Durham University

Durham E-Theses

Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts

Andrew Perry

How to cite:

Perry, Andrew (2008) Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1969/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

Abstract

Andrew Perry

"Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts"
Ph.D. September 2008

Recent scholarship has discussed Luke's view of the Spirit in relation to conversion-initiation, the life of the early church, and the requirements of mission. This emphasis upon the functionality of the Spirit has associated the Spirit with the beginning of the church and its requirements. Accepting that Luke deploys a view of the Spirit as the "Spirit of prophecy", research illustrates disagreement about the functions Luke ascribes to the Spirit.

This dissertation supplements and challenges this balance in two ways. It shows that the Jewish background for Luke's view of the Spirit is more variegated than the rubric "the Spirit of prophecy" would suggest. It supplements the consensus view that Luke's eschatological framework for the bestowal of the Spirit is essentially about the beginning of the church, arguing that Luke also presents the bestowal of the Spirit in relation to the "last days" and closure of a Jewish age.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author or the university to which it was submitted. No quotation from it, or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author or university, and any information derived from it should be acknowledged.

1 8 DEC 2008



"Eschatological Deliverance: The Spirit in Luke-Acts"

By Andrew Perry

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham
Faculty of Arts and Humanities,
Theology Department
September, 2008

Table of Contents

Abstract 1
Title Page 2
Table of Contents 3
Declaration 7
Statement of Copyright 8
Acknowledgements 9
Abbreviations 10
Dedication 11

CHAPTER ONE 12
Review of Scholarship

1. Introduction 12
2. Types of Research 13
3. Milestones in Research 14
    3.1 The Current State of Research 20
4. Themes in Lucan Research 22
    4.1 Background 22
        4.1.1 Lucan and Early Church Pneumatology 27
            4.1.1.1 Discontinuity Hypotheses 27
            4.1.1.2 Continuity Hypotheses 29
        4.1.2 Scope of Study 31
    4.2 The Spirit and Salvation History 31
        4.2.1 Scope of Study 33
    4.3 Jordan and Nazareth 35
        4.3.1 Scope of Study 41
    4.4 Pentecost 41
        4.4.1 Scope of Study 47
5. Outline of Study 48

CHAPTER TWO 49
Methodology

1. Introduction 49
2. Comparison of Second Temple Texts 49
3. Intertextuality 51
    3.1 Critical and Pre-Critical Frameworks 58
    3.2 Intertextual Reading 61
    3.3 Quotation and Allusion 63
4. Typology, History, and Eschatology 65
    4.1 Typological Criticism 66
    4.2 Narrative Criticism 67
    4.3 Redaction Criticism 69
    4.4 History 70
        4.4.1 Lucan Historiography 70
        4.4.2 Biography 74
        4.4.3 Scriptural History 76
5 Eschatology 80

CHAPTER THREE 85
Pneumatological Traditions

1. Introduction 85
2. The Functions of the Spirit 88
2.1 Scriptural Texts 88
2.1.1 Hebrew Scriptures 91
2.1.2 Septuagint 100
2.1.3 Conclusion 101
2.2 Traditions of Interpretation in the First Century 102
2.2.1 Scriptural Interpretations 103
2.2.2 Sapiential and Philosophical Writings 108
2.2.3 Restoration Prophecies 111
2.2.4 Conclusion 114
2.3 Rabbinical Materials 116
2.3.1 Targums 117
2.3.1.1 Codex Neofiti 120
2.3.1.2 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 122
2.3.1.3 Fragment Targum 123
2.3.1.4 Targum Onqelos 124
2.3.1.5 Targum Jonathan to the Prophets 125
2.3.1.6 Evaluation of Evidence 128
2.3.2 Mishnah, Midrash and Talmud 144
2.3.2.1 Tannaitic Texts 148
2.3.2.2 Evaluation of Evidence 157
2.4 The Effects of the Spirit in Luke-Acts 157
2.4.1 Referring Expressions 157
2.4.2 Effects 163
2.4.3 Evaluation of Evidence 167
3. Conclusion 167

CHAPTER FOUR 170
The Bestowal of the Spirit in Luke

1. Introduction 170
2. Pentecost in the Gospel of Luke 171
2.1 Eschatological Bestowal 172
2.1.1 The Spirit and Power of Elijah and Pentecost 176
3. Jesus' Anointing 179
3.1 Empowerment 179
3.1.1 Davidic Messiah 183
3.2 The Isaianic Story-Line 185
3.2.1 Immediate Contextualization 186
3.2.2 Extended Contextualization 188
3.2.3 Lucan Application 189
3.2.3.1 Textual Questions 190
3.2.3.2 Authorial Themes 192
3.2.3.3 New Exodus Restoration 195
3.2.3.4 Exilic Restoration 202

3.2.3.5 Jubilee Restoration 210
3.2.3.5.1 Jubilee Release 211
3.2.3.5.2 Opening the Eyes 216
3.2.3.5.3 The Poor and the Downtrodden 220
3.2.4 Dissonance 222
3.2.4.1 Elements of Restoration 226
4. Conclusion 228

CHAPTER FIVE 230
The Bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost

1. Introduction 230
2. The Pentecost Theophany 231
2.1 Calendrical Evidence 232
2.1.1 Evaluation 233
2.2 Scriptural Evidence 234
2.2.1 Evaluation 235
2.3 Second Temple Evidence 241
2.3.1 Evaluation 243
2.4 Conclusion 249
3. Speech Acts 250
4. Anticipations of the Spirit 253
4.1 Using Malachi 254
4.1.1 Malachi and Pentecost 266
4.1.2 Conclusion 277
4.2 Using Isaiah 278
4.2.1 Luke's Use of Isaiah 32 278
4.2.1.1 Readings of Isaiah 32 279
4.2.1.2 Story Elements in Isaiah 32 281
4.2.1.3 Isaianic Typology 287
4.2.1.4 Dissonance 290
4.2.1.5 Restoration in Acts 292
4.2.2 Conclusion 299
4.3 Using Joel 300
4.3.1 Isaiah 2:2 305
4.3.1.1 The "Last Days" and the "Two Ages" 309
4.3.1.2 Agreements with Acts 319
4.3.1.3 Dissonance 324
4.3.2 Joel 3:1-5 325
4.3.2.1 Agreements with Acts 337
4.3.2.2 Dissonance 342
4.4 Conclusion 346

CHAPTER SIX 347
Conclusion

1. Introduction 347
2. Summary of Findings 347
3. Implications and Prospects 350

3.1 Commencement Eschatology 350
3.1.1 Identifying Commencement Motifs 353
3.2 Closure Eschatology 362
3.2.1 The Restoration of Israel 364
3.3 Questions 366
4. Conclusion 368

Bibliography 369

Declaration

The material contained in this thesis has not been previously submitted for a degree in this or any university.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

The research for this dissertation was undertaken as a result of the award of a three-year AHRC grant and many acknowledgements are due upon the completion of a thesis. The principal debt of gratitude is to my supervisor. Prof. Loren Stuckenbruck, whose advice and support has always been available throughout this process. I have also benefited from the generous help of other supervisors, who have stood in for Prof Stuckenbruck during two terms of research leave, including Professors James Dunn and John Barclay. I was also fortunate to be awarded an exchange student scholarship to Duke University for the Spring semester of 2006. During this time, I was greatly helped by Dr. Kavin Rowe in many conversations on Luke-Acts, and by his comments on my developing thesis. Prof Joel Marcus was also supportive and generously read and commented upon parts of the thesis. Finally, I would also like to thank Prof Hermann Lichtenberger for facilitating my use of the library at the *Insitut für antikes Judentum und hellenistische Religionsgeschichte* at Tübingen during a two month stay in 2004.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations follow the standard set out in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. P. H. Alexander, et. al.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). unless otherwise noted below.

BLS	Bible and Literature Series
DBI	R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London: SCM Press, 1990)
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
JPTSup	Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
LS	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, (7th ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889).
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology

For My Mother

CHAPTER ONE
Review of Scholarship

1. Introduction

Recent scholarship has discussed Luke's view of the Spirit in relation to conversion-initiation, the life of the early church, eschatology and the requirements of mission. An emphasis upon the functionality of the Spirit has associated the Spirit with the beginning of the church and its requirements. Accepting that Luke deploys a view of the Spirit as the "Spirit of prophecy", research illustrates disagreement about the functions Luke ascribes to the Spirit.

This dissertation supplements and complements this balance of approach in three ways.

1) First, it shows that the Jewish background for Luke's view of the Spirit is more variegated than the rubric "the Spirit of prophecy" would suggest.

2) Secondly, we supplement the approach that describes the bestowal of the Spirit in terms of the needs and benefits of the church, proposing that Luke *also* presents the bestowal of the Spirit in relation to the "last days" of a Jewish age. Accordingly, our approach more fully describes the eschatological framework implied in Luke's use of certain Jewish scriptural texts legitimating the bestowal of the Spirit. Thus, in contrast to much recent work on the Spirit, we do not focus on issues surrounding conversion-initiation and mission. Our goal is instead to record and discuss the typology and the dissonance created by Luke's use of Isaiah, Joel and Malachi in relation to the bestowal of the Spirit at Jordan and Pentecost.

3) Thirdly, we will argue that Luke presents the work of the Spirit through John the Baptist, Jesus and the early church in relation to the need to escape the coming judgment of God (using Joel); in respect of a requirement for reformation and renewal (using Malachi); and in regard to the restoration of Israel (using Isaiah).

In our study, we present the eschatological framework for Luke's bestowal of the Spirit as not just about the *beginning* of the church; it is also about the *closure* of a Jewish age. In Luke's view, there was a "wrath to come", a destruction of Jerusalem and a new "exile"; against this setting the Spirit was given to facilitate the preaching of deliverance and the proclamation of a future restoration as well as the bringing about of a remnant of Israel and the incorporation of the Gentiles into this body. It is this setting in which the Spirit engenders the life of the community.

2. Types of Research

The history of research into Lucan pneumatology can be divided into three types:

1) Investigations have been carried out into exegetical and theological problems surrounding the *identity* and *functions* of the holy[1] Spirit. This work has been carried out in relation to Luke's own eschatological and ecclesiological framework.

2) A second kind of research has sought to situate Lucan pneumatology in the historical context of either first century Judaism, broader Hellenistic religious culture, or the development of Christianity.

3) Since the literary turn in biblical studies in the 1980s, research has also been conducted into the narrative characteristics of Luke-Acts. Part of this research has investigated the role of the holy Spirit as a *character* in the story-plot.

We will first give an historical skeleton of scholarship and identify recent landmark works with which to enter into dialogue. Thereafter, we will

---

[1] We follow the convention of referring to the Spirit where there is a collocation of ἅγιος with πνεῦμα as 'holy Spirit' rather than 'Holy Spirit'.

describe four topics that are prominent in the literature, and select the issues that we will take up in the rest of the study.[2]

3. Milestones in Lucan Research

It is evident that certain studies on Lucan pneumatology have historical importance. A survey of scholarly citation and discussion identifies the following monographs as historically significant:[3]

i) Hermann Gunkel set the agenda for the modern discussion in *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes* (1888)[4] by placing to the foreground of debate the questions of i) the relationship between Paul, the primitive church and Luke; ii) the relevance of the Jewish background;[5] and iii) the functional role of the holy Spirit.

---

[2] Detailed reviews of Lucan scholarship on pneumatology during the twentieth century can be found in R. P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 17-49; François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty Three-Years of Research 1950-1983* (Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1987), ch. 4; M. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 19; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 13-44; and M. M. B. Turner, *Power from on High: the Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 20-79. François Bovon brings the review of Lucan scholarship up to date in his essay, "Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect", in his *Studies in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 19-37. These reviews proceed from the contributions of German scholarship in the early half of the twentieth century, and conclude with more recent Anglo-Saxon scholarship. Turner's is the most comprehensive, and it is to his review that we are indebted for analysis of German and French scholarship. Our review is thematic and we have not sought to duplicate the extensive reviews of Turner, Menzies and Bovon.

[3] That is, the criteria used here for this selection are: what work is most often cited and discussed by current scholars.

[4] Hermann Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888).

[5] The foundational study into first century Jewish thought about the Spirit, which was supportive of Gunkel's emphasis, is that of Paul Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließend Judentum* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1910). The contrary foundational study for studying Hellenistic ideas and their relationship to Jewish thought is that of Hans Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1919).

Gunkel worked within the nineteenth century "History of Religions School",[6] and used a phenomenological method. He saw considerable difference between a Pauline soteriological Spirit and the "miraculous" views of Luke and the primitive church, but he nevertheless made the concept of *power* (and its effects) central to his treatment of both traditions. The fact that Gunkel's 1888 work was translated into English in 1979[7] is testimony to its continuing significance.

Gunkel argues that while Paul accepts the miraculous effects of the Spirit, he sees the importance of the gift of the Spirit in terms of its ethical effects. This manifestation of the Spirit was to be seen against the Jewish idea that the Spirit had been withdrawn until the *eschaton*.[8] Accordingly, the Spirit was a sign of the presence of the eschatological kingdom as it was the life of that kingdom.[9] The difference between Paul and Luke-Acts was that for Luke the ethical effects of Spirit were secondary to the miraculous effects.[10]

ii) Friedrich Büchsel's *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*[11] (1926) was the first study to set out the case for significant continuities between the New Testament writers, and as such was intended as a corrective to Gunkel. Büchsel sought to show how the Spirit in the Gospels is not just about miraculous effects (as per Gunkel), but is also about life and an ethical power to live in fellowship with God—a "spirit of sonship". On this basis he sought to show how Paul's *experience* as a pneumatic only added personal

---

[6] For an overview of this school, see R. Morgan, "History of Religions School" *DBI* 291-292.

[7] H. Gunkel, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: the Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul* (trans. R. A. Harrisville and P. A. Quanbeck II; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

[8] Gunkel, *Influence*, 70.

[9] Gunkel, *Influence*, 96.

[10] Gunkel, *Influence*, 18; see Wenk's discussion, *Community-Forming Power*. 15-18.

[11] F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926).

detail to the same concept of sonship displayed in the narrative of the Gospels.

iii) H. von Baer's *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (1926)[12] is the foundational study for Lucan pneumatology, because it anticipates later redaction-critical approaches to Luke-Acts and sets out the basic questions that scholars must address. Von Baer's theological contribution lies in his claim that Luke uses a salvation-historical framework in his presentation of the Spirit. His claim is that Luke is not concerned with the Spirit as a source of moral renewal but rather as the driving force of God's plan. This salvation-historical framework would later (with revisions) shape the work of Hans Conzelmann.[13]

iv) G. W. H. Lampe wrote extensively on the Spirit. His early thinking is set out in *The Seal of the Spirit* (1951), which is a doctrinal study of baptism and confirmation in the apostolic church and early church fathers. His contribution to Lucan scholarship was made in a long article, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke" (1956). His thesis was then re-stated (with modifications) in his Bampton Lectures on Christology and Pneumatology: *God as Spirit* (1976).[14] His early material argues that the Spirit is about missionary empowering and selectively given, although he does not believe that Luke is consistent in his portrayal of the Spirit. Lampe's later work modifies this position and suggests a more fundamental experiential view is represented in Acts—the gift of the Spirit communicates the presence of Jesus.

---

[12] Hans von Baer, *Der Heillige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926).
[13] Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: SCM Press, 1982).
[14] G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (2nd ed.; London: SPCK, 1967); "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke" in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed., D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 159-200; *God as Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1976).

v) E. Schweizer and other scholars contributed the article on "πνεῦμα" in *TDNT* (1956). This article continues to influence discussion in virtue of its summary of older scholarship, its distinctive theses, and its position in *TDNT*. Schweizer's contribution was on the "Spirit and the New Testament".[15] His contribution lies in his emphasis that the Jewish conception of the Spirit as the "Spirit of prophecy" is the relevant background for Luke, and in his depiction of Luke's pneumatology as a nuanced development over against other synoptic writers and Paul.

