel B. "From 'John's Baptism' to 'Baptism in the Name of the Lord Jesus': The Significance of Baptism in Luke-Acts." In *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Anthony R. Cross, 157-73. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 171. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- _____. *Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- _____. "Narrative Criticism." In *Methods for Luke*, ed. Joel B. Green, 74-112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- _____. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gregory, Andrew F. and C. Kavin Rowe, eds. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. *Christology in the Synoptic Gospels: God or God's Servant?* New York: T & T Clark International, 2012.
- _____. *God's Equal: What Can We Know about Jesus' Self-Understanding in the*

Synoptic Gospels?. Library of New Testament Studies. New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.

Grogan, Geoffrey W. "The Light and the Stone: A Christological Study in Luke and Isaiah." In *Christ the Lord*, ed. Harold H. Rowdon, 151-67. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888.

Gunton, Colin E. *The One, the Three and the Many: God, Creation and the Culture of Modernity, The Bampton Lectures 1992*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Haacker, Klaus B. "Der Geist und das Reich im Lukanischen Werk: Konkurrenz oder Konvergenz zwischen Pneumatologie und Eschatologie?" *New Testament Studies* 59 (2013): 325-45.

Hahn, Scott "Kingdom and Church in Luke-Acts." In *Reading Luke*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Hadley, Judith M. "The De-Deification of Deities in Deuteronomy." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 157-74. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hamilton, James M. Jr. *God's Indwelling Presence*. New American Commentary Studies in Bible and Theology. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2006.

Hamilton, Victor P. *The Book of Genesis Chapters 1-17*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990.

_____. *The Book of Genesis Chapters 18-50*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Harnack, Adolf. "Über einige Worte Jesu, die nicht in den kanonischen Evangelien stehen, nebst einem Anhang über die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Vaterunsers." In *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: Jahrgang 1904*, 179-208. Berlin: Verlag der Königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1904.

Harris, Scott L. *Proverbs 1-9: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation*. SBL Dissertation Series 150. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Hartman, Lars. "Early Baptism—Early Christology." In *The Future of Christology Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks, 191-201. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Harvey, Anthony. "Christ as Agent." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament*, ed. L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright, 239-50. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

- Hays, Richard B. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*. New York: T & T Clark, 1996.
- _____. "The Canonical Matrix of the Gospels." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*, ed. S. C. Barton, 53-75. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- _____. "Knowing Jesus: Story, History and the Question of Truth." In *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, ed. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays, 41-65. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- Hengel, Martin and A.M. Schwemer. *Jesus und das Judentum*. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck 2007.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Höhne, David A. *Spirit and Sonship*. Ashgate New Critical Thinking in Religion, Theology and Biblical Studies Series. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2010.
- Hollander, H. W. and M. De Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, Acta Theologica Danica, vol. 2. Aarhus, Denmark: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Holmås, Geir Otto. *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 433. London: T & T Clark International, 2011.
- Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. Texte und Untersuchungen 104. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968.
- Horbury, William. "Jewish Messianism and Early Christology." In *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, 3-24. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- Hosch, Harold E. "RŪAH in the Book of Ezekiel: A Textlinguistic Analysis." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 14 (2002): 77-125.
- House, Paul. *Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Houston, Walter. "'Today, in Your Very Hearing': Some Comments on the Christological Use of the Old Testament." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament*, ed. L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright, 37-50. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Hubbard, Moyer V. *New Creation in Paul's Letters and Thought*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 119. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Hui, Archie W. D. "John the Baptist and Spirit-Baptism." *Evangelical Quarterly* 71

(1999): 99-115.

Hultgren, Arland J. *Christ and His Benefits*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Hummel, Horace D. *Ezekiel 21-48*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2007.

Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 211. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.

_____. *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?: Historical Questions about Earliest Devotion to Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

_____. "Monotheism, Principal Angels, and the Background of Christology." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, 546-64. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Idestrom, Rebecca G. S. "Echoes of the Book of Exodus in Ezekiel." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 33 (2009): 489-510.

Imschoot, Paul van. "L'esprit de Jahvé, source de vie dans l' Ancien Testament." *Revue biblique* 44 (1935): 481-501.