According to Schweizer, Matthew and Mark present the Spirit largely in miraculous terms. Luke innovates upon this presentation in two directions: i) he presents the Spirit as the source of inspired speech rather than as a miraculous power;[16] and ii) he narrates the dawn of a new age with the general bestowal at Pentecost. Schweizer sees the Spirit in Luke-Acts primarily in terms of mission rather than any ethical effects.[17]

vi) The work of J. D. G. Dunn represents a more contemporary starting point for research into Lucan pneumatology, which we adopt in this study. He presents a modern application of von Baer's salvation-critical approach and the most comprehensive defence of the view that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is connected with Christian life. His thesis is that the reception of the Spirit is part of a single process of conversion-initiation. In arguing this case, Dunn opposed older Pentecostal and Sacramental views. His principal studies are *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (1969) and *Jesus and the Spirit* (1975), and his collected papers on the topic have been published in *The*

---

[15] "πνεῦμα", *TDNT* 6:396-451. This entry has been conveniently excerpted and presented with some material omitted in book form, A. Schweizer *et al.*, *The Spirit of God* (trans. A. E. Harvey; London: A & C Black, 1960). Schweizer first presented his views in "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament" *Int* 6 (1952): 259-278, and later in a popular format in *The Holy Spirit* (trans. R. H. Fuller and I. Fuller; London: SCM Press, 1981).

[16] Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:406-407; *The Spirit of God*, 41-42.

[17] On this, see Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 24.

Christ and The Spirit (1998).[18] Dunn has exerted considerable influence and provoked a great deal of scholarly comment.

vii) M. M. B. Turner has written extensively on the Spirit and his principal work is *Power from on High: the Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (1996). This is a substantial revision of earlier articles as well as his doctoral thesis. It is complemented by his, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now*[19] (1996), which is a more general treatment of the Spirit in the New Testament. Turner describes his position as "broadly charismatic",[20] and he positions his work as a correction to classical Pentecostalism. Using tradition-historical and redaction-critical methods, he argues that the Spirit is involved in the conversion and ethical transformation of an individual.[21] Accordingly, Turner notes that "the Spirit's involvement in...various dimensions of Christian life throws a question mark over the widely-held thesis that for Luke the gift of the Spirit is a *donum superadditum*".[22]

viii) R. P. Menzies' doctoral study is *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: with special reference to Luke-Acts* (1991). This is a classical Pentecostal study, defending the view that the Spirit in Luke-Acts is the Spirit of prophecy and an added empowerment for mission. Menzies is one of a number of Pentecostal scholars who have responded to the challenge presented by Dunn's work.[23] Like Turner, he works with tradition-historical and redaction-critical methods, but he is also concerned with the

---

[18] J. D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1969); *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975); *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

[19] M. M. B. Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996).

[20] *Power*, 11.

[21] *Power*, 119-137.

[22] *Power*, 433.

[23] These include F. D. Brunner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970); R. Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984); and J. B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991).

development of ideas about the Spirit in the first century. Against Turner and Dunn, Menzies argues that, "Luke, in accordance with the primitive church, does not present reception of the Spirit as necessary for one to enter into and remain with the community of salvation".[24] In this respect, Menzies aligns Luke's concept of the Spirit with a pre-Pauline church over against Paul whom he regards as presenting a soteriological concept of the Spirit. Luke does not present the Spirit as a soteriological necessity; rather the Spirit is concerned with revelation and inspired speech.[25]

ix) W. H. Shepherd's study, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (1994),[26] is the first narrative-critical examination of the holy Spirit. He is not concerned with questions of theology, but rather with the function of the holy Spirit as a character in Luke-Acts. His argument is that such a narrative function is evidence that the author of Luke-Acts has a *personal* conception of the holy Spirit. His argument is that Luke took the personified Spirit found in the Old Testament and placed it into a narrative, thus making it a character. For Shepherd, the holy Spirit functions as a reliable character in Luke's narrative, thereby imparting to other characters the same reliability with which he is associated. The point of this characterization is to convey divine assurance to the reader of the story Luke is telling (Luke 1:4).

Shepherd does not identify any earlier historico-critical study as foundational to a consideration of Lucan pneumatology; his concern is to nominate an appropriate literary theory which he can then use as a foundation for his treatment of Luke-Acts. He reviews a selection of historico-critical work on Lucan pneumatology, but he does not set this work in a history of ideas context or nominate any particular historical study as seminal for his own study.

---

[24] *Development*, 279.
[25] *Development*, 225-226.
[26] W. H. Shepherd, *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 147; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).

3.1 The Current State of Research

Lucan scholarship on the Spirit continues to be vibrant working in and around the debate as it has been configured by Dunn, Menzies and Turner. Thus, M. W. Mittlestadt in *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts* argues that Pentecostal scholarship "neglects elements of the work of the Spirit in contexts of opposition",[27] and that "contemporary Pentecostals desiring to develop a comprehensive Lucan pneumatology must appreciate not only the triumph of Spirit-led proclamation, but also the tragedy of the rejection of the Spirit-led messenger".

E. J. Woods, in a specialized narrative-critical study, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*,[28] has offered an analysis of Luke 11:20 against a background of Jewish and non-Jewish literature, seeking to illuminate the central travel section of Luke's gospel. His thesis is that the "finger of God" is an expression that "stands for God the Father himself at work in Jesus' life"[29] rather than the holy Spirit.

J. Hur, in *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, offers a similar narrative-critical treatment following Shepherd. His contribution has been to offer a more thorough-going analysis of the role of the holy Spirit within the plot of Luke-Acts, presenting the Spirit as the "helper" in this plot.[30] M. Wenk, in *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*, has offered a study solely on the socio-ethical role of the Spirit. He seeks to build on Turner's work and consider the role of the Spirit as a transforming influence with the framework of the restoration of Israel.[31] Finally, Y. Cho, in *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul*, has investigated the development of early church pneumatology. Following leads provided by Menzies, Cho argues that whereas for Paul,

---

[27] M. W. Mittlestadt, *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 27.
[28] E. J. Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 205; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 2001).
[29] *Finger*, 253.
[30] J. Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 31-33, 183, 281.
[31] *Community-Forming Power*, 44-49, 151.

"life in the Spirit becomes his way of speaking about the blessings of the kingdom", for Luke, "the Spirit inspires the proclamation of the kingdom of God and in this way, the Spirit makes it possible for people to enter the kingdom of God".[32]

Turner offers the following outline of the current state of research (2004): scholars agree that the Lucan "Spirit" is the "Spirit of prophecy" and that his language is rooted in Jewish ways of thinking; they agree that the Spirit is the uniting and driving force within Luke's scheme of salvation-history; and they agree that Luke's pneumatology has a Christocentric focus. They disagree on whether Luke conceives of the Spirit as intricately related to the everyday life of the Christian.[33]

Turner further comments that scholarship since von Baer has had to extricate itself from the horns of a dilemma: does Luke associate the Spirit with the "everyday inner life of the Christian", or does he make the Spirit essentially "the power to witness to the Gospel"?[34] Turner and Menzies offer opposing solutions to this dilemma. Our project does not engage this debate as it currently stands, but re-examines two issues that have received less critical attention, viz. i) whether Luke regards the Spirit as the "Spirit of prophecy"; and ii) how his scriptural source texts contribute differing elements to his eschatological understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit.

---

[32] Y. Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005), 12.

[33] See Turner's articles, "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness" in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (eds., I. H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans. 1998), 327-348, and "The Spirit and Salvation in Luke-Acts" in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (eds., G. N. Stanton, B. W. Longenecker and S. C. Barton; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 103-116 (105). See also the similar summary in Hur, *Dynamic Reading*, 23-27, who tabulates where scholars position themselves on these issues.

[34] *Power*, 36.

Recent scholarship[35] has engaged the work of Dunn, Turner and Menzies, who had in their turn engaged the work of older English and German language scholarship. We shall likewise engage Turner, Dunn and Menzies, and add to our dialogue partners the recent study by Wenk, along with commentary analyses.

4. Themes in Lucan Research

In this section, we will review Lucan pneumatological research in a thematic[36] way under four headings. Our study does not develop and defend theses under every heading; each topic area deserves its own dedicated monograph. Our purpose in this review is to mark out the territory upon which our study makes a contribution.

4.1 Background

The prevailing consensus is that the most illuminating literary context for the Lucan presentation of the Spirit is that of the Jewish scriptures[37] and other first century Jewish writings. Menzies comments that, "due to the early efforts of H. Gunkel, F. Büschel, and H. von Baer, it is now recognised that Judaism provided the conceptual framework for the pneumatological reflection of Luke".[38] Turner remarks that the most enduring contribution of the History of Religions' School since Gunkel has been to show that, "the spirit-motifs in Luke's writings are predominantly Jewish in origin".[39] Gunkel was quite clear in his own valuation, both in relation to the

---

[35] For instance, Hur, *Dynamic Reading*, 14, and Cho, *Spirit and Kingdom*, 1, select Dunn, Menzies and Turner as representative of previous scholarship.
[36] That is, our review is of the theological themes in research rather than issues of history or redaction.
[37] We use the expression "Jewish Scriptures" to cover both Hebrew/Aramaic and Old Greek traditions. See R. T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 5-9 for the terminological background. It is a moot question as to what Luke considered to be "scriptural" in terms of "canon"; he quotes from scriptural material seeking to validate his story, and this material (Isaiah, Malachi, Joel) is plausibly construed to be part of any mainstream "canon" amongst the Judaisms of the first century, see K. D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 5.
[38] *Development*, 52.
[39] *Power*, 52.

primitive church and also to Paul. He comments that "the assumption of Jewish influence always carries much greater probability than does the assumption of the influence of the Old Testament".[40] Gunkel sought to correct the Hellenistic bias of the History of Religions' School of his day in respect of the primitive church.[41] In establishing this context for any study of the Spirit in Luke-Acts, however, it is important to distinguish the relative value of the Jewish scriptures versus other first century Jewish writings.

Menzies uses the Jewish background to show that "intertestamental Judaism consistently identifies experience of the Spirit with prophetic inspiration",[42] and that "the Jews of the pre-Christian era generally regarded the gift of the Spirit as a *donum superadditum* granted to various individuals so that they might fulfil a divinely appointed task".[43] Menzies selects and categorizes texts from the Diaspora and Palestine, Qumran and later rabbinic literature. Menzies' thesis is that Luke "retained the traditional Jewish understanding of the Spirit as the source of special insight and inspired speech".[44] Paul, on the other hand, derived his soteriological concept of the Spirit from Jewish sapiential traditions.[45]

Menzies' use of the Jewish background can be questioned. First, the later more comprehensive study[46] of J. R. Levison identifies Jewish material that

---

[40] *Influence*, 13. Gunkel also claims that "it is a grave error in method, which must result in a mass of misconceptions, to attempt to derive Paul's sphere of ideas or even his usage directly from the Old Testament and consequently to ignore the apostle's origin in Judaism", 76.

[41] Gunkel observes that because very few pneumatic phenomena are manifest in the literature of Judaism "we are compelled to construct our analogies to New Testament ideas from the Old Testament", *Influence*. 21. Gunkel has an *experiential* focus which forces him down this road, whereas Menzies and Turner adopt the thesis that the Lucan Spirit is principally about prophecy and can root this concept more readily in Judaism.

[42] *Development*, 52.

[43] *Development*, 52.

[44] *Development*, 279.

[45] *Development*, 317-318.

[46] J. R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1997).

associates the Spirit with angelic work, and this material is not addressed by Menzies.[47] He also documents Jewish "spirit" texts that are unrelated to the concept of prophecy.[48] Secondly, Levison's treatment of some of the same material that Menzies cites is radically different.[49] Thirdly, because Menzies is keen to promote one concept of the Spirit as dominant, his interpretation of some texts is *forced*.[50] Finally, Menzies' understanding of the Jewish Spirit of prophecy can be questioned; Turner believes that he has "quite seriously misunderstood it"[51] by construing it too narrowly in terms of the one aspect of *prophecy*.

Turner has a broader understanding of the Jewish concept of the Spirit of prophecy. He argues that "the earliest community was a Jewish community, and intertestamental Judaism did not use the term Spirit as an explanation of all otherwise inexplicable manifestations of supernatural power: only certain types of event were regularly attributed to the Spirit—principally those that could be classed as manifestations of the 'Spirit of prophecy'; namely revelation, wisdom and charismatic speech".[52] However, he also claims that,

---

[47] Levison discusses the treatments of Philo and Josephus of the story of Balaam's ass, who both introduce the idea of an angelic spirit invading Balaam to impart prophetic speech, *Judaism*, 27-55. Menzies does not discuss Philo's treatment of this story, and he does not discuss the angelic aspects in Josephus' interpretation.

[48] Levison discusses Pseudo-Philo's interpretation of the Spirit in the book of Judges as a spirit that transforms Israel's leaders; he also discusses Philo's treatment of the effect of the Spirit on Abraham's character, *Judaism*, 84-98.

[49] Levison discusses Pseudo-Philo's treatment of the story of Balaam's ass; here he proposes that Pseudo-Philo saw the Spirit as 'life itself', *Judaism*, 56-65. This treatment opposes Menzies' claim that Pseudo-Philo regarded the Spirit in this story as the Spirit of prophecy, *Development*, 74.

[50] For example, Menzies treats such texts as Luke 1:17; 4:14; 24:49; Acts 1:8; and 10:38 as critically distinguishing πνεῦμα and δύναμις, and he argues that Luke redactionally introduces δύναμις in order to handle the category of miracle and preserve the Jewish concept of πνεῦμα as the Spirit of prophecy.

[51] *Power*, 13. This is also noted by Finny Philip, *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology* (WUNT 2/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 15.

[52] *Power*, 25.

> ...Jews did not think of the 'Spirit of prophecy' as 'the Spirit of the inspiration of the "prophetic" phenomena *alone*', but as something more like 'the Spirit which is typically associated with "prophetic" phenomena, but also at other times revealed as the "Spirit of power"'....[53]

And he further claims that,

> ...various sectors of Judaism expected the 'Spirit of prophecy' to give such important and/or transforming revelation, and such ethically *renewing* wisdom, that these activities would almost inevitably be regarded as *virtually essential* for fully authentic human existence before God.[54]

Turner selects texts from the same range of literature as Menzies, but he does note that it is only in the Targums[55] that the expression "Spirit of prophecy" has the wider associations he advocates; in other Palestinian and Hellenistic texts, the wider associations attach to the expression "the Spirit".

Turner's treatment of the Jewish background is more satisfactory than that of Menzies. Turner still centralizes the notion of prophecy, but he broadens our understanding of prophecy so that it embraces a variety of speech acts and has a transforming effect on human lives.[56] Because of this linkage, Turner argues that Luke's concept of the Spirit has soteriological significance. Even with a broader concept, Turner's treatment is susceptible to criticism. Turner's use of Targumic material[57] carries an anachronistic

---

[53] *Then and Now*, 16.
[54] *Then and Now*, 17.
[55] This is a critical qualification for his presentation of the Spirit of prophecy as the dominant conception in Judaism; see *Power*, 5. 89-90.
[56] *Power*, 90-91.
[57] Underpinning our note of caution are the exegetical guidelines for the Targumim given by B. D. Chilton in "Reference to the Targumim in the

danger, especially as he concedes that the expression "Spirit of prophecy" is predominantly a Targumic phrase.

Turner's presentation of the Jewish background raises the question as to whether the notion of prophecy should be central to an explanation of the Spirit.[58] Levison in his study sounds a note of caution when he says, "The study we have undertaken...has made crystal clear...there are many other instances in which the presence of the spirit does not effect an experience of prophecy",[59] and "The writings of first century biblical interpreters, therefore, exhibit enormous creativity and diversity with respect to the *effects* and the *nature* of the spirit, depending on their contextual needs".[60] In particular, as we have already noted, Levison documents many first century texts which betray an understanding of the Spirit as angelic. Levison's study therefore has the effect of opening up the whole question of whether *there is* a dominant conception of the Spirit in Judaism which can be pointed to as an influence on Luke.

Our contrary contention therefore is that the variegated nature of the Jewish background prevents our using a single dominant concept of the Spirit, whether narrowly (Menzies) or more broadly (Turner) conceived. Instead, we shall argue that in terms of the *effects* of the Spirit, the Jewish background attributes responsibility to the Spirit for a broader range of human behaviours and states than just "the prophetic".

Exegesis of the New Testament" in *The Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers (*SBLSP 34; Chico: Scholars Press, 1995), 77-81.

[58] Other scholars offer a similar generalization; for example, see C. S. Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 12, and Shepherd, *Narrative Function*, 41-42. The generalization is reflected in dictionary summaries, such as Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:407, and Judaist scholarship, such as G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (3 vols; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), 1:237, 421. P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom heilegen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1972), 14-15, gives a list of scholars who subscribe to this generalization. It is also found in the work of linguists, see D. Hill, *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 238.

[59] *Judaism*, 248.

[60] *Judaism*, 240.

4.1.1 Lucan and Early Church Pneumatology

The *goal* of setting the pneumatology of Luke-Acts in an historical context has dominated scholarship since O. Pfleiderer's *Der Paulinismus*.[61] This has involved positioning Luke-Acts in relation to the pneumatologies of the various synoptic traditions of the early church, the views of Jesus himself, and in relation to Paul. This exercise has been supported by showing how the various pneumatologies either fit within or innovate upon a first century (principally Jewish) context. A developmental thesis logically presupposes a base upon which the development is constructed, and this explains why proposals about the principally Jewish background, and proposals about New Testament pneumatologies, have gone hand in hand. The two most recent major redaction-critical studies (Menzies and Turner) have this focus.

In the pursuit of this goal, scholars rely on critical frameworks. Assumptions regarding the origin and date of gospel traditions and a solution to the synoptic problem are required; corresponding assumptions are required for the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline writings; further, redaction-critical assumptions are required for Luke-Acts that identify authentic Jesus tradition and sources from any Lucan overlay. For this reason, older scholarship, like that of Gunkel or von Baer, which labours with a less diverse picture of the evidence, is not as perceptive in handling what Turner calls "the Lucan interest".[62] With these assumptions, a foundation for a developmental proposal is then laid which consists in a characterization of similarities and differences between Luke-Acts and other peer texts in the literary context.

4.1.1.1 Discontinuity Hypotheses

Menzies discusses the pneumatology of Luke-Acts using the developmental notions of continuity and discontinuity.[63] These notions pertain to whether

---

[61] O. Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1873).

[62] *Power*, 26.

[63] Menzies adds a third category of a "mediating position". This is more a description of Lucan scholarship than Luke's thought, and so we will not use

Luke's thought is continuous or discontinuous with the primitive church (the Matthew, Mark and Q traditions), Johannine traditions, and Paul. It is worth noting that Menzies runs together different notions of "continuity": *chronological, conceptual* and *socio-literary*. Not only is Luke-Acts different from Paul in its *conceptual portrayal* of the Spirit, it is also discontinuous with Paul in terms of any Pauline *socio-literary influence* upon Luke-Acts. In respect of the other gospel traditions, Menzies locates Luke-Acts subsequent to Mark and Q and a literary heir to these traditions, which makes Luke-Acts a *chronological* development upon Mark and Q.

Menzies' thesis is that "Paul was the first Christian to attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit and that this original element of Paul's pneumatology did not influence wider (non-Pauline) sectors of the early church until after the writing of Luke-Acts".[64] Menzies' argument is, first, that soteriological functions were not generally attributed to the Spirit in intertestamental Judaism, where the Spirit was regarded as the source of prophetic inspiration; and secondly, Luke deploys this dominant Jewish perception and consistently portrays the Spirit as a prophetic endowment. In addition, Menzies argues that Luke does not subscribe to the primitive church's broader concept of the Spirit (evidenced in the earliest gospel traditions) as the source of miraculous power.[65]

Menzies regards his work as reviving the position of Gunkel and Schweizer, who likewise viewed Paul as fundamentally innovative in his treatment of the Spirit. Gunkel attributed an experiential understanding of the Spirit to the primitive church—the Spirit was responsible for the extra-ordinary experience of the early Christians. This emphasis distinguished the early church from Judaism and Paul. In this way, Gunkel differs from Menzies in his picture of early church development. Menzies' narrower prophetic view of the Spirit in Luke and Acts is more easily rooted in Judaism. Schweizer

---

it here; it describes scholars who treat Luke's theology and pneumatology without reference to a developmental thesis, *Development*, 18.

[64] *Development*, 48.

[65] *Development*, 196.

distinguished Luke and Paul by explaining Paul's pneumatology as the result of Hellenistic influence,[66] and he distinguished Luke from the other synoptic traditions by attributing to Luke a narrower view of the Spirit a- the Jewish Spirit of prophecy.[67] Menzies' position approaches that of Schweizer in affirming that "wisdom traditions from the Hellenistic Jewish milieu which produced Wisdom were known to Paul"[68] and of influence in his pneumatology.

4.1.1.2 Continuity Hypotheses

Menzies concedes that the majority of scholars have identified various shared themes between Luke-Acts, other gospel traditions, and Paul. We can classify this homogeneity in two ways, following Turner's lead.[69]

1) Scholars may broaden the Jewish background concept of the Spirit of prophecy so that it embraces the miraculous and/or the ethical. Turner discerns in Luke-Acts a "Christianized" version of the Jewish Spirit of prophecy:

> The 'Spirit of prophecy' anticipated in Judaism prototypically afforded revelation, wisdom, and invasive prophetic and doxological speech. The Spirit as 'the power of preaching' was a Christian understanding, which involved the combination of one or more of these enhancing the speaker's argument/exhortation, and/or providing signs that corroborated the speaker's discourse, and/or a numinous convincing power sensed in the speaker or his speech giving his message special 'impact' for the hearer.[70]

Turner disagrees with Menzies' picture of the relationship between Luke and the primitive church precisely because he believes Luke's notion of the Spirit of prophecy is broader. Turner also believes that Luke's portrait of the

---

66 *TDNT* 6:416.
67 *TDNT* 6:407.
68 *Development*, 303.
69 *Power*, 66-67.
70 *Power*, 431-432.

Spirit has important elements of the more developed thought of Paul and John. Thus we see that in Acts that the Spirit is the basis of Jesus extending his presence to believers, while in Paul and John the Spirit is the basis of personal unity between Christ and the individual.[71] Further. Luke clearly attributes wider functions to the Spirit to do with Christian life, and this perspective on the Spirit is greatly expanded upon by Paul.[72]

2) Scholars may broaden the concept of the Spirit *in* Luke-Acts so that Luke is seen to be embracing a broader range of functions in addition to any central function like the prophetic. Against Menzies, Dunn counsels, "Is there not a danger here of speaking as though there were two completely dissociated functions of the Spirit, as though, in effect, the Spirit of prophecy were a different Spirit from the Spirit of Salvation".[73] This identity is pitched sometimes as a power [74] and sometimes as a person,[75] and it allows him to sketch continuities between Luke and Paul.

Dunn sketches continuities between Paul and Luke affirming that both see the Spirit as that which "makes a man a Christian"[76] and gives to him his distinctively Christian experience. In Luke-Acts, the Spirit is the basis of the life of the Christian, and illustrated in visible behaviours. This is the case for Jesus as much as for the believers after Pentecost. Dunn sees Paul's distinctive theological contribution as his explanation of the Spirit as focused on making a person *like* Christ—the Spirit mediates an experience of sonship to the believer like that of the sonship of Jesus.

---

[71] *Power*, 430.
[72] *Power*, 445.
[73] "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts (1993)" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 222-242 (227).
[74] "Spirit and Holy Spirit in the New Testament" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 3-21 (10).
[75] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 43-61 (50-51).
[76] J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Enquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1997), 183.

4.1.2 Scope of Study

It is beyond the scope of our study to position Luke's presentation of the Spirit in a developmental framework in relation to earlier or later gospel traditions or Pauline and Deutero-Pauline letters. Our concern is to evaluate whether current scholarship accurately describes the underlying (Jewish/Hellenistic) base upon which theological development has happened and position Luke's concept of "the Spirit" in relation to this background. Our objective is to show that Luke has a broad concept of the Spirit in keeping with the variety and complexity of the Judaisms of his day.

4.2 The Spirit and Salvation History

The proposal of H. Conzelmann (based on the work of von Baer) that Luke divides history into three epochs has been influential in Lucan research,[77] although other scholars have argued for the retention of an imminent eschatology in Luke.[78] Conzelmann's premise for attributing such a division to Luke is the delay of the Parousia and an emerging recognition of "the problem of the existence of the church in a continuing period of time".[79] Conzelmann's proposal is that the age of the church is analogous to the age of Israel with the same institutional focus. However, such a division creates the explanatory problem of how the two ages are to be related. Conzelmann, and those who have followed him, have seen the ministry of Jesus as a bridging epoch.

---

[77] *Theology*, 16. Conzelmann's argument is detailed and redactional in its method. His case is that Luke modifies his materials in such a way as to diminish any eschatological focus; this in turn makes room for a "new" dispensation in salvation-history, that of "the church". The general problem with Conzelmann's analysis is that sufficient eschatological material survives his reductionist programme to cast doubt on its viability. Furthermore, the structural centre of his thesis—an interpretation of Luke 16:16—can be seriously questioned, for example, see Paul Minear's influential article, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories", in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1976), 111-130 (122). Minear's influence is reflected in commentaries such as that of C. F. Evans. *Saint Luke* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 53.

[78] For opposing views, see M. A. Powell, *What Are They Saying about Acts?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 58-62. It is probably best to view Conzelmann's scheme more accurately as *non*-eschatological.

[79] *Theology*, 14, 95-97, 131-132.

Some scholars explain Luke's theology of the Spirit within Conzelmann's salvation-historical framework. For example, Dunn makes Jesus' Jordan experience and Pentecost the decisive moments in Luke's scheme of salvation-history. Jesus' reception of the Spirit is not primarily an empowering for service, but instead his initiation into a new age: "The descent of the Spirit on Jesus effects not so much a change in Jesus, his person or his status, as the beginning of a new stage in salvation-history".[80] Dunn's argument against traditional Pentecostal views of Jesus' Jordan experience is that its significance is not just personal to Jesus and therefore a model for Christian experience; its significance is epochal. It is not a stage in Jesus' personal life, so much as a stage in God's plan.[81]

Dunn's treatment of Pentecost is likewise subordinated to a Lucan salvation-historical framework. He claims, "As Jesus entered the new age and covenant by being baptized in the Spirit at Jordan, so the disciples followed him in like manner at Pentecost",[82] and he argues, "As the beginning of the new age of the Spirit, the new covenant, the Church, it is what happened at Pentecost and not before which is normative for those who would enter that age, covenant and Church".[83] Hence, Dunn's understanding of the baptism of the Spirit is not that of a subsequent and (optional) additional gift subsequent to Christian conversion, but as an integral part of the matrix that is conversion-initiation.

These two epochs are bridged by Jesus. Dunn states, "Jesus is the one who effects these transitions, and in his own life each phase is inaugurated by

---

[80] *Baptism*, 28.

[81] Menzies opposes Dunn's "entry into a new age" reading in *Development*. 153-154, and it does appear counter-intuitive: it defines an age in an individualistic way, whereas it might well be argued that "age" is a social construct, and one best defined in relation to textual material mentioning times and periods.

[82] *Baptism*, 40.

[83] *Baptism*, 53.

his entering into a new relationship with the Spirit".[84] Thus Dunn argues that "Jesus, precisely in his relation with the Spirit, provides a bridge between the old age of Israel and the new age now recognized as the age of the church".[85] The difference in Jesus' relationship to the Spirit is signalled in the third epoch by Jesus becoming Lord of the Spirit.

While Conzelmann's three-epoch framework can be questioned, some epochal view of salvation-history seems appropriate and the Spirit does play a pivotal role at the beginning of Jesus' ministry and the apostolic ministry. Much of Dunn's evidence does not establish that Luke thought of the ministry of Jesus as a *distinct* epoch. It can equally show that Luke thought in terms of two ages, which was the common Jewish eschatological model.[86] This is the approach favoured in this study: the bestowal of the Spirit should be situated in relation to two epochs.[87] However, whether a two or three epoch model is advocated, scholars have argued that the bestowal of the Spirit represents the *beginning* of a new age. Dunn and Turner[88] identify the new age by pointing up how it is like the old age in its beginnings. Following many scholars, they compare Pentecost to Sinai, so that the giving of the Law is compared to the giving of the Spirit, and argue that this repetition of pattern shows a new beginning in the purpose of God. Thus, it is argued that Pentecost represents either initiation or renewal of a covenant with God.

4.2.1 Scope of Study

Our study does not follow this common line of argument. We seek to complement this approach by showing how Luke's use of certain Jewish

---

[84] *Baptism*, 40-41, cf. *Jesus and the Spirit*, 64.
[85] "Spirit and Holy Spirit", 9.
[86] Dunn appears to reject this possibility as Luke's view in *Baptism*, 46, but accepts Pentecostal criticism of a three epoch model in "Response", 233-234.
[87] For a defence of the "two-age" model, see A. J. Mattill, *Luke and the Last Things* (Dillsboro: North Carolina Press, 1979), and ch. 2 for a critique of Conzelmann. R. T. Carroll reviews relevant scholarship in *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), ch. 1.
[88] Turner, *Power*, 279-290; Dunn, *Baptism*, 48-49.

scriptures address the *closure* of the old age. Our interest is not in each manifestation of the Spirit in the story of Luke-Acts, but with the contribution made to Luke's eschatological framework by traditions in Isaiah, Joel and Malachi.

The ideas we explore are ones of reformation and renewal of the people. and the deliverance and liberation of a remnant in the face of a forthcoming wrath. Our study shows that these motifs inform Luke's thinking about the significance of Jordan and Pentecost. This is a peculiarly *Jewish* eschatological perspective upon Luke-Acts, because it relates the bestowal of the Spirit to the last days of a Jewish age.[89]

While not rejecting the applicability of the notion of the *beginning* of a new age, we argue that the leading typology of Pentecost is not one based around Sinai and the presentation of a Christian analogue to the Old Covenant and the Law. Rather, it shows a typology based on narrative patterns of deliverance, reformation and renewal. This is a new emphasis in studies of Pentecost, and it is one that establishes a link between witness and the offer of a corporate salvation. We will show that this is consistent with Luke's programmatic use of Isaiah 61 in Luke 4.

This is a soteriological interpretation of the bestowal of the Spirit, but not one that is linked to Sinai and notions of "covenant" and "law". In this way, we support Menzies' contention that there is no intention on the part of Luke to evoke the event of Sinai as a model for understanding Pentecost, although Menzies does not take our eschatological approach.[90]

The closure of a Jewish age implies the prospect of the beginning of a new age. The bestowal of the Spirit at Jordan and Pentecost is part of the matrix

---

89 This contrast is recognised by O. Cullmann, who argues that, "it is simply not true that Primitive Christianity has the same eschatological orientation as does Judaism", *Christ and Time* (trans. F. V. Filson; London: SCM Press, 1951), 85.

90 *Development*, 241.

that is this prospect for such a new age. However, our argument will be that this prospect is also signalled by the bestowal of the Spirit in the prophetic proclamation narrated in Luke 1 and 2. The model for understanding this beginning is an Elijah-like prophetic ministry of "turning the hearts of the children to the fathers" and a proclamation of forthcoming deliverance. It is this model that is taken up again in Luke's narratives of Jordan, Nazareth and Pentecost. Such a model signals the closure of an age because it urges a *turning* from what is old and towards what is to come.

4.3 Jordan and Nazareth

The principal debate in this area concerns the significance of Jesus' Jordan experience. The question is whether in addition to receiving empowerment at Jordan, Jesus also received the Spirit of eschatological sonship. Dunn is the principal advocate of this latter emphasis. He adds to his dispensational[91] perspective a broad understanding of Jesus' reception of the Spirit as *role enhancement*; but he is careful to subordinate this significance: "At each new phase of salvation-history Jesus enters upon a new and fuller phase of his messiahship and sonship".[92] To this concept of role-enhancement, Dunn adds an experiential dimension. He presents the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as a subsequent possession by the Spirit and "first and foremost an *experience*",[93] and "Jesus' own experience of intimate sonship must be attributed to the Spirit".[94]

Dunn also draws parallels between Jordan and Pentecost. He regards Jesus' Jordan experience as prototypical. He states that "as a type of Christian conversion-initiation, we see that entry into the new age and covenant is a single complex event, involving distinct actions of man (baptism) and God (gift of the Spirit), bound together by the repentance and commitment which

---

[91] We use the term "dispensation" as a neutral synonym of terms such as "age", "period", "epoch"; no theological freight is implied in our use of the term.