Issler, Klaus. "Jesus's Example: Prototype of Dependent, Spirit-Filled Life." In *Jesus in Trinitarian Perspective*, ed. Fred Sanders and Klaus Issler, 189-225. Nashville: B & H Academic, 2007.

Jenson, Philip P. "Interpreting Jonah's God: Canon and Criticism." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 229-45. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Jenson, Robert W. "Identity, Jesus, and Exegesis." In *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays, 43-59. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.

_____. *The Triune Identity: God According to the Gospel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2002.

Jervell, Jacob. "Ein Interpolator interpretiert: Zu der christlichen Bearbeitung der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen." In *Studien zu den Testamenten der zwölf Patriarchen*, ed. W. Eltester, 30-61. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1969.

_____. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Johnson, Andy. "Resurrection, Ascension and the Developing Portrait of the God of Israel in Acts." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 57 (2004): 146-62.

- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- _____. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." In *Who Do You Say That I Am?*, ed. Mark Allan Powell and David R. Bauer, 49-65. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.
- _____. *Luke*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Jones, Barry Alan. *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon*. SBL Dissertation Series 149. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Joyce, Paul M. *Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 51. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Just Jr., Arthur A. *Luke 1:1-9:50*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1996.
- Keck, Leander E. "Christology of the New Testament: What, Then, Is New Testament Christology?" In *Who Do You Say That I Am?*, ed. Mark Allan Powell and David R. Bauer, 185-200. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Kennard, Douglas W. *Messiah Jesus*. Theology and Religion, vol. 263. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.
- Kezber, Ilze. *Umstrittener Monotheismus: Wahre und falsche Apotheose im lukanischen Doppelwerk*, Novem Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus/Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 60. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Kim, Hee-Seong. *Die Geisttaufe des Messias*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 81. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Jesus Christ in Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Proclamation Commentaries. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.
- _____. "Jesus as the 'Prophetic Messiah' in Luke's Gospel." In *The Future of Christology Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, ed. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks, 29-42. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Kinlaw, Pamela E. "From Death to Life: The Expanding $\kappa\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in Ezekiel." Perspectives in Religious Studies 30 (2003): 161-72.
- Klein, Hans. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
- Kline, Meredith G. "Divine Kingship and Genesis 6:1-4." *Westminster Theological Journal* 24 (1962): 187-204.
- _____. *Images of the Spirit*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1999.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Ist die Erste Bibel monotheistisch?" In *Der eine Gott und die Götter*,

- ed. M. Oeming and K. Schmid, 39-48. *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 82. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2003.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Wisdom of Solomon," ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 698-714. *New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Knierim, Rolf P. *The Task of Old Testament Theology: Method and Cases*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.
- Koch, Diertich Alex. "Geistbesitz, Geistverleihung und Wundermacht: Erwägungen zur Tradition und zur lukanischen Redaktion in Act 8:5-25." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77 (1986): 64-82.
- Koch, Robert. *Geist Und Messias*. Beitrag zur Bleibischen Theologie Des Alten Testaments. Wien, Austria: Verlag Herder, 1950.
- Kohn, Risa Levitt. *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Koorevaar, Hendrik. "The Torah Model as Original Macrostructure of the Hebrew Canon: a Critical Evaluation." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 122 (2010): 64-80.
- Krieg, Robert A. *Story-Shaped Christology*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Kuecker, Aaron J. *The Spirit and the 'Other': Social Identity, Ethnicity and Intergroup Reconciliation in Luke-Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 444. New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.
- Kugal, James L. *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies on the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement 156. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2012.
- Kutsko, John F. *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel*. Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego, vol. 7. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- Labuschagne, C. J. *The Incomparability of Yahweh in the Old Testament*. Pretoria Oriental Series, vol. 5. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *God as Spirit: The Bampton Lectures, 1976*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- _____. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham, 159-200. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- _____. "The Lucan Portrait of Christ." *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955-1956): 160-75.
- Leaney, Robert. "The Lucan Text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk xi, 2-4)." *Novum*

Testamentum 1 (1956): 103-11.

- Lee, David. *Luke's Stories of Jesus*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 185. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Lee, DooHee. *Luke-Acts and 'Tragic History': Communicating Gospel with the World*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 346. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Leisegang, Hans *Der Heilige Geist: Das Wesen und Werden der mystisch-intuitiven Erkenntnis in der Philosophie und Religion der Griechen*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1919.
- Levison, John R. *Filled with the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2009.
- _____. "Josephus' Interpretation of the Divine Spirit." *Harvard Theological Review* 87 (1994): 123-28.
- _____. *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentum 29. New York: Brill, 1997.
- Lim, Bo H. *The "Way of the LORD" in the Book of Isaiah*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 522. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 282. New York: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Lund, Øystein. *Way metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Lust, Johan. "Ezekiel 36-40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 517-33.
- _____. "The Final Text and Textual Criticism: Ezek 39,28." In *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, ed. Johan Lust, 48-54, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 74. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986.
- Lys, Daniel. *Rûach : le souffle dans l'Ancien Testament: Enquête Anthropologique à Travers L'histoire Théologique d'Israël*. Études d'histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962.
- Ma, Wonsuk. *Until the Spirit Comes: The Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 271. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: A Global Pentecostal Theology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- MacDonald, Nathan. "Aniconism in the Old Testament." In *The God of Israel*, ed.

Robert P. Gordon, 20-34. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of "Monotheism."* Forschungen zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

_____. "Monotheism and Isaiah." In *Interpreting Isaiah*, ed. David G. Firth and H. G. M. Williamson, 43-61. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.

_____. "The Origin of 'Monotheism.'" In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North, 204-15. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.

MacDonald, Neil B. *Metaphysics and the God of Israel: Systematic Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Magne, Jean. "La réception de la variante 'Vienne ton esprit sur nous et qu'il nous purifie' (Lc 11, 2) et l'origine des épicleses, du baptême et du 'Notre Pere.'" *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988): 81-106.

Mainville, Odette. *L'Esprit dans L'Oeuvre de Luc*. Montreal: Fides, 1991.

Mallen, Peter. "Genesis in Luke-Acts." In *Genesis in the New Testament*, ed. Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, 60-82. Library of New Testament Studies 466. New York: T & T Clark, 2012

_____. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*, Library of New Testament Studies 367. New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.

Mánek, Jindřich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1958): 8-23.

Manson, William. *The Gospel of Luke*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.

March, W. Eugene. "God with Us: A Survey of Jewish Pneumatology." *Austin Seminary Bulletin* 83 (1967): 3-16.

Marshall, I. Howard. "The Christology of Acts and the Pastoral Epistles." In *Crossing the Boundaries*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce, and David E. Orton, 167-82. Biblical Interpretation Series 8. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.

_____. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.

_____. "'Israel' and the Story of Salvation: One Theme in Two Parts." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, ed. David P. Moessner, 340-57. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.

_____. *Jesus the Saviour*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1990.

_____. *The Origins of New Testament Christology*. Rev. ed. Downers Grove, IL:

InterVarsity Press, 1990.

Martens, Elmer A. *God's Design: A Focus on Old Testament Theology*. N. Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1998.

Martin, Lee Roy. "Power to Save!?: The Role of the Spirit of the Lord in the Book of Judges." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 16 (2008): 21-50.

Martinez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1997; reprint, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

_____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*. Vol. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1998; reprint, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

Mason, Rex A. "The Relation of Zech. 9-14 to Proto Zechariah." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 227-39.

Mauser, Ulrich. "One God Alone: A Pillar of Biblical Theology." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 12 (1991): 255-65.

May, Herbert G. "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in the Old Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 1-14.

McGrath, James F. *The Only True God*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009.

McQueen, Larry R. *Joel and the Spirit: The Cry of a Prophetic Hermeneutic*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Méndez-Moratalla, Fernando. *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplemental Series 117. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004.

Menzies, Robert P. "The Christology of Luke's Gospel and Acts." In *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, 122-47. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005

_____. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 54. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

_____. *Empowered for Witness*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers*. The JPS Torah Commentary. New York: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.