[92] *Baptism*, 29, cf. *Jesus and the Spirit*, 62-67.

[93] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)", 45.

[94] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)", 50.

is expressed in the former and results in the latter".[95] Dunn is careful to decouple water-baptism from the cognitive response of man and tie reception of the Spirit to repentance and commitment. This allows him to handle those occasions in Acts where reception of the Spirit is not tied to water-baptism, and it allows him to oppose sacramentalist viewpoints. It also allows him to oppose Pentecostal views that de-couple baptism in the Spirit from the process of conversion-initiation, and make spirit-baptism a *secondary* experience.

Dunn further argues that, "in Acts the gift of the Spirit is essentially God's saving response of forgiveness and life to the call of repentance and faith".[96] For Dunn, the possession of the Spirit by the believer has a strong experiential dimension (as it had for Jesus) in addition to the possession of any charismata. This possession is "the common ground between the believer and the exalted Lord".[97] Using Pauline concepts, but attributing the same theology to Luke (by noting Acts 16:7 τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ), Dunn says that "it is now the Spirit's work to reproduce [the character of Christ] in the Christian".[98] Jesus' exaltation has changed his relationship to the Spirit; as a result of his ascension, Jesus has become Lord of the Spirit. Dunn's gloss on this is that as a result, "Jesus has given personality to the Spirit",[99] and it is therefore the personality of Jesus that is experienced in the experience of the Spirit.

A number of Pentecostal scholars have criticized Dunn's position. Their accusation is that Dunn has allowed Pauline theology to colour his reading of Luke-Acts,[100] but this complaint is secondary to the main problem in

---

[95] *Baptism*, 37.
[96] "Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 207-209 (208).
[97] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)", 52.
[98] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)", 52.
[99] "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)", 52.
[100] Dunn acknowledges this common complaint of Pentecostal scholars in "Response", 223. It continues to be repeated today, see Mittlestadt, *Spirit and Suffering*, 23.

Dunn's position. Dunn parallels Jesus' Jordan experience with Pentecost and Turner correctly notes that for Dunn "to describe Jesus' experience of the Spirit as archetypal clearly has considerable implications for Lucan soteriology and christology".[101]

While Dunn rightly emphasizes an experiential dimension to both Jesus' possession of the Spirit and the post-Pentecost church, it is questionable whether both experience the Spirit in salvific terms. The connection between conversion, repentance, the receiving of forgiveness and the receipt of the Spirit, which Dunn sees in Acts 2, is not matched in Jesus' Jordan experience.[102] Accordingly, we agree with Turner's reading that Jesus' reception of the Spirit is an "empowering for the messianic task";[103] Jesus received the Spirit for the benefit of others. Furthermore, Turner's argument that Jesus is already the "eschatological son"[104] prior to his baptism and, moreover, aware of this status, is decisive in precluding any interpretation of Jordan as a bestowal of sonship. Turner's position is supported by Jesus' use of Isaiah 61 in his Nazareth address. This source text does not appear to go beyond the notion of empowerment in the claims of its anointed individual.

Turner interprets Luke's programmatic use of Isaiah 61 within the context of an Isaianic restoration. He avers, "Luke's portrait is dominated by his broader intention to portray the ministry of Jesus...as the fulfilment of God's promises savingly to restore his people Israel and make her a light to the nations".[105] This is our starting point for considering the eschatological framework of Jesus' empowerment.

---

[101] "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective" *TynBul* 32 (1981): 3-42 (9).
[102] Schweizer argues that since Jordan and Pentecost were not assimilated to one another by Luke, this indicates that he sees Jesus' endowment with the Spirit as on a "different plane from that of the community". *TDNT* 6:405.
[103] *Power*, 199, 429. See also Hur, *Dynamic Reading*, 20, and Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 191.
[104] *Power*, 199, 429.
[105] *Power*, 429.

Turner offers the fullest treatment of the eschatological framework within which the bestowal of the Spirit takes place. He characterizes the restoration as a "messianic Jubilee and New Exodus".[106] Using as a basis Luke's citation of Isaiah 61, he states that "...Jesus is empowered by the Spirit to free Israel from her 'slave-poverty', 'exile-captive' and 'blind' estate and lead her along the wilderness way towards restored Zion...".[107] In this he ascribes new exodus and Jubilee typology to Luke. Our disagreement with Turner will be on whether Isaiah 61 and its sister text in Isaiah 58 encodes *both* new exodus and Jubilee typology.

This aspect of Lucan pneumatology interfaces with more general research in Lucan eschatology including specific research around the theological motifs of restoration[108] and exile[109] in Second Temple Judaism. Two important recent studies of the theme of restoration in Luke-Acts are those by M. E. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-Gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts*, [110] and D. W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*.[111]

M. E. Fuller has nuanced Luke's notion of "restoration" with an exilic emphasis. Fuller shows that the exilic model of restoration is common in Second Temple literature and he selects three motifs in this literature for

---

106 *Power*, 429.
107 *Power*, 429.
108 See the essays in J. M. Scott, ed., *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, & Christian Perspectives* (JSJSup 72; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), in particular the essay by R. Bauckham, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts", 435-487.
109 N. T. Wright gave a recent impetus to this line of research by arguing that the Jews thought of themselves as "in exile" under Roman occupation: see N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1993). This has attracted some support; see C. M. Pate, *Communities of the Last Days* (Leicester: Apollos, 2000), ch. 5. For criticism, see the essays in C. C. Newman, ed., *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999).
110 M. E. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-Gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (BZNW 138; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003); Fuller provides a review of research, 4-9.
111 D. W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002).

his study: (1) Israel's re-gathering; (2) the defeat of the nations: and (3) a new temple. In respect of Luke-Acts, Fuller's study centres on the re-gathering of Israel around the Twelve,[112] but he also discusses Luke's use of restoration motifs in Luke 1-2[113] and Luke's understanding of Israel's exile.[114] His thesis is broad and intersects with our study in respect of Luke's use of Isaiah in Luke 4. While not rejecting his presentation of the gathering of Israel around the Twelve, we find reason to question his interpretation of the *exilic association* of the wilderness motif in Luke 3-4.

Fuller sees an exilic wilderness motif in Luke's use of Isaiah 40,[115] the encounter of Jesus with the devil in the wilderness,[116] and in Jesus' proclamation of the "end of the exile" in his Nazareth Address.[117] He affirms that "The exilic connotations of the wilderness are an important interpretive key to understanding how Luke presents and understands John and Jesus",[118] and "Luke's most important means of describing Israel's continual exile is his characterization of Israel as a 'wilderness' (ἔρημος)".[119] His case is based around Luke's use of Isa 40:3-5 in John the Baptist's declaration (Luke 3:4-6). He then treats the Nazareth pericope as a counterpoint to this proclamation, with Jesus declaring the release of exiles.

Fuller recognizes that Isaiah 61 provides Luke with a "conceptual frame to elucidate an important dimension of Jesus' restitution of Israel, one that takes into account his work of proclamation and healing",[120] but his setting of such restoration against an "exile" can be questioned. Our contrary proposal is that Luke sees the counterpoint of John the Baptist's wilderness as a *wilderness of the land* requiring a Jubilee restoration.

---

[112] *Restoration*, 239-253.
[113] *Restoration*, 204-207.
[114] *Restoration*, 207-239.
[115] *Restoration*, 219.
[116] *Restoration*, 229.
[117] *Restoration*, 236.
[118] *Restoration*, 219.
[119] *Restoration*, 211.
[120] *Restoration*, 237.

Fuller states that "In Acts 1-2, Luke completes his description of Israel's eschatological restoration"[121] and that "For Luke, the heavenly enthronement of the messiah results in the climax of Israel's re-gathering and restoration".[122] Fuller's reading of the enthronement of Jesus can be accepted, but our contrary proposal will be that there is no *completion* of a description of restoration in Acts 1-2. Rather, the bestowal of the Spirit has a purpose in deliverance that stands in tension with any notion of complete restoration. Instead, Luke has a clear concept of unfulfilled prophecy which he associates with the Second Advent (Acts 3:21).

D. W. Pao's study develops the thesis that "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".[123] In developing this reading, Pao argues that Luke's use of Isaiah provided "grounds for a claim by the early Christian community to be the true people of God in the face of other competing voices",[124] and the ecclesiological use of Isaiah "shows up in Acts when Luke focuses on the themes of the Gentile mission and Israel's rejection in his construction of the identity claim for the early Christian movement".[125] Pao's study thus has an ecclesiological emphasis[126] rather than a christological emphasis in its treatment of Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures, and this is a useful contribution to discussion.

Pao believes that the exodus paradigm has been eschatologized in Isaiah and repeatedly invoked. He collects[127] under the rubric of such a new exodus motifs such as the "way in the wilderness", the provision in the desert, the defeat of Rahab, the creation of a new people, and the agency of the Word of God. He then traces Luke's application of these ideas in his narrative.

---

121 *Restoration*, 258.
122 *Restoration*, 272.
123 *New Exodus*, 5; see also ch. 2.
124 *New Exodus*, 5.
125 *New Exodus*, 34.
126 *New Exodus*, 10.
127 *New Exodus*, 55-59.

Commencing with the prologue of Isa 40:1-11, Pao traces four Isaianic themes in Acts: the restoration of Israel, the power of the word of God, an anti-idol polemic, and a concern for the nations.[128] Pao's study is primarily based in Acts, but he also discusses Luke's gospel insofar as it is the "prelude to the development of the Isaianic program in Acts".[129]

Pao's treatment of exodus types in Isaiah 40-66 is valuable, and his use of the new exodus rubric impinges on our study in the same way as Turner. Our disagreement with Pao therefore is whether Isaiah 58 and 61 should be brought under this rubric, or whether instead we should only use a notion of a Jubilee restoration focused on the land in our description of Luke's use of these Isaianic texts.

4.3.1 Scope of Study

This is a much discussed area in Lucan pneumatology and we do not address the question of Jesus' own experience of the Spirit. Turner presents a balanced perspective when he says that Luke is not concerned with the Spirit to "highlight a benefit to Jesus' own religious life and perception".[130] Rather, our interest is in the eschatological framework that Luke supplies for Jesus' empowerment. Accordingly, we examine the implications of Luke's use of Isaiah in the Nazareth address. We will argue that Luke presents Jesus' ministry as a "Jubilee" restoration of the land through his programmatic use of Isaiah. We will present this as a more satisfactory typology than the "new exodus" and "exilic" emphases of Turner, Pao and Fuller.

4.4 Pentecost

Three broad positions on the meaning of the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost can be noted. The gift may be interpreted solely in terms of mission; it may be construed in terms of the functions needed to build up the individual

---

[128] *New Exodus*, 13.
[129] *New Exodus*, 13.
[130] *Power*, 429.

Christian and the church; finally, it may be understood in terms of conversion and initiation into the church.

The premise for scholars[131] who present an empowerment and subsequence view is that the gift of the Spirit is promised to those who are *already* Christians. This prior status is shown by Luke's loose coupling of reception of the Spirit and water baptism. Luke has examples of baptised believers without the Spirit (Acts 8). The gift of the Spirit is therefore secondary and additional to the Christian life; its purpose is mission. Scholars who take this approach may further delimit the Spirit as essentially prophetic in the style of the Old Testament prophets *preaching* to Israel. Menzies offers the most detailed defence of this position.

Menzies argues that redactional changes by Luke show a deliberate use of the Jewish concept of the Spirit of prophecy. For example, he notes that, i) Luke has linked Jesus' baptism and receipt of the Spirit to Jesus' Nazareth address (Luke 4:16-30) in which Jesus interprets his mission in terms of Isaiah 61 stripped of its miraculous aspect;[132] ii) Luke alters the *Sitz im Leben* for the blasphemy against the holy Spirit logion (Luke 12:10) to one that has a witness emphasis and does not involve reference to the miraculous;[133] and iii) Luke makes Joel central to the interpretation of Pentecost.[134] Menzies makes the gift of the Spirit embrace a variety of phenomena such as revelation, visions, inspired speech, predictive prophesying and preaching.

---

131 In addition to Menzies, Lampe's early work represents this view as does Schweizer in his *TDNT* article.

132 *Development*, 146, 159, 166-167. Thus, for example, Menzies interprets Luke's exclusion of ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ from his citation of Isa 61:1-2 indicates an exclusion of a miraculous dimension.

133 *Development*, 194. Here, Menzies regards Luke's relocation of the holy Spirit logion to a context of witness as significant.

134 *Development*, 210-212.

Dunn finds evidence of a soteriological concept of the Spirit in Acts 2 for two reasons: first, Pentecost is part of a *scheme of salvation*:[135] secondly, Luke uses the language of promise and covenant, and such language concerns what it is to *be* a believer.[136] Since Jordan and Pentecost initiate new stages in the purpose of God, bestowal of the Spirit can be considered as a "gift" in both cases. These stages pertain to the offer of salvation, and thus the gift of the Spirit is part of this bringing of salvation to the believer. Dunn comments that "for Luke Pentecost was the beginning of the new covenant in the experience of the disciples".[137] Dunn supports his analysis with exposition that links Luke's language in Acts with themes of Abrahamic promise and Old Testament prophecies of the new covenant.

Turner agrees with Menzies that Luke makes Joel central to his Pentecost account, and does not echo or allude in Acts 2 to the Old Testament soteriological texts needed by Dunn.[138] However, he argues that Luke does not restrict the operation of the gift of the Spirit to mission, and ascribes gifts to the Spirit for building up the church and bringing about ethical renewal. Turner affirms that an emphasis on the Spirit as a selective prophetic endowment for mission does not do justice to the *universal* offer of the gift or its close proximity to conversion.[139] These aspects suggest that the Spirit has a role in the building up of the believer. Thus, while Turner retains the central use of Joel's prophecy as a control on his interpretation of Acts 2, he seeks to interpret Joel's prophetic gift of the Spirit in a wider sense worked out in the body of Acts.

The question for scholars working in this area of Lucan pneumatology is whether and how Luke-Acts makes the Spirit "the power of eschatological

---

[135] *Baptism*, 40-41.
[136] *Baptism*, 47.
[137] *Baptism*, 49.
[138] *Power*, 71-71.
[139] *Power*, 78-79. Hence, Turner argues in "Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8: The Waterloo of Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology?" *Pneuma* 23 (2001): 265-286 (278), that the example of Acts 8 "is not genuinely about what might be regarded as normal subsequence, but about unusually and divinely delayed experience of salvation".

sonship" for Christians.[140] This area of theological debate can be usefully analysed using the distinction between first and third person. With this classification we can construct a definition of what would count as a "first-person" soteriological effect of the Spirit. This kind of effect would be one that was brought about directly with the person themselves without the involvement of a third party. Such an effect would be about bringing the person into the church or maintaining the person in the church. Other effects of the Spirit could be deemed soteriological, but have a "third-person" focus. For example, a word of prophecy may have soteriological consequences in others by having an edifying or converting effect.[141]

Schweizer illustrates one kind of pole in this theological spectrum. He argues that Luke moved beyond the Jewish heritage, which restricted the Spirit of prophecy, by working out the eschatological significance of the Spirit of prophecy being given to *all* members of the community.

> The Spirit is, therefore, not the power which binds a man to God and transfers him into a state of salvation; it is a supplementary power which enables him to give form to his faith in the concrete activity of the proclamation of the Gospel.[142]

Here Schweizer denies that the Spirit has a first-person focus, if by this it is meant that its possession benefits believers themselves by "binding" them to God. Instead, the Spirit is an added missionary power with epistemic effects given to all believers. Schweizer's claim is that Luke does not associate the Spirit either with the miraculous or with "strongly ethical effects".[143] For Schweizer, the difference between Paul and Luke is that Paul has a first-

---

[140] Turner, *Power*, 36.

[141] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 133-146, offers a complementary analysis of this kind of effect in terms of speech act theory and the perlocutionary effects of speech acts engendered by the Spirit.

[142] "Spirit of Power", 268. See also *TDNT* 6:412.

[143] *TDNT* 6:407. Turner notes that the translation in *TDNT* incorrectly attributes to Schweizer the opposite opinion to that expressed in the German original, *Power*, 60; so too Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 24.

person perspective on the soteriological effect of the Spirit. His soteriological proposal is that for Paul, πνεῦμα "is now the power of God which brings a man to faith".[144] This characterization gives a first-person focus to Pauline thought: "it is no longer a supplementary phenomenon as in Acts, but the power which determines the new life of faith".[145]

Gunkel is further along the theological spectrum than Schweizer in respect of Luke-Acts. Reviewing texts in Acts, Gunkel concludes, "we may not state, therefore, that the activities of the Spirit are indifferent to the moral-religious sphere...but the everyday religious acts of the ordinary Christian are not perceived as gifts of the holy Spirit".[146] This position is in keeping with Gunkel's approach to the Spirit as concerned with extra-ordinary experiences and it is a first-person perspective with carefully circumscribed limits that arguably fall short of being soteriological. However, for Paul, Gunkel says that he "described the Christian life as an activity of the πνεῦμα in a completely original way",[147] which gives the Spirit a broader first-person remit; for Paul, the Spirit was concerned with ethical renewal and not the bringing of a person to faith.[148]

Menzies is at the same end of the spectrum as Schweizer. His emphasis on the gift of the Spirit as an exclusive *donum superadditum* detaches the Spirit in Luke-Acts from soteriological work. The key exegetical move here is that the Spirit is given to those who are *already saved*. Such a "post-conversion" position assumes a narrower definition of what would count as a soteriological act by restricting such an act to conversion and initiation: "for Luke, the Spirit remained the source of special insight and inspired speech. The important corollary is that neither Luke nor the primitive church attributes soteriological significance to the pneumatic gift in a manner

---

144 *TDNT* 6:432.
145 *TDNT* 6:432.
146 *Influence*, 18.
147 *Influence*, 102.
148 *Influence*, 91.

analogous to Paul".[149] Accordingly, Menzies argues, "Luke, in accordance with the primitive church, does not present reception of the Spirit as necessary for one to enter into and remain with the community of salvation".[150]

Scholars have focused on the *universal*[151] promise of the Spirit as the main innovation in Lucan thought and argued that this suggests the Spirit has a first-person focus. To this it is also added that Luke ties the Spirit to the process of conversion and initiation, which also suggests a first-person focus. Both Dunn and Turner agree on a first-person perspective. Dunn sees the Spirit directly involved in the *entry* of the individual to the new covenant and his subsequent maintenance; he says that the gift of the Spirit is the "bearer of salvation".[152] Turner affirms that the Spirit is "a divine power active through the messenger (in a variety of ways) giving conviction to the message, and so prompting repentance and belief even if not mechanistically ensuring it".[153]

Turner argues that the "benefits of salvation"[154] were made present in the ministry of Jesus through his empowerment by the Spirit and subsequently continued after the ascension by the Pentecost gift of the Spirit. This gift was the means by which the presence of Jesus continued to be mediated to the disciples and it is therefore "soteriologically necessary"[155] for the continuation of those benefits that Jesus ministered in his earthly life. The gift of the Spirit is bestowed in order to "equip"[156] the believer for the Christian life. He avers, "Luke could not envisage how the experience of

---

[149] *Development*, 48.
[150] *Development*, 279.
[151] For example, Turner, "Restoration and Witness", 338
[152] *Baptism*, 92.
[153] *Power*, 435.
[154] *Power*, 435.
[155] *Power*, 435.
[156] *Power*, 437.

salvation and discipleship could be maintained. deepened and extended without the gift of the Spirit granted to the disciples".[157]

4.4.1 Scope of Study

Our understanding of the Lucan concept of the Spirit is not one that is exclusively third-person orientated whether missiological or soteriological. If Pentecost is read in the context of last days of a Jewish age and in the light of the need to deliver the people from a coming judgment, it follows that Menzies' missiological emphasis is correct.

Luke presents a story set within the eschatological expectations of Luke 17:20-37 and 21:6-36. A purpose of the bestowal of the Spirit relates to the requirements of the "last days", which is to secure an escape from the wrath to come. However, Luke's use of Joel 3:1-5 betrays a *third-person corporate* soteriology—the effects of the Spirit are principally concerned with the witness and preaching necessary to secure the deliverance of a remnant.

However, the presentation of third-person or first-person soteriological effects is a false dichotomy for Luke. This is shown by his use of Malachi 3 and Isaiah 32 alongside Joel 3 in his prophetic validation of Pentecost. These other texts bring to his overall presentation an individual soteriological dimension which is centred on motifs of reformation, renewal and restoration. Our study will provide further evidence for the case that there is an ethical dimension to Luke's pneumatology.

In our study, we do not engage in a discussion of the effects of the gift of the Spirit upon the individual—whether and how episodes in Acts show the requirements of mission and/or the transformation of the believer's life. Rather, we supplement Turner's work[158] with a fuller discussion of the co-

---

[157] *Power*, 446.

[158] We are also supplementing the work of Wenk who, as we have noted, also seeks to develop Turner's approach.

text[159] of Luke's principal references to the Jewish scriptures (Isaiah, Joel, and Malachi). Our discussion of this scriptural background will show that ethical transformation and renewal are fundamental to the gift of the Spirit. This quality of life is plausibly deemed to be salvific and about "sonship".

5. Outline of Study

Our argument is presented in four chapters. In **Chapter Two**, we discuss our approach in the study and justify our choices of method. In **Chapter Three**, we argue that it is inappropriate to make the *content-rich* notion of "prophecy" the central defining characteristic of "the Spirit". Instead, we should work with a more variegated notion of the functions of the Spirit when analysing first century materials.

In **Chapters Four and Five**, we consider the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus at Jordan and the disciples at Pentecost. Through an examination of the Jewish scriptural texts that Luke uses to explain and validate these bestowals, we argue that Luke directs the reader to place the bestowal of the Spirit in a *Jewish* eschatological framework comprised of the "last days" of an age in which there is a need for *deliverance*. This deliverance pertains to the land and a "Jubilee" motif is used by Luke to signal his understanding of the kind of restoration on offer in Jesus' ministry and the apostolic preaching.

Finally, in a **Concluding Chapter** we summarize our findings and sketch some directions for future research.

---

[159] We take the notion of "co-text" to denote the surrounding literary context of a text in contradistinction to the "context" which includes a broader historical range of considerations; see M. M. B. Turner and P. Cotterell, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989), 16.

CHAPTER TWO

Methodology

1. Introduction

Three principal methods inform this study: i) a comparison of Second Temple texts in order to establish a literary context for Luke's understanding of the concept of "the Spirit"; ii) an intertextual reading of Luke's scriptural texts thereby supplying an interpretative matrix for the bestowal of the Spirit at Jordan and Pentecost; and iii) a predominantly typological analysis of this interpretative matrix in order to furnish a description of Luke's eschatological framework for such bestowal. Each of these three methods will now be discussed.

2. Comparison of Second Temple Texts

Luke[1] does not write in a vacuum;[2] Luke and Acts emerged in a literary context.[3] Whether we consider Luke to be a Palestinian or Hellenistic Jew, or a Greek,[4] he is evidently very familiar with the Jewish scriptures. Our

---

[1] Following many studies, we presume a single author for Luke and Acts. For support see J. L. Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC 35A; Dallas, Texas: Word Books, 1989), xxxvii-xxxix; F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1952), 2-8; B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 51-60. With Pao, *New Exodus*, 19, our study offers a thematic argument for unity.

[2] We do not rely on any specific date for Luke and Acts. The consensus of scholars dates both works to after 70 C.E.; for example, see I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 33-35 and Witherington, *Acts*, 60-63. For a pre-70 C.E. dating, see J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), 86-117.

[3] K. Rowe has argued in "History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts" *JSNT* 28 (2005): 131-157, that a unified authorship does not imply that Luke and Acts were read together. However, L. T. Johnson's reply in "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?" *JSNT* 28 (2005): 159-162, shows that the implied reader of Acts is expected to have read the Gospel of Luke. C. H. Talbert's discussion of the "successive" nature of the Acts in *Reading Acts* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1997), ch. 1, also appears decisive in establishing that the implied reader of Acts is expected to read the Gospel of Luke.

[4] E. Haenchen surveys the early church evidence for traditional ascription of authorship in *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 3-14.

study does not rely on any particular view of the real author of Luke and Acts; we use the designation "Luke" to refer to the "implied author" of these two texts. S. Chatman states of this notion that it "is implied, that is, reconstructed by the reader from the narrative".[5] Insofar as we discuss the use of πνεῦμα in Luke and Acts and the integration of selected Jewish scriptures in those texts, we are constructing an aspect of the author of these works, but only *as he is presented in them*. It is outside the scope of our thesis to consider the wider issues of authorship of Luke and Acts.

Our investigation into Luke's pneumatology therefore needs to enquire into his background of the Jewish scriptures and their interpretation in the first century. Our method for this enquiry is *synchronic* rather than *diachronic*. We are not seeking to offer theses about any diachronic dependence between Jewish traditions and Luke and Acts, or the evolution of ideas in Jewish pneumatology. Our study is *conceptual* and seeks to delimit the concept of the Spirit in the Judaisms[6] of Luke's time period. Nevertheless, while this methodological presumption is sound for logistical reasons, it can only postpone an exploration of tradition-history for future research.

Lucan scholars typically set Luke's pneumatology against a background of comparative Second Temple texts and we follow in this approach.[7] We consider those texts that offer understandings of the functionality of "the Spirit". Two methodological problems attend this procedure: first, there is the problem of selection—different scholars make different selections of "first century" material; and secondly, there is the problem of how to characterize and group the texts that are chosen.

For a recent discussion see M. C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007), ch. 1.

[5] S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978), 148. For a seminal discussion of the notion of the "implied author" see W. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd ed.; London: Penguin Books, 1983), 71-76.

[6] Our working presumption is that first century Judaism consisted of a number of alternative Judaisms. For a defence of this view see J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton, *Judaism in the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 1995), ch. 1.

[7] See Turner, *Power*, chs. 3-5, and Menzies, *Development*, chs. 2-5.

We justify and present a broad selection of texts in Chapter Three and develop a philosophical framework for the analysis of the texts. We take this approach in order to bring a new perspective on the texts and demonstrate the broad understanding of the effects of the Spirit that existed in Luke's day. We will argue that there is no one dominant conception of the Spirit in Second Temple Judaism and we will show that Luke's understanding of the effects of the Spirit is similarly broad.

3. Intertextuality

Our second method, which we deploy in Chapters Four and Five, is intertextual.[8] Many studies of Luke and Acts have highlighted the use of the Jewish scriptures,[9] rather than other non-scriptural writings. This implies that Luke expects his readers to make hermeneutical connections

---

[8] For an overview of intertextual theory see the essays in D. N. Fewell, ed., *Reading between the Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1992). It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the philosophical hermeneutics of various intertextual theories, and consequently we apply no particular technical vocabulary to Luke's text. For a theoretical discussion of scriptural usage applied to the Gospel of Luke, see R. L. Brawley., *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), ch. 1.

[9] The basis for recent work has been T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentkichen Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akadamie-Verlag, 1968) and M. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969). The approach of Rese was then challenged by D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), ch. 1. These studies have their focus in Luke's Christology and are concerned with establishing Luke's *Vorlage*, the reasons for his variations from the hypothetical *Vorlage* and the kinds of use of the Jewish Scriptures that there is in Luke-Acts. More recent monographs have been C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); C. A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); and Litwak, *Echoes*. A steady stream of articles continues to review Luke's use of the Old Testament, e.g. C. K. Barrett, "Luke/Acts" in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (eds., D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 231-244; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts", in his *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 295-313; and J. T. Sanders, "The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Acts" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 191-198.

with a certain body of literature and it implies a "privilege" accorded by Luke to that body. A methodological choice of the Jewish scriptures over other first century Jewish writings is therefore warranted.[10]

An intertextual method is appropriate for an investigation of Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures, but this requires a clearly defined text in relation to Luke and Acts and his scriptural materials.[11] We follow the consensus of scholars in taking the Alexandrian text to be the original Lucan text to the extent that it is represented in the eclectic text of Nestle-Aland (NA27. 1993).[12] For the purposes of our analysis, we take this to be the final form of Luke's text, while recognizing that this methodological assumption would require qualification by any text-critical study.[13]

Studies have shown Luke's dependency on the Jewish Greek Scriptures[14] insofar as we can determine these texts. However, K. D. Litwak concedes

---

[10] Litwak, *Echoes*, 4.

[11] There are other methods of investigation which we do not pursue. Thus, Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures could be examined in a historical and comparative way within the context of Jewish exegesis of the first century. For example, Sanders and Evans discuss the issue of Midrash in *Luke and Scripture*, 1-14; Barrett offers a source-critical discussion of Luke's gospel quotations and allusions in "Luke/Acts", 231-237; and Fitzmyer compares the formulas Luke uses to introduce quotations with Qumran documents in "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts", 296-301. These are historical-critical investigations whereas our study is solely *literary* in that we do not seek to position Luke's use of Jewish scripture in an historical relationship with, for example, synoptic sources or contemporary Jewish methods of exegesis.

[12] *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: ed., K. Aland et al.; 27th ed.: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993). For discussion of the text see, Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 40-47 and C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols: ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 1998), 1:20-29. The Western additions pertaining to "the Spirit" are conveniently listed by M. E. Isaacs. *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament* (London: Heythrop Publications, 1976). Appendix E.

[13] In our study, variations between the Western and Alexandrian traditions only become relevant when we discuss Luke's citation of Joel, and at that point we will argue in favour of the Alexandrian text (see Chapter Five).

[14] The classic study is that of W. K. L. Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts" in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1* (eds., F. J. Foakes Jackson

that "there may be places in Luke-Acts where Luke's scriptural intertextual references are influenced by Hebrew or Aramaic scriptural texts".[15] In a review of proposals on the identity of Luke's scriptures.[16] D. L. Bock observes, "Old Testament texts could have come to him [Luke] through renderings of the Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, or the Targums, as well as through various types of LXX translations and community testimonia".[17] Furthermore, if we broaden our horizon and consider Luke's audience,[18] it is not certain that we can assume that Luke presumes a readership versed in *only* the Old Greek scriptures. C. A. Kimball's recent discussion of Luke's use of the OT is careful to document lexical variation between Luke's quotations and both the MT and the LXX, and this is a necessary procedure when discussing the question of the identity of Luke' scriptures in any particular quotation of allusion.[19] Accordingly, in our study we recognise the priority of the Jewish Greek scriptures but include the Hebrew to allow for the mix of versions around in Luke's day.

The burden of our discussion is centred on the *context* of Luke's scriptural quotations and allusions. As such, this is a study of motif and theme, rather

---

and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols; London: Macmillan, 1920-1933), 2:66-105. For a discussion of the possible explanations of lexical variation between the LXX and the MT in respect of Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures, see McLay, *Use of the Septuagint*, 17-36. Fitzmyer in "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts", 304-305 offers a convenient lists of quotations that exactly match the LXX, partly correspond to the LXX, and are not close to the LXX.

[15] *Echoes*, 6-7.

[16] *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 13-27.

[17] *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 16.

[18] Questions about Luke's real audience are beyond the scope of this study: our research supplies data for a determination of Luke's real audience. Luke may have envisaged an individual (Gentile or Jewish), a specific community (Gentile, Jewish, or mixed), or the wider church as his audience. It is quite possible that Luke has a complex of different readers in mind, and caters for each with varying degrees of success. For a presentation of the argument for a mixed audience, against the consensus of a Gentile audience, see P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), ch. 2. For a broad view of Luke's audience see the essays in R. Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), the proposals of which are equally applicable to Acts.