Miller, Geoffrey D. "Intertextuality in Old Testament Research." *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2010): 283-309.

Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays*

Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, 111-30. London: SPCK, 1968.

Miura, Yuzuru. *David in Luke-Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 232. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Moberly, R. W. L. "How Appropriate is 'Monotheism' as a Category for Biblical Interpretation?" In *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism*, ed. Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Wendy E. S. North, 216-34. New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.

_____. "Is Monotheism Bad for You?: Some Reflections on God, the Bible, and Life in the Light of Regina Schwartz's *The Curse of Cain*." In *The God of Israel*, ed. Robert P. Gordon, 94-112. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 64. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

_____. "Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative: Luke's Narrative Plan of Israel's Suffering Messiah as God's Saving 'Plan' for the World." In *Reading Luke*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, 125-56, Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

_____. "*Two* Lords 'at the Right Hand'? The Psalms and an Intertextual Reading of Peter's Pentecost Speech (Acts 2:14-36)." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Philips, 215-32. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Moles, John. "Luke's Preface: The Greek Decree, Classical Historiography and Christian Redefinitions." *New Testament Studies* 57 (2011): 461-82.

Moltmann, Jürgen. *The Spirit of Life: A Universal Affirmation*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Montague, George T. "The Fire in the Word: The Holy Spirit in Scripture." In *Advent of the Spirit: An Introduction to Current Study of Pneumatology*, ed. Bradford E. Hinze and D. Lyle Dabney, 35-65. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001.

Morgan, Christopher W. and Robert A. Peterson, eds. *The Deity of Christ*. Theology in Community. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2011.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Christology of Acts." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, 159-85. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

_____. *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____. "Wisdom and Yahwism Revisited." In *Shall not the Judge of All the Earth Do What is Right?* ed. David Penchansky and Paul L. Redditt, 191-200. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

- Moyter, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. "Luke and the Septuagint." *Novum Testamentum* 54 (2012): 13-15.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Wisdom's Song: Proverbs 1:20-33." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 456-60.
- Nassauer, Gudrun. "Gegenwart des Abwesenden. Eidetische Christologie in Lk 1.39-45." *New Testament Studies* 58 (2011): 69-87.
- Neve, Lloyd. *The Spirit of God in the Old Testament*. Tokyo: Seibunsha, 1972.
- Newman, Carey C., James R. Davila, Gladys S. Lewis, eds. *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement, vol. 63. Boston: Brill, 1999.
- Nir, Rivka. *Joseph and Aseneth: A Christian Book*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 42. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35a. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- _____. "Luke^s and Acts." In *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Vol. 3, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 1901-32. Boston: Brill, 2011.
- North, J. Lionel. "Praying for a Good Spirit: Text, Context and Meaning of Luke 11:13." *Journal for the Study of New Testament* 28 (2005): 167-88.
- Origen. *Homilies on Numbers*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Ancient Christian Texts. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2009.
- O'Toole, Robert F. *Luke's Presentation of Jesus: A Christology*. Subsidia Biblica 25. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000; reprint Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Press, 2002.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *Acts*. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- _____. "Narrative Closure and Openness in the Plot of the Third Gospel: The Sense of an Ending in Luke 24:50-53." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1986 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent Harold Richards, 201-23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Pattison, George. *God and Being: An Enquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Penn, Michael. "Identity, Transformation, and Authorial Intent." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (2002): 171-83.

- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus—God and Man*. Translated by Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.
- Penner, Todd C. “Madness in the Method?” *Currents in Biblical Research* 2 (2004): 223-93.
- Petersen, David L. “A Book of the Twelve?” In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, ed. James D. Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, 3-10. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Philip, Finny. *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 194. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Phillips, Thomas E. *Acts within Diverse Frames of Reference*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 2009.
- _____. “Why Did Mary Wrap the Newborn Jesus in ‘Swaddling Clothes’? Luke 2.7 and 2.12 in the Context of Luke-Acts and First-Century Literature.” In *Reading Acts Today*, ed. Steve Walton and Thomas E. Phillips, 29-42. Library of New Testament Studies 427. New York: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Placher, William C. “How the Gospels Mean.” In *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays, 27-42. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. New American Commentary, vol. 26. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.
- Porter, Stanley E., Paul Joyce, David E. Orton, eds. *Crossing the Boundaries*. Biblical Interpretation Series, vol. 8. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. “Sweet Mercy Metropolis: Interpreting Aseneth’s Honeycomb.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 14 (2005): 133-57.
- Puech, Émile. “L’Esprit Saint À Qumrân.” *Liber Annuus* 49 (1999): 283-97.
- Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Ray, Jerry Lynn. *Narrative Irony in Luke-Acts: The Paradoxical Interaction of Prophetic Fulfillment and Jewish Rejection*. Mellen Biblical Press Series, vol. 28. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Studien zum Neuen Testament. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. “How to Read the Book of the Twelve as a Theological Unity.” In *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve*, ed. James D. Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney, 75-87. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 15. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*. Vol. 1. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and

- David Pellauer. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- _____. *Oneself as Another*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1991.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." In *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas Phillips, 193-213. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Robson, James. *Word and Spirit in Ezekiel*. Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 447. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Ross, Allen P. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- Rowe, C. Kavin. "Acts 2.36 and the Continuity of Lukan Christology." *New Testament Studies* 53 (2007): 37-56.
- _____. *Early Narrative Christology*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2006; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- _____. "Luke and the Trinity: An Essay in Ecclesial Biblical Theology." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 56 (2003): 1-26.
- Rowley, H. H. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 15 (1940): 313-34.
- Runge, Steven E. "Joel 2:28-32a in Acts 2:17-21: The Discourse and Text-Critical Implications of Variation from the LXX." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, CA, 18 November 2007.
- Rusam, Dietrich. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Sailhamer, John H. *The Pentateuch as Narrative*. Library of Biblical Interpretation. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.
- _____. "Genesis." In vol. 1 of *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Tremper Longman III and David E. Garland, 21-332. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis*. The JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989.
- Schäfer, Peter. Schäfer, Peter. "Die Termini 'Heiliger Geist' und 'Geist der Prophetie' in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim Zueinander" *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 304-14.
- _____. *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 28. Munich: Kosel, 1972.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *The History of the Christ: The Foundation for New Testament Theology*.

Translated by Andreas J. Köstenberger. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997.

Schmid, Konrad and Odil Hannes Steck. "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament." In *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*, ed. James M. Scott, 41-82. Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement, vol. 72. Boston: Brill, 2001.

Schimid, Konrad. "Differenzierungen und Konzeptualisierungen der Einheit Gottes in der Religions- und Literaturgeschichte Israels." In *Der eine Gott und die Götter*, ed. M. Oeming and K. Schmid, 11-38. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 82. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2003.

Shubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." In *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. W. Eltester, 165-86. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 21. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957.

Schultz, Richard L. "The Ties that Bind: Intertextuality, the Identification of Verbal Parallels, and Reading Strategies in the Book of the Twelve." In *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, ed. Paul L. Redditt and Aaron Scharf, 27-45. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 325. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Schweizer, Eduard. *The Holy Spirit*. Translated by Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

_____. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

_____. *The Good News according to Luke*. Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.

_____. "πνεῦμα." In Vol. 6, *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.

Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 48. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992.

Shea, Chris. "Imitating Imitation: Vergil, Homer, and Acts 10:1-11:18." In *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian Jewish Narrative*, ed. Jo-Ann A. Brant, Charles W. Hedrick, and Chris Shea, 37-60. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Seitz, Christopher R. "The Divine Name in Christian Scripture." In *Word Without End: The Old Testament as Abiding Theological Witness*, 251-62. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