[19] *Exposition*, chs. 3 and 4.

than textual questions relating to the quotations and allusions themselves.[20] While the Greek of the quotations and allusions we discuss corresponds closely to the LXX, and would support the thesis that Luke is using the Old Greek directly or through a source,[21] the narrative in which this scriptural usage is set has story elements which may or may not correspond to the LXX source contexts on a lexical level. Unless we assume that Luke's potential audience is *only* versed in the story from the Old Greek, we cannot exclude a consideration of the story elements of Greek *and* Hebrew scriptural materials. Hence, it is useful to cite both Greek and Hebrew scriptural source materials when considering the possibility of correspondences.[22]

An intertextual method goes beyond our first, comparative, method. That method (as we defined it) brings texts from a literary co-text into an illuminating relationship without making claims about dependencies such as quotation, allusion and echo. Our second method is therefore stronger in the results that it puts forward because it asserts such dependencies.

R. B. Hays, in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*,[23] has proposed seven criteria for assessing intertextual links.[24] These have been applied to Luke and Acts by R. L. Brawley.[25] While we do not explicitly apply Hays' seven-fold criteria for assessing echoes, the intertextual links that we propose in our study are amenable to his model of assessment. Hays' first

---

[20] That is, while it is necessary to discuss in Chapters Four and Five textual questions relating to Luke's use of Isaiah 58 and 61 and Joel 3, the issues in this area are not the focus of our study.

[21] Fitzmyer, "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts", 306.

[22] Text-critical questions relating to the Old Testament are not addressed in our study, accordingly we use the critical editions of A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (2 vols; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979) and *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (eds., K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; 4th ed.: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990).

[23] R. B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

[24] *Echoes*, 29-32.

[25] Brawley, *Text to Text*, 13-14, 86-90.

criterion for assessing an echo is whether the source text was available to the author and audience; this is trivially satisfied in our case.

Hays' second criterion concerns the volume of corresponding lexical and syntactic material. This criterion is obviously satisfied in respect of Luke's quotation of Joel, notwithstanding the determination of textual questions, but the lexical coincidence drawing in Isaiah 32 is slight; nevertheless, we will show that an allusion to this text also appears certain.

Hays notes that the volume of an echo is not only determined by correspondence; the distinctiveness or prominence of the precursor text is also a factor. Thus, given the rarity of spirit-bestowal texts in the prophetic corpus, their distinctiveness accentuates any possible echo from a later writer, especially when the candidate echo is set within a bestowal context; accordingly, a link between Isaiah 32 and Luke-Acts seems secure.

According to Hays, an echo is also strengthened if it is rhetorically prominent in the successor text, i.e. the plausibility of co-incidence is reduced. The programmatic nature of the Baptist's prediction, Jesus' promises about the Spirit to the Twelve, as well as Pentecost, ensures that any echo is meant to have a critical role in interpretation.

Hays' third criterion tests whether an echo is from a text that an author uses on more than one occasion. This criterion can be broadened to include a count of how often an author quarries a book or parts of a book for allusive material, which might show a predisposition towards making the echo under test. In respect of Malachi 3, the allusion to the "Coming One" of Mal 3:1 in Luke 3:16 is supported in his subsequent identification of John the Baptist as "the Messenger" of Malachi 3 (Luke7:27).

Hays' fourth criterion is that the echo should fit with the line of argument being developed by the author. In the case of Luke's echo with Malachi 3, we will show that this fits with his temple-directed apologetic and theme of

reformation in teaching. Luke's use of Joel serves his purpose in offering a deliverance context and a broadly-based bestowal of the Spirit. Isaiah 32 offers an Isaianic restoration context for the bestowal of the Spirit which dovetails with Luke's use of Isaiah 61 in respect of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit. These echoes therefore fit with his end-time expectations for Jerusalem and the "generation" contemporary with Jesus.

Hays' fifth criterion is an assessment of whether a proposed allusion is historically plausible for the original audience. Our study contributes a more thorough-going analysis of what is consonant and dissonant between the intertexts brought together by Luke. Accordingly, while it may be historically plausible that Luke's audience saw basic connections with Isaiah, Joel and Malachi, it may be implausible to suppose that they perceived the same range of consonant and dissonant detail that we will outline. On the other hand, if we judge (from Luke and Acts as a whole) that Luke is a sophisticated interpreter of the Jewish scriptures, it is possible that Luke did encode the narrative patterns that we will highlight; thus, we would argue that our proposals could satisfy this criterion, subject to future research into Luke's real audience.

Hays defines his sixth criterion as a question: Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes?[26] Some, but not all, of the allusive detail we will propose has been offered by other commentators. Accordingly, our proposals will only *partly* satisfy this criterion because previous commentators have brought different intertexts to bear on Jordan and Pentecost.

Hays' final criterion "is difficult to articulate precisely without falling into the affective fallacy, but it is finally the most important".[27] This concerns the "satisfaction" of a proposed echo or group of echoes between texts, and such satisfaction is a function of the reading background of a commentator.

---

[26] *Echoes*, 31.
[27] *Echoes*, 31.

Hays' evaluation of this criterion shows a reader-response methodological preference in his analysis. Our focus is on the text and Hays' textual criteria (1-4) are more important for our study.[28]

We apply an intertextual method in order to uncover the potential reading response of Luke's "implied reader".[29] The notion of an "implied reader" is an abstract literary construct under which a critic can gather detail about what is implied in a text about *potential* readers of that text. There may be no real reader that exactly matches such a construct in the reception history of the text, but there may have been *some* real readers that approximated towards such an ideal (cf. Acts 17:10-15; 18:24-28), and these may have encouraged Luke to include a fairly dense intertextual weave in his narrative.

Insofar as an author sets up intertextual relationships, texts can be gathered together and analysed therefore in respect of the "implied reader". J. B. Tyson observes, "The modern interpreter may identify some of the assumptions about the implied reader by being attentive to allusions that appear in the text, characters that are not fully identified, references that require geographical knowledge, events that are not fully explained, as well as indications of language, customs, and literary competence".[30]

---

[28] Hays observes of his criteria of assessment that, "To run through this series of criteria for each of the texts that I treat would be wearisome", *Echoes*, 32. Our approach is similar: we presume Hays' criteria in our presentation, but do not explicitly frame our remarks using his tests.

[29] For discussion of the notion of the "implied reader", see M. A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (London: SPCK, 1993), 19-21; R. M. Fowler, "Who is 'The Reader' in Reader-Response Criticism?" *Semeia* 31 (1985): 5-21 (10); J. B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), ch. 1; W. S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1993), ch. 2; and Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 149-150.

[30] *Images*, 23. Tyson goes on to offer an analysis of the assumptions about the implied reader in terms of their geographical knowledge of the Mediterranean world, the characters in Luke's account, the competence of the reader in Greek, a knowledge of recent public events, measurements and money, the religious practices of the Jews, and an acceptance of the authority of the Jewish scriptures, 24-39.

Of the various data that may be gathered about the implied reader that Tyson sketches, our interest is the knowledge of the intertext implied by Luke's use of a text. We assign to the implied reader knowledge of what *might*[31] be brought from the intertext (and its context) to the reading of Luke's narrative. In this methodological choice, we recognise the integrity of the intertext, that it in some sense stands "over against" Luke's own text, and that it may challenge or supplement (through the implied reader) Luke's own usage.

In this respect, P. Merenlahti has observed that the prologue to Luke's gospel implies that the reader will be "familiar with the Jewish Scriptures, their interpretation, and the Christian proclamation".[32] Luke states to Theophilus "that you may know the truth concerning the things of which you have been instructed (περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης)" (Luke 1:4). Whether we regard Theophilus as a real individual or a notional reader, the implication is that Luke is writing for those *within* the community. As we shall outline below, Luke's prologue states an interest in matters of record, but his narrative also shows a conscious attempt to *continue* the biblical history. An implication of this characteristic is that a reader is expected to look for notes of continuity in the narrative, and it is these intertextual links for the implied reader that we describe and discuss in our study.[33]

3.1 Critical and Pre-Critical Frameworks

Luke principally uses oracles from Isaiah, Malachi and Joel in explaining Jordan and Pentecost. We cannot bring a historico-critical reading framework of these prophetic works to our analysis of Luke-Acts, because

---

[31] The question of what *ought* to be ascribed to the implied reader vis-à-vis their reading of the original context of Luke's quotations, allusions and echoes is vexed and requires a theoretical discussion of metalepsis. This is beyond the scope of our study, and we are concerned with what *might* have been brought to bear on Luke's narrative by the implied reader.

[32] P. Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 53.

[33] For further reasons, see Pao, *New Exodus*, 35.

Luke is not a historico-critical reader.[34] Instead, a pre-critical framework is required.[35] This places restrictions upon the possible results to be obtained from our intertextual method.

J. Barton argues[36] that readers in the Second Temple period understood the prophets to be seers and visionaries, communicating a message with future application. The books that bore the names of the prophets were presumed to be coherent in their message and relevant.[37] For example, there would be no perceived difficulty in taking Isaiah of Jerusalem to address both his own times and future happenings in Israel, either in or after the Exile,[38] or even later at the "end of the age". There would be no impetus on this count towards a complex compositional understanding of Isaiah. Barton's generalization offers a presumption that Luke's implied reader is to be taken as a typical Second Temple reader. Such a reader would be similar to one presumed in other NT documents which record quotations equally from

---

[34] Luke is adept at the critical use of source materials, as evidenced in his use of Mark and Q; it may therefore be the *status* of the Jewish Scriptures which prevent him taking a similar critical view; no historico-critical trajectory of interpretation has been identified in the early church writings, see M. Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), ch. 1.

[35] Pao, *New Exodus*, 19, makes the same point.

[36] J. Barton, *Oracles of God* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 131-140. Barton notes, "the normal methods of biblical criticism, which have been so successful in penetrating to the heart of the message of the prophets through the accumulated accretions of the centuries are powerless to show us how these books looked to a reader in the time of Philo or Josephus", *Oracles*, 149.

[37] R. E. Clements, "Patterns in the Prophetic Canon" in *Canon and Authority* (eds., G. W. Cook and R. O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 42-55 (43), observes that the Lucan speech in Acts 3:18, 24 shows "the prophetic corpus of the canon was conceived to present a unified and coherent message".

[38] A comparable reading context is illustrated in Josephus' and Ben Sira's treatment of Isaiah, *Ant.* 11.1.2, and *Sirach* 48:23-25; see Clements, "Prophetic Canon", 44. Ben Sira's reading of the book shows awareness of the historical detail in Isaiah 36-39, and this implies awareness of the previous materials, and he attributes the "comfort" oracles of "Second Isaiah" to Isaiah of Jerusalem.

all parts of Isaiah *as if* the book has Isaiah of Jerusalem as the one author.[39] An eighth/seventh century context for Joel can also be proposed on a similar basis.

The book of Joel lacks any decisive historical contextualizing data in its superscription. The location of Joel early in the Book of the Twelve may have led to a pre-exilic reading subsequent to or contemporaneous with Micah (LXX) or Amos (MT), given that prophets later in the sequence of the Twelve are deemed post-exilic.[40] Barton surmises that, "probably because it is grouped with the pre-exilic prophets Amos, Hosea and Micah in both the Hebrew and Greek canon, Joel was assumed in ancient times to be a work from the same period as they".[41] J. Trebolle-Barrera, commenting upon the DSS biblical manuscripts, makes a similar point, and compares the approximate chronological ordering of the Book of the Twelve with the chronological ordering of the books of the Psalter.[42] The safest assumption is that Luke would have regarded Joel as an eighth/seventh century prophet.

Malachi also lacks a superscription and it "offers no reference points for concrete dating".[43] However, this lack of certainty pertains more to when Malachi is to be situated within the fifth century.[44] For our purposes, it is sufficient to assume that Luke would have placed Malachi subsequent to

---

[39] Thus Isaiah is "bold" saying what he does in Isa 65:1 (Rom 10:20); oracles are spoken "through" Isaiah the prophet (Isa 53:4; Matt 8:17; Isa 40:1; Matt 3:3; Isa 9:1-2; Matt 4:15); Isaiah speaks "well" in Isa 29:13 (Mark 7:6). *and so on*.

[40] The grouping of the "Twelve" was known in Luke's day (*Sirach* 49:10, *Contra Apion* I. 8.3), and dating would appear to be a factor in the arrangement, see *b. Bat.* 14b.

[41] *Oracles*, 14.

[42] J. Trebolle-Barrera, "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed., T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000). 89-106 (91).

[43] B. Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 17.

[44] P. A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 156-160.

the re-building of the temple (515 B.C.E.), and subsequent to Haggai and Zechariah.[45]

3.2 Intertextual Reading

The NT writings *in general* illustrate a method of interpretation whereby disparate Jewish scriptures are brought into a relationship with one another regardless of the placement of those scriptures in a developmental framework. This can be seen in the work of scholars who have variously traced allusions to different (widely separated) Jewish scriptures in the same stretch of text. Such work implies that the authors of NT writings were in the habit of treating the Jewish scriptures in a holistic and undifferentiated manner. This reading tendency impacts the range of intertexts that a NT writer may expect of the reader, i.e. the implied reader is expected to bring *any* Jewish scriptural material that is similar in form and/or content to the NT writing to bear on the process of understanding.

This method of reading is synchronic and pre-critical rather than diachronic and historico-critical.[46] The intertextuality that arises from synchronic reading is different from that offered in the "inner-biblical exegesis" of M. Fishbane, who grounds his intertextual analysis in a diachronic framework.[47] The synchronic approach consists in the historically undifferentiated reading of the Jewish scriptural material. It bears comparison to the canonical approach of Childs,[48] but without a notion of canon. Of these two text biased methods for approaching intertextuality, the synchronic is to be preferred because it reflects the likely reading prejudice of the first century audience.

---

[45] The common Tannaitic rabbinical refrain that the Spirit of prophecy ceased with these prophets supports this assumption.

[46] We use "diachronic" and "synchronic" in a literary rather than linguistic sense. For a discussion of the two types of method see J. Barr, "The Synchronic, the Diachronic and the Historical" in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (ed., J. C. De Moor; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 1-14.

[47] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

[48] B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1979).

Synchronic and diachronic approaches to intertextuality are different again to a purely reader-centred approach, where what the reader brings to a text determines the intertextual connections that are discerned. Fewell observes that, "discovering intertextual connections is a reader-orientated enterprise",[49] but while the choice of intertexts made by a reader inevitably governs the resulting interpretation, our concern is the reading response of the implied reader of Luke-Acts. Hence, a method that privileges the text is required. It is in the text that the author has encoded expectations of the reader vis-à-vis the contribution to be made by the Jewish scriptures to any understanding.

Our working definition of "intertextuality" is narrow. We are not just concerned with "the imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one";[50] this would restrict our study to strictly corresponding lexical material. Instead, we have broadened our definition of "intertextuality" so that it operates more abstractly over "semantic and syntactic materials". However, this definition is narrower than that noted by J. Culler, who observes that with some methods, "intertextuality thus becomes less a name for a work's relation to prior texts than a designation of its participation in the discursive space of a culture".[51] As Hays observes, this broader view of intertextuality "converges with the traditional concerns of historical criticism of the Bible".[52] A diachronic intertextual method (a method sensitive to the historical development of Israel's scriptural texts), while appropriate for intertextual reading today, is less applicable when we seek to uncover the intertextuality that *Luke* embeds in his work.

---

[49] D. N. Fewell, "Introduction: Writing, Reading and Relating" in *Reading between the Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (ed., D. N. Fewell: Louisville: WJK Press, 1992), 11-20 (17).

[50] Hays, *Echoes*, 14. Hays' method "incorporates a serious concern for diachronic issues, without making them the centre of attention". *Echoes*, 198 n. 52. Our method is further along the spectrum towards the synchronic pole.

[51] J. Culler, *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge, Kegan & Paul, 1981), 103.

[52] *Echoes*, 15.