_____. "Ezekiel 37:1-14." *Interpretation* 42 (1992): 53-56.

_____. *The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

_____. *Isaiah 1-39*. Interpretation: A Bible commentary for Teaching and

- Preaching. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993.
- Sekki, Arthur Everett. *The Meaning of RUAḤ at Qumran*. SBL Dissertation Series 110. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Shelton, James B. *Mighty in Word and Deed*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991.
- Shepherd, William H. Jr. *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts*. SBL Dissertation Series 147. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Sieber, John H. "The Spirit as the 'Promise of My Father' in Luke 24:49." In *Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit*, ed. Daniel Durken, 271-78. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979.
- Simkins, Ronald. *Yahweh's Activity in History and Nature in the Book of Joel*. Ancient Near Eastern Texts and Studies 10. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1991.
- Sjöberg, Erik. "קִיּוּן in Palestinian Judaism." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 6. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 375-89. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968.
- Smalley, Stephen S. "The Christology of Acts Again." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley, 79-94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Smit, Joop. "The Function of the Two Quotations From Isaiah In Luke 3-4." In *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition: Essays in Honour of Maarten J. J. Menken*, ed. Bart J. Koet, Steve Moyise, and Joseph Verheyden, 41-56. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. "Introduction to a Hermeneutics of Identity." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 168 (2011): 3-19.
- _____. "Jesus and a Hermeneutics of Identity." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 168 (2011): 131-45.
- Spencer, F. Scott. "Preparing the Way of the Lord: Introducing and Interpreting Luke's Narrative: A Response to David Wenham." In *Reading Acts*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, 104-24, Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Stählin, G. "Τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apostelgeschichte 16:7)." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: Studies in Honor of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley, 229-52. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Steinmann, Andrew E. *Proverbs*. Concordia Commentary. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2009.
- Stettler, Christian. *Das letzte Gericht*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Stordalen, T. *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and the Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 25. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Charismatic Theology of Saint Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984.
- _____. "The Influence of the Old Testament on the Charismatic Theology of St. Luke." *Pneuma* 2 (1980): 32-50.
- _____. *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Strazicich, John. *Joel's Use of Scripture and Scripture's Use of Joel*. Biblical Interpretation Series. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. "The Assertion of Divine Power in Ezekiel 33:21-39:29." In *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, 156-72. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- _____. "Ezekiel's Conceptualization of the Exile in Intertextual Perspective." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 1 (2012): 154-72.
- _____. "Ezekiel: Zaodkite Priest and Visionary Prophet of the Exile." In *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature*, 125-43. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 45. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- _____. *Tanak: A Theological and Critical Introduction to the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and The Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.
- _____. "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15." In *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H. Silberman*, ed. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel, 129-41. New York: Ktav, 1980.
- _____. *Reading Luke*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1989.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- _____. "The Story of Israel within the Lukan Narrative." In *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, ed. David P. Moessner, 325-39. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Christology in Luke, Speech-Act Theory, the Problem of Dualism in Christology after Kant." In *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 453-72. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- _____. *The Holy Spirit: In Biblical Teaching, Through the Centuries, and Today*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013.
- Thompson, Alan J. *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 27. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- _____. *One Lord, One People: The Unity of the Church in Acts in Its Literary Setting*. Library of New Testament Studies 359. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. "Jesus and God." In *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 2575-97. Boston: Brill, 2011.
- Thompson, Richard P. *Keeping the Church in Its Place: The Church as Narrative Character in Acts*. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. "Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 22 (1936): 245-95.
- Torgovnick, Mariann. *Closure in the Novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981.
- Trilling, Wolfgang. "Le message de Jean-Baptiste, Lc 3, 10-18." *Assemblées du Seigneur* 2 (1969): 65-74.
- Trites, Allison A. "The Transfiguration in the Theology of Luke: Some Redactional Links." In *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament*, ed. L. D. Hurst and N. T. Wright, 71-82. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Trompf, G. W. *The Idea of Historical Recurrence in Western Thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." In *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, ed. Joseph Verheyden, 133-64. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- _____. *Luke*. T & T Clark Study Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1996; reprint, New York: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- _____. *Christology and the New Testament*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- Tuell, Steven S. "Haggai-Zechariah: Prophecy after the Manner of Ezekiel." In *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve*, ed. Paul L. Redditt and Aaron Schart, 273-91. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 325. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Turner, Max. "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective." *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 3-42.

- _____. "Luke and the Spirit: Renewing Theological Interpretation of Biblical Pneumatology." In *Reading Acts*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, 267-93, Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- _____. *Power from on High*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Spirit of Christ and Christology." In *Christ the Lord*, ed. Harold H. Rowdon, 168-90. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1982.
- _____. "The Spirit of Christ and 'Divine' Christology." In *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 413-36. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1994.
- _____. "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness." In *Witness to the Gospel*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, 327-48. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. "Spiritual Gifts Then and Now." *Vox Evangelica* 15 (1985): 7-64.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Birth Narratives and the Beginning of Luke's Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 103-20.
- _____. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
- VanderKam, James C. *Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- VanGemeren, W. A. "The Spirit of Restoration." *Westminster Theological Journal* 50 (1988): 81-102.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "Does the Trinity Belong in a Theology of Religions? On Angling in the Rubicon and the 'Identity' of God." In *The Trinity in a Pluralistic Age*, ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer, 41-47. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Vawter, Bruce. "Yahweh: Lord of the Heavens and the Earth." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 461-67.
- Verheyden, Joseph, Korinna Zamfir, Tobias Nicklas, ed. *Prophets and Prophecy in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- _____. "Calling Jesus a Prophet, as Seen by Luke." In *Prophets and Prophecy in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, ed. Joseph Verheyden, Korinna Zamfir, and Tobias Nicklas, 177-210. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Vinson, Richard B. *Luke*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing Incorporated, 2008.

- Wagner, Siegfried. "Geist und Leben nach Ezechiel 37, 1-14." In *Ausgewählte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, ed. D. Mathias, 151-68. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.
- Wallace, Howard N. "The Toledot of Adam." In *Studies in the Pentateuch*, ed. J. A. Emerton, 17-34. *Vetus Testamentum Supplements*, vol. 41. New York: E. J. Brill, 1990.
- Walton, Steve. "'The Heavens Opened': Cosmological and Theological Transformation in Luke and Acts." In *Cosmology and New Testament Theology*, ed. Jonathan T. Pennington and Sean M. McDonough, 60-73. LTS 355. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.
- Webb, Robert L. "The Activity of John the Baptist's Expected Figure at the Threshing Floor (Matthew 3.12 = Luke 3.17)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 43 (1991): 103-11.
- _____. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 62. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Welker, Michael. *Gottes Geist: Theologie des Heiligen Geistes*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993.
- Wenham, "The Purpose of Luke-Acts: Israel's Story in the Context of the Roman Empire." In *Reading Acts*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, 79-103, *Scripture and Hermeneutics Series*, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Wenk, Matthias. *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Westermann, Claus. "Geist im Alten Testament." *Evangelische Theologie* 41 (1981): 223-30.
- _____. *Genesis 1-11*. Translated by John J. Seullion. *A Continental Commentary*. London: SPCK, 1984.
- Wilkins, Wilhelm. "Wassertaufe und Geistempfang bei Lukas." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 23 (1967): 1-44.
- Wilson, S. G. *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*. London, 1979.
- Wise, Michael O. "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam." *Revue de Qumran* 15 (1991): 123-32.
- Witherington III, Ben. *The Many Faces of the Christ: The Christologies of the New Testament and Beyond*. *Companions to the New Testament*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1998.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. "The Transcendent Nature of Covenant Curse Reversals." In *Israel's*

- Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*, ed. Avraham Gileadi, 319-25. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988.
- Woodhouse, John. "The 'Spirit' in the Book of Ezekiel." In *Spirit of the Living God Part One*, ed. B. G. Webb, 1-22. Sydney: Lancer, 1991.
- Woods, Edward J. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 205. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Wright, Christopher J. H. *Knowing the Holy Spirit through the Old Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.
- Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- _____. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1997.
- _____. "Whence and Whither Historical Jesus Studies in the Life of the Church?" In *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, ed. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays, 115-58. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.
- _____. *How God Became King: The Forgotten Story of the Gospels*. New York: HarperOne, 2012.
- Wright, Stephen I. "Reading Luke, Hearing Jesus and Understanding God: Reflections on Some Hermeneutical Issues: A Response to John Nolland." In *Reading Acts*, ed. Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, 210-28. Scripture and Hermeneutics Series, vol. 6. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Yamazaki-Ransom, Kazuhiko. *The Roman Empire in Luke's Narrative*. Library of New Testament Studies 404. New York: T & T Clark International, 2010.
- Youngblood, Ronald F. *The Book of Isaiah: An Introductory Commentary*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *I Am Yahweh*. Translated by Douglas W. Scott. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1982.
- _____. *Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 1-24*. Hermeneia. Translated by J. D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- _____. *Ezekiel 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel Chapters 25-48*. Hermeneia. Translated by J. D. Martin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Zwief, Arie W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements, vol. 87. New York: Brill, 1997.