3.3 Quotation and Allusion

An understanding of quotation and allusion is assumed by our study. Whilst correctly identifying and analysing quotations is important to our study, our main field of interest is allusion.[53]

In a recent discussion of quotation and allusion and their relationship to questions of intertextuality, M. Orr identifies characteristics of allusion.[54] She distinguishes quotations as offering a greater level of precision in terms of their identity compared to allusions. The critical distinguishing feature of a quotation is that it is demarcated by textual indicators that allow reference to the corresponding lexical material. The referential object of a quotation is a piece of language, though not necessarily the same language as the quoting text. However, an adequate analysis of quotation cannot be given solely in terms of the notion of reference and a referential object. Orr notes that "it is not what is repeated, or indeed who repeats, that is intrinsic to quotation, but the how and why of its repetition".[55]

In this remark, Orr recognises that the interesting questions are often not about duplicated textual material or about introductory formulas, or even questions of definition and classification,[56] but about the *significance* that the quotation carries in the quoting context. How is this significance related to the significance of the quoted material in a source text? However, quotation of the Jewish scriptures (either of the Hebrew/Aramaic or Greek)

---

[53] While Hays defines "echo" in terms of the interplay between two texts, *Echoes*, 20, and "echo" to be a subtler variant of "allusion", *Echoes*, 29, in this study, we do not operate any distinction between "echo" and "allusion"; we use these terms as stylistic variants.

[54] Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2003), ch. 4.

[55] *Intertextuality*, 132.

[56] We are not offering a methodological discussion of "quotation", "allusion" or categories that are often linked, such as "citation", "borrowing", "echo", "influence" and "imitation". Our purpose is to examine specific quotations and allusions rather than the topic of reproducing meaning itself. For a methodological discussion see R. L. Schultz, *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999), ch. 6.

is complex, often with lexical variation from the original "inside" the quotation, and a different kind of use of the quoted material from that being made in the source. Thus, any discussion of significance cannot proceed without taking into account lexical variation and changes in the usage of material.

The analytical category of "allusion" is broader than that of "quotation", and a quotation may be regarded as a species of allusion. An allusion may consist in any number of literary constructs, for example, a plotting structure (e.g. a wilderness journey), the presence of a character type (e.g. a prophet wearing a certain type of clothing), the choice of a distinctive type-scene (e.g. a mountain location), the sharing of a common *development* of theme *and so on*; or it may consist in fragmentary lexical material (e.g. a three word phrase), a common syntagmatic or semantic framework. In sum, whatever level of analysis is applied to a text (from discourse semantics to lexical analysis), a correspondence between texts offers the possibility of allusion.

Allusions that consist in shared (or corresponding) lexical material are close cousins to quotations but lack the typical demarcation of quotations; allusions that consist in the correspondence of a literary construct, however, may not share lexical material. The paucity of lexical material reverses Orr's stricture about quotations when we consider allusions: here there is a requirement to state *in what* the allusion consists as well as the "how and why" of the repetition. One method of approach would be to state in advance what criteria we will operate in the identification of allusions. However, rather than offer a theoretical discussion of possible criteria, our approach will be practical. For any given allusion we will state in what we consider the allusion to exist and assess the likelihood of Luke having intended the allusion.

In order to make a case for an intentional allusive re-use of language from another text on the part of *Luke*, we invoke larger semantic structures. That

is, an allusion is given a rationale as a component within a larger framework such as a "theme", a "motif", a "plot", a "character", *and so on*. The intentionality of the allusion therefore is based on the presence of a larger shared *design*, and the shared design justifies the claim that smaller semantic and syntactic material is allusive.

Of course, the claim of a shared design is as much a claim to an "allusion" as any claim made on behalf of smaller shared semantic and syntactic materials. But a claim to a shared design is more impressive, because of its larger scope and the involvement of multiple elements. Where we observe shared designs between texts, it is less likely that any shared elements which go to make up these designs are accidental; it is more likely that the smaller elements are allusive.[57] Thus allusions are stronger or weaker depending on the number and variety of intertextual connections with which they are supported.

It is one thing to assert that *there is* an allusion in a text; it is another to say in *what* the allusion consists—its scope; and it is yet another to give a *genetic account* for that allusion. Accounting for an allusion may involve recourse to the author and an explanation of his influences or theological intentions; influences may be literary sources or broader cultural conventions of expression and common traditions. Of these genetic factors, our interest is principally with identifying the *typological reasons* for the quotations and allusions that Luke makes in respect of the Spirit.

4. Typology, History, and Eschatology

Our third and final method is typological, the practice of which is dovetailed with our intertextual approach in Chapters Four and Five. Our intertextual method is concerned with describing the textual links between Luke's narrative and his scriptural source materials. With such links identified our

---

[57] This "argument from design" makes it more likely that *Luke* (the author) has intentionally encoded allusions using small discrete semantic and syntactic elements.

typological method overlays a kind of analysis that offers an explanation of design for those intertextual links.[58]

Correctly identifying and scoping allusions is a precursor to any typological project. However, such a project brings with it certain questions of method, because the typological analysis of allusions requires justification. We do this by arguing a threefold case: first, that the genres of Luke and Acts are best understood as *kinds* of history-writing; secondly, that Luke's historiography is strongly influenced by Jewish historiographical methods, which involve the *imitation* of Jewish scriptural writings through typology; and thirdly, that Luke's narrative is an attempt to *continue* Israel's scriptural story.

4.1 Typological Criticism

The typological method employed in this study is not confessional, devotional or apologetic.[59] Our method of interpretation assumes a historical-literary focus on the part of Luke.

A number of scholars argue that the rationale for typological exegesis in the New Testament is the concomitant belief that the events surrounding Jesus and the church are part of a scheme of salvation-history that is moulded by God to "reveal and illumine His purpose".[60] Such moulding, it is argued, illustrates a selective and escalating repetition of pattern so that Old Testament actions, events, institutions and persons bear similarities to

---

[58] An implication of our study is that Luke is not using *testimonia*, because his usage of these sources involves typological correspondences between his narrative and the wider setting of the lexical citations. This result is consistent with other studies, for example, Pao, *New Exodus*, 29, who cites further support.

[59] G. W. H. Lampe, "The Reasonableness of Typology" in *Essays on Typology* (eds., G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe; London: SCM Press, 1957), 9-38 (23).

[60] E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1957), 128. Similar theory is presented by L. Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. D. H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), ch. 9.

corresponding entities in New Testament history.[61] The Old Testament elements are therefore seen to have a predictive quality[62] that is matched to New Testament fulfilment.

This rationale is not necessary to our typological project. Instead of working with a pre-emptive and predictive model of revelation, our working assumption is that the use of typology in Luke-Acts is *retrospective*. This is a weaker thesis without the theological freight of a philosophy of history. It commits us only to the position that Luke has read the Jewish scriptures and modelled his story here using patterns[63] and themes that he has found in those writings.[64] Many commentators on Luke and Acts identify echoes and allusions to Old Testament narratives, and on the basis of these they suggest typologies.[65]

4.2 Narrative Criticism

Narrative Criticism is the natural sister of typology. The method works with a *received form* of the text rather than employing a stratigraphic method to uncover *layers* of textual tradition. Narrative Criticism provides material for typology in its analysis of *character*, *episodic events*, *story settings*,

---

[61] E. Earle Ellis, "How the Old Testament uses the New" in *New Testament Interpretation* (ed., I. H. Marshall; Exeter: Paternoster, 1979), 199-219 (212).

[62] Many scholars have argued for a "prophecy-fulfilment" method in Luke's use of the Jewish Scriptures, for example, H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968), 303-305; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 157-162.

[63] R. Alter calls these patterns, "type-scenes" in his *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 50.

[64] Thus a typical definition would be that of D. L. Bock in "Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 280-307 (282), who argues that Luke's use of quotation is "'typological-prophetic' in that the pattern of God's activity is reactivated in ways that mirror and enhance his acts of old". Again, Rebecca I. Denova refers to Luke's narrative as "typological history" in *The Things Accomplished Amongst Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 230.

[65] The terminology that we use for this relationship is "type" and "anti-type"; the "type" is the precursor element, and the "anti-type" is the corresponding element in Luke's narrative story.

plotting, *narrative sequencing*, *emphasis* and *point of view*.[66] Luke's own point of view may be inferred from aspects of design in his narrative, such as his plot, importance of the character,[67] circumstances of the speech, and the content of speeches. Given Luke's partisan avowal in his gospel preface, it is unlikely that he is simply representing typical views of his characters unrelated to his own.

F. Kermode comments that a typological reading presents a hidden plot within "the manifest one".[68] So, for example, it is not just a question of seeing Jesus' exorcisms as a contributory factor leading to his death: there is a broader plot of salvation history. This plot requires us to set Jesus' words and actions within the context of Israelite history and the history of God's dealings with humankind. Typology is one method of interpretation that seeks to integrate the Lucan story with the wider cultural history.

Typologies are proposed by commentators who rely on correspondences using these literary elements. For example, scholars have been concerned with whether Luke employs a wider typological framework for his plot, and have attempted to match parts of Luke's narrative to Exodus story structures, often using filters supplied by the Isaianic corpus.[69]

---

[66] The most comprehensive study of Luke-Acts from a narrative perspective is R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-1990).

[67] While Luke may represent typical views of his characters in their speeches (e.g. those of Felix), it is likely that he presents his own point of view in the speeches of his main reliable characters (his heroes) such as the speech at Pentecost.

[68] F. Kermode, *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 64.

[69] See C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel" in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed., D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 37-53; J. Mánek, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke" *NovT* 2 (1958): 8-23; D. P. Seccombe, "Luke and Isaiah", *NTS* 27 (1981): 252-259; and D. P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lucan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989). Moessner states, "Luke's central section is the story of the journeying salvation of the new Exodus prophesied by Moses to the people of the Horeb covenant as the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham and his descendents", 290.

4.3 Redaction Criticism

The redaction-critical method is a valuable technique for identifying distinctive Lucan theological emphases in contradistinction to those in other gospel traditions; as a method it is less productive when used for Acts, as underlying sources are not readily available. This method has dominated studies of Lucan pneumatology.[70] However, once an *authorial form* of Luke and Acts is identified, it can be analysed without regard to compositional history, because authors and redactors in addition to their own contributions to the text have taken over whatever theology is implied in unaltered sources.[71] This methodological presupposition[72] allows us to place to one side any compositional analysis for the restricted materials that we study.

Our intertextual method seeks to place Luke's narrative alongside the scriptural texts he has used to explain the bestowal of the Spirit. Our goal is to lay out the most likely reading response of Luke's implied reader. The source and redaction history of Luke's pericopae, scriptural quotations, and allusions, as this has been presented by scholars, is not overtly advertised by Luke. It is not likely that such knowledge would have been part of what Luke *required* of his reader, even if s/he had knowledge of the multifarious traditions about Jesus. Accordingly, a *received form* methodology seems the most appropriate.

---

[70] Hur, *Dynamic Reading*, 23, lists 11 scholars since Baer, including Dunn, Turner, and Menzies, and all have employed the redaction-critical method: Hur uses a narrative-critical method.

[71] A criterion for deciding *what* Luke intentionally takes over from his sources (whether conventional gospel sources or scriptural material) would be the following: a detail in a source is intentionally included if and only if it has corresponding resonance elsewhere in Luke's narrative.

[72] For a defence of this presupposition see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 6 and Carroll, *Response*, 31-33. Carroll documents the move of Lucan scholarship away from Conzelmann's and Haenchen's emphasis on redaction critical methods towards recognising the value of *final form* criticism for ascertaining Luke's theology.

4.4 History

The justification of our typological method depends upon the prior conclusion that the genres[73] of Luke and Acts are *kinds* of history writing with affinities to existing Jewish historiographical models. It is not necessary for our study that Luke and Acts share exactly the same sub-genre or that Luke and Acts considered as a two-volume work have a single genre assignment.

4.4.1 Lucan Historiography

Scholars tend to assign a genre of "Hellenistic historiography" to Acts on the basis of Luke's literary techniques, and they refer to his use of certain literary forms and his avowal of an "historical" method.[74] An assignment of "Jewish Hellenistic historiography" usually accepts this verdict. but argues that the *content* of Luke-Acts makes it a "Jewish Hellenistic History". Such histories may be classified into various sub-types,[75] and Acts bears affinities with such writings[76] insofar as they apply Jewish scriptures to their own contemporary history.

---

[73] For a discussion of the notion of genre, see A. Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 20-24, and J. Culler, *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 72-73.

[74] For discussion see, Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* 196, 344, and "The Greek and Jewish Traditions of Writing History" in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1* (eds., F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols; London: Macmillan, 1920-1933), 2:7-29 (15); D. L. Balch, "The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel or Political History?" *SwJT* 40 (1990): 5-19; and D. E. Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 116. Recognition of historiography on the part of Luke is also found in commentaries, for example, F. Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. C. M. Thompson; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 16-25.

[75] For example, see the classification in R. T. France, "Jewish Historiography" in *Gospel Perspectives* (eds., R. T. France, D. Wenham and Craig Blomberg; 6 vols; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980-1986), 3:99-127.

[76] Typical examples of these writings include the Qumran Pesharim and the Jewish Apocalypses, as well as those "histories" such as 1 and 2 Maccabees that draw upon scriptural episodes to narrate their own events.

Several features of Luke-Acts have been aligned with extant Hellenistic histories. These include the existence of common literary forms such as prefaces and speeches; evidence that Luke has employed an historical "method", stating an historical purpose in his prefaces, and using sources: and the subject-matter itself of Luke and Acts — it appears to be a "history".

H. J. Cadbury asserted that "it is the bare fact of his [Luke] using a preface rather than in its details that Luke's relation to literature is apparent".[77] Cadbury also argued that Luke's "prefaces and dedications at once suggest classification with the contemporary Hellenistic historians".[78] The use of prefaces was common in the Hellenistic era (but not earlier), for example, Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities*,[79] and Polybius, *Histories*.[80]

The recapitulation of Acts is brief and directs a reader to the relationship that the second work has in an entire design. In this regard, Acts bears comparison to briefer recapitulations in historical multi-volume works that do little more than link the parts of a single work, for instance, Josephus, *Antiquities* Book VIII.1.1 "concerning David...we have written in the preceding book. Now when his son Solomon...".[81] Therefore any genre indications in the gospel preface carry forward for the implied reader to the continuing story in Acts.

The topics covered in Hellenistic prefaces bear some comparison with Luke's prefaces, but there are also points of dissimilarity. L. C. A. Alexander has argued[82] that the prefaces to Luke and Acts do not exactly fit the Hellenistic historiographical pattern. Several points of dissimilarity are proposed:

---

[77] *Making of Luke-Acts*, 196, 344.
[78] "The Greek and Jewish Traditions of Writing History", 2:15.
[79] Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* (trans., E. Cary; Loeb Classical Library: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), Book I.1-8.
[80] Polybius, *The Histories* (trans., W. R. Paton; Loeb; London: Heinemann, 1925), Book I.1-5.
[81] Similar brevity is found at *Ant.* Book XIII.1.1; XIV.1.1.
[82] L. C. A. Alexander, "The Preface to Acts and the Historians" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 73-103, which restates her

1) The sizes of the prefaces are smaller than those in other histories. e.g. *Polybius* Book VI.2.1-10, *Diodorus* Book I.1-5 extend to several pages. Further, Luke's style in the preface is not as elevated as those of the Greek historians.

2) The subject-matter of Luke and Acts, as laid down in the prefaces, does not match Hellenistic histories. The scope of the work is narrow (a social movement) unlike political and military concerns of standard histories, and the scale of the work is small compared to the multi-volume works of Hellenistic histories, e.g. Diodorus and Polybius offer forty volumes.

3) Dedications are not normally found in history-writing, although Josephus' *Antiquities* is an exception. They are found in other types of literature, for example, Plutarch's *Table-Talk* I.612.[83] Alexander comments that dedications are found in histories "outside the mainstream of Greek culture".[84] This may explain the freedom exercised by Luke to include a dedication. Similarly, Greek historians usually give their own signature, whereas this is absent in Luke-Acts.