_____. *Christ, the Spirit and the Community of God: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

ABSTRACT

THE MESSIAH AND THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT: THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS' ROLE AS THE GIVER OF THE SPIRIT IN LUKE-ACTS

Matthew Godshall, Ph.D.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2013

Chairperson: Dr. Mark A. Seifrid

Without rejecting the general consensus among scholars that Luke emphasizes the humanity of Jesus, this dissertation attempts to contribute to the field of Lukan Christology by contending that there is more to the Lukan portrait of Jesus than what is generally acknowledged. Through his particular presentation of Jesus as the Spirit-Giver, Luke unveils the divine identity of the Messiah.

Chapter 1 provides a history of research of Lukan Christology and highlights the various controlling categories scholars have proposed for analyzing Lukan Christology. It concludes that there is a need for a study on Luke's Spirit-giver motif and its contribution to Lukan Christology.

Because the OT provides the conceptual world from which Luke develops his Spirit-Giver motif, chapter 2 examines the eschatological passages in Ezekiel, Isaiah, Joel, and Zechariah to see how that act of giving the Spirit is linked with the unique identity of Yahweh. The primary claim in this chapter is that the OT consistently presents the act of giving the eschatological Spirit as an act unique to the divine identity of Yahweh. This claim is supported in three ways: first, the primary metaphors employed to describe the giving of the Spirit are new creation and new exodus; second, the prophets

explicitly link the act of giving the Spirit with Yahweh's identity as Israel's God; third, the act of giving the Spirit is reserved for Yahweh alone.

Chapter 3 explores how the *act* of giving the eschatological Spirit was understood in Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism. This chapter highlights the continuity between the OT and Jewish literature: the act of giving the Spirit is linked with God's identity as the creator and redeemer. Despite its diversity, early Judaism associated the act of giving the Spirit with the unique identity of God and no other figure is ever presented as sharing this role.

Chapters 4 and 5 examine Luke's Gospel and Acts respectively in the attempt to understand how Luke himself has uniquely developed the Spirit-Giver motif. In drawing upon the OT promise of the outpouring of the Spirit, Luke presents Jesus as participating in a role that was reserved exclusively for Yahweh and unique to his identity as Israel's creator and covenant God. As the Spirit-Giver theme unfolds, the identity of Jesus and the Father overlap in their shared role as the Spirit-Giver. This theme is thus evidence of Lukan divine identity Christology.

Chapter 6 concludes the argument and explores implications for Lukan Christology.

VITA

Matthew Steven Godshall

EDUCATION

B.A., The Master's College, 2001
M.A., Talbot School of Theology, 2004
Th.M., Western Seminary, 2007

ORGANIZATIONAL

Society of Biblical Literature
The Evangelical Theological Society

ACADEMIC

Assistant to Dr. Clint Arnold, Talbot School of Theology, 2004
Assistant to Dr. James DeYoung, Western Seminary, 2006-2007
Greek Tutor, Western Seminary, 2006-2007
Adjunct Professor, Corban University, 2007-2008
Adjunct Professor, Western Seminary, 2013-present
Adjunct Professor, William Jessup University, 2013-present

MINISTERIAL

Worship Leader, Trinity Baptist Church, Pasadena, California, 2000-2002
Pastoral Intern, Whittier Hills Baptist Church, Whittier, California, 2002-2005
Worship Leader, Whittier Hills Baptist Church, Whittier, California, 2003-2005
Worship Leader, Amazing Grace Bible Church, Louisville, Kentucky, 2013-2014