4) Alexander observes that recapitulations are relatively rare in Hellenistic histories. Her comment is that "recapitulation at the beginning of a book cannot therefore be described as in any way *customary* or *usual* in Greek historiography".[85]

---

thesis set out in *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[83] Plutarch, *Moralia* (trans., P. A. Clement and H. B. Hoffleit; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

[84] "The Preface to Acts and the Historians", 86.

[85] "The Preface to Acts and the Historians", 91.

Accordingly, Alexander argues that the Luke's prefaces correspond more closely to "the scientific tradition" of writing, which she documents, but concedes that such a tradition is too broad to be considered a genre.[86]

The methodological problem inherent in Alexander's discussion is the problem of "induction". Examples of classical and Hellenistic historiographical prefaces can be more or less aligned with Luke's prefaces with appropriate similarities and dissimilarities noted (and the same exercise can be carried out for "scientific" works), but such a catalogue falls short of providing a general criterion whereby a Hellenistic historiographical genre can be identified. Scholars seek a general rule, but the partiality of the evidence falls short of providing a general rule.

Moreover, D. E. Aune makes the obvious point against Alexander that, "since Luke does not appear to be a scientific or technical treatise, this thesis poses an apparent problem".[87] Luke-Acts consists of narrative discourse, whereas the "scientific tradition" is comprised of expository and descriptive discourse. Accordingly, we would argue that the dissimilarities identified by Alexander between Luke's prefaces and historiographical works do not override the similarities, given that these are supported by the *narrative character* of Luke-Acts. R. I. Pervo's observation that "Alexander has demonstrated that the prefaces do not support the claim that Luke introduced himself as a historian"[88] is too hasty; Alexander has merely illustrated the inductive problem that scholars face by re-balancing the mix of evidence.

---

[86] "The Preface to Acts and the Historians", 77-78.

[87] D. E. Aune, "Luke 1.1-4: Historical or Scientific *Prooimion*?" in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World* (eds., A. Christopherson *et al.*; JSNTSup 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 138-148 (141). Aune goes on to illustrate the inductive problem: he compares Luke's prefaces to one in Plutarch's *Moralia*, 144, but admits "one swallow doth not a summer make", 147.

[88] R. I. Pervo, "Direct Speech in Acts and the Question of Genre" *JSNT* 28 (2006): 285-307 (286).

Our conclusion therefore is that while Alexander has shown that the existence of a preface in Luke and Acts is not *sufficient* to warrant a classification of Luke and Acts or Luke-Acts as Hellenistic historiography, she has not shown that, taken with other features of the two works, such as the avowed method, the structural placement of speeches, rhetoric,[89] and the narrative character, the existence of Luke's preface is not *jointly sufficient* for some historiographical classification.

4.4.2 Biography

Many scholars reject a "historical" classification for the Gospel of Luke, and suggest it is a biography. C. H. Talbert has proposed that Acts should also be classified as a biography of the successors of Jesus.[90] The motivation for proposing an alternative classification for Acts is the difference in *content* between Acts and Hellenistic and Jewish histories: Acts is not about the great questions of state, the rise and fall of nations, or the vicissitudes of the Jewish people.

The genre of Luke's gospel plausibly fits the category of "biography", although its preface more closely conforms to historical models. D. E. Aune observes that the series of biographies undertaken by Greco-Roman authors illustrate stereotyping by presenting their subjects in "a typecast social role and the stereotypical virtues and/or vices associated with that role".[91] This biographical technique is comparable to Luke's portrayal of John the Baptist and Jesus as prophets: their lives conform to the Jewish scriptural pattern of warning, a call to repentance, a promise of restoration of divine

---

[89] Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist*, 15-32, 40-47, compares Luke's rhetorical style with Hellenistic standards for composing speech and prose, and with regard to Luke's aims as stated in his prologue.

[90] C. H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (SBLMS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), and "The Acts of the Apostles: monograph or 'bios'?" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 58-72.

[91] *Literary Environment*, 33. Hence, while there is an obvious emphasis on Jesus' deeds and teaching, there is little treatment of his character in terms of the "inner life".

favour, but eventual rejection. It is this stereo-typing that further justifies our typological analysis.

Luke's gospel is didactic and encomiastic insofar as it recommends Jesus' life and teaching. It does this through miracle stories, pronouncement stories, episodes, speeches, sayings and parables. These types of literary unit are found in Greco-Roman biographies. Accordingly, Aune argues that while there are "no exact literary analogues",[92] "the gospels are a subtype of Greco-Roman biography",[93] although "the Evangelists wrote biography with historical intentions".[94]

Acts does not obviously narrate lives but rather the progress of a movement. Talbert has argued that Acts is a "succession biography" and used Diogenes' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* as a parallel. His thesis has not been widely accepted. D. L. Balch accepts that, "Luke-Acts is concerned with succession, but more with who are heirs to God's promises to Moses and the prophets, less with who are the individual, institutional successors of Jesus".[95] Balch argues that succession narratives are "individualistic" whereas Acts is concerned with a group and its societal impact. Aune has also criticized Talbert and observed that the succession narratives are just *lists* of disciples rather than any coherent story about the legitimacy of a movement.[96] Talbert seems to accept that his thesis is weakest at this point, and his later treatment is more cautious.

---

[92] *Literary Environment*, 46. Aune is forced to make this concession because of the lack of popular literature. While Luke's gospel may appear biographical, it is not written in the same elevated style of Greco-Roman biographies.

[93] *Literary Environment*, 64. For a discussion of the sub-types of Greco-Roman biography, see D. E. Aune, "Greco-Roman Biography" in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (ed., D. E. Aune; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 107-126 (107-109).

[94] *Literary Environment*, 65.

[95] "Genre of Luke-Acts", 6.

[96] *Literary Environment*, 79.

Talbert's later analysis contains the seeds of its own refutation.[97] He observes that some succession narratives are just "lists" of disciples, which is unlike Acts. He notes that where there is some narrative story-telling in a succession story, it is relatively brief, and Acts is long; and he shows that the terminology of succession[98] is different to Acts. Over and above Talbert's own qualifications, there is a stronger objection to classifying Acts as a "succession" narrative. For Luke, the founder is not dead; he makes an appearance in Acts more than once, and is constantly affirmed to be alive by the major characters.

While the genre of the gospel might be "biographical", this is an unlikely classification for Acts; the programmatic statement of Acts 1:8 is missiological. Luke does not make any effort to narrate the life stories of his principal characters, or bring out incidental details of character. Accordingly, if Luke-Acts is to be assigned a genre, it is better understood as "historiography" in a broad sense. Whether Luke and Acts are considered to be a single genre, Luke's practice of imitation and stereotyping justifies the application of a typological method.

4.4.3 Scriptural History

It can be argued that Luke intended Luke-Acts as a "scriptural" writing and as a *continuation* of Jewish scriptural history.[99]

---

[97] "Monograph or Bios", 64-69.

[98] Talbert argues that διατίθεμαι, ("appoint unto you", Luke 22:29) pertains to the apostolic ministry, and that with this verb Luke signals a succession. "Monograph or 'Bios'", 67-69. However, it is more likely that this appointment relates to a kingdom that is deliberately postponed at the beginning of Acts rather than the apostolic mission (Acts 1:6).

[99] Fitzmyer argues that Luke wrote his account in a way that imitated Jewish historiography, see "Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts", 296, 309-310. A similar case is presented in B. S. Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History" in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (eds., B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 65-82; B. T. Arnold "Luke's Characterizing Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Acts" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 300-323; and N. A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts" in *Studies in Luke-*

A number of evidential features support an identification of Luke-Acts as a species of Jewish scriptural history. First, Luke continues the story elements (plot lines, events and characters) of the Jewish scriptures;[100] secondly, he imitates Jewish scriptural episodes through quotation, echo and allusion;[101] thirdly, he uses a Septuagintal style in writing, particularly the early part of Luke and Acts;[102] and finally, Luke presents a theological history which continues the salvation-historical acts of God in respect of Israel.[103]

These features present a *sufficient* case for identifying the genre of Luke and Acts collectively as candidates for a continuation of "Jewish scriptural history", because their presence in the two works dominate its character when compared to any Hellenistic characteristics. This quantitative dominance implies a scripturally sensitive reader, and invites such a reader to read Luke and Acts *alongside* the Jewish scriptures. The literary co-text that Luke requires of his readers is the most natural group of writings to suggest as the genre of Luke-Acts. If this is the case, a typological analysis of Luke's intertextuality is justified, because Luke has sought to continue a "scriptural" style in his narrative.[104]

Luke-Acts is not unique in this respect. Scholars have observed[105] that 1 Maccabees is heavily influenced by Jewish scriptural phraseology, whereas 2 Maccabees is more like Hellenistic story-telling. Such a "scriptural" style forms a precedent for Luke's acknowledged Septuagintal style. Aune suggests that 1 Maccabees might have been intended as a sequel to the

---

Acts (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1976), 139-158 (152-153).

[100] Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History", 70-71.

[101] Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History", 71-75.

[102] Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History", 68-70.

[103] Rosner, "Acts and Biblical History", 78-80.

[104] Fuller, *Restoration*, 200 n. 25, correctly observes a distinction between a thesis that Luke continues scriptural history and a thesis that Luke intends his writing to be accepted as Scripture.

[105] Aune, *Literary Environment*, 105.

Chronistic history.[106] Although it commences with the significant events in the reign of Antiochus IV, rather than continue the Chronicler's history, it does have an opening summary of history from Alexander the Great to Antiochus. This bears comparison with Luke-Acts insofar as Luke attempts to continue the Jewish story in his account. However, the basis of continuation is different: 1 Maccabees relives the days of Joshua with battles up and down the land; Luke-Acts continues the story of Israel from the prophetic perspective.[107]

As H. W. Attridge has argued, the history in both 1 and 2 Maccabees serves a theological purpose. The apologetic aim in 1 Maccabees is one of justifying the Hasmonean dynasty, and this is secured by affirming that they are God's representatives (e.g. 1 Macc 5:62), functioning in traditional ways as priests and judges over Israel. Attridge also notes that 1 Maccabees portrays the Hasmoneans as fulfilling "the traditional expectations of Israel" and thus inaugurating "a period of eschatological bliss".[108] This characterization bears some similarity to Luke and Acts in the portrayal of the apostles as "judges" and in conflict with the Jerusalem Priests, representing an alternative authoritative source of teaching as representatives of God through the holy Spirit. However, whereas 1 Maccabees is political and military in its content, Luke-Acts is a story of proclamation and discipleship.

T. L. Brodie has observed that in Greco-Roman culture the practice of imitation was widespread, and observes that "in the period from about 100 BC to 100 AD the literary world was largely concerned with reshaping the

---

[106] *Literary Environment*, 105.
[107] Luke's mention of Gabriel (Luke 1:19, 26) may be a conscious attempt to connect his story to Danielic visions of the end-times for the "holy people" (Dan 8:24), and the "Seventy Sevens" prophecy (Dan 9:21-27). These visions supply an eschatological scheme in which the messiah appears towards the end in the seventieth seven (Dan 9:26), and they are mediated by Gabriel.
[108] H. W. Attridge, "Jewish Historiography" in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (eds., R. A. Kraft and G. W. Nickelsburg; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 311-346 (318).

great texts of the past".[109] In particular, the imitation of scriptural episodes in Jewish Hellenistic histories justifies our search for imitation in Luke and Acts.

For example, in 1 Maccabees,[110] Matthias kills in a public display like Phinehas (1 Macc 2:23-26; Num 25:7-11), he delivers a death-bed exhortation to faithfulness in the face of adversity like Moses (1 Macc 2:49-65; Deuteronomy 33), the succession from Matthias to Judas Maccabeus resembles the succession of Joshua (1 Macc 3:1-2; Deut 34:9), Judas Maccabeus' exploits are summarised in similar terms to Joshua's conquest of the land (1 Macc 3:3-9), and he reduces the size of his army in the same manner as Gideon (1 Macc 3:56; Judg 7:5-6).

Typological analysis is a description of mimesis. D. R. Macdonald has proposed six criteria for "detecting mimesis in ancient texts"[111] which bear some comparison with Hays' criteria for evaluating echoes. The first criterion, accessibility, assesses the likely availability of the imitated text. The second criterion is based on how many authors in a literary context imitate the same text. The third criterion counts the volume or density of parallels between the imitated and imitating text. The fourth criterion looks for shared sequencing of details in the two texts; a shared sequence strengthens the claim for imitation. The fifth criterion examines distinctive traits that might cement two texts in a relationship of imitation. And finally, the sixth criterion is interpretability—an explanation of why the two texts might be related needs to be offered. We do not directly apply these criteria in our typological analysis; however, our presentation of the shared

---

[109] T. L. Brodie, "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24" *NTS* (1986): 247-267 (249). See also his "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Sources" in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed., C. H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad Publishing. 1984), 17-46.

[110] See Aune, *Literary Environment*, 105.

[111] D. R. Macdonald, "Introduction" in *Mimesis and Intertextuality* (ed., D. R. Macdonald; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 1-9 (2).

patterns between Luke and Acts and Luke's scriptural source materials is amenable to Macdonald's six tests.

5. Eschatology

Finally, in our discussion of method, it is necessary to state how we use concept of "eschatology".

In his *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, Childs argues that the shaping of Isaianic materials placed later material into an eighth century context, with a consequent loss of the original historical context thus making the message "fully eschatological".[112] Clements argues a similar case for the Prophets in general, viz. that the redactional treatment of the books and their collocation into a "group" tended towards making their message more eschatological. Thus he comments, "the process of collecting and editing, leading to canonization of prophecy came to be invested with a number of basic guidelines as to its meaning, especially its spelling out of hope for the restoration and salvation of Israel".[113] R. P. Carroll argues[114] that the perception of failure in prophetic salvific predictions partly led to post-exilic redactional additions and changes that made the materials more eschatological. He also argues that such a perception also led to the treatment of prophetic predictions as symbolic (typological or allegorical).[115]

These observations identify distance between oracle and historical context. but they do not establish distance between oracle and *story*.[116] It may not be possible to identify an initial historical catalyst or a proximate application

---

[112] *Introduction*, 326. Childs' conclusion is that "the final form of the literature provided a completely new and non-historical framework for the prophetic message which severed the message from its historical moorings and rendered it accessible to all future generations", 337.

[113] "Patterns", 52.

[114] R. P. Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed* (London: SCM Press, 1979). 40, 55.

[115] *When Prophecy Failed*, 66.

[116] Our focus on "story" reflects our interest in typology; Pao, *New Exodus*, 251-251, expresses a similar view on the importance of "story", which is reflected in his method of approach to Acts.

for an oracle, but it is still possible to read a story off the page. It is this residual characteristic that allows Clements to observe, with regard to later Isaianic material incorporated into Isaiah 1-39, that it often possesses a "perfectly credible setting in the eighth century".[117] Thus, OT scholars dispute which material is later and grafted into a prophetic book, and which material is early but subjected to later editorial work.

A further difficulty attaches to the analysis of scholars such as Childs, Clements and Carroll. As G. B. Caird has shown, the term "eschatology" is vexed.[118] Caird identifies various notions that have been conveyed by the term in respect of both OT and NT texts. Of these notions, Childs, Clements and Carroll are using the notion of "eschatology" in contrast to the proximate historical context in which the substance of an oracle is delivered. Their notion is literary insofar as it comments upon a quality in the writing of the Prophets that has emerged in the course of redactional activity. This quality is that the writing has become more of a vision of a *future history* distant from the prophet and one which encapsulates such ideas as the restoration and hegemony of Israel, the central role of Jerusalem and the Law, and the ideals of a new age; such realities can be deemed "eschatological" insofar as they are placed in a final consummation of God's purposes. This will be the sense in which we use the notion of eschatology in regard to Luke and Acts.

Insofar as we have distinguished story from history and asserted that it is possible to read a story "off the page" of the prophetic oracles, a binary contrast between eschatology and history is unhelpful. In terms of the historical and prophetic traditions, the "story" of the eighth and sixth centuries shares an invasion of the land from a Mesopotamian superpower, and the devastation and political-economic chaos that accompanies such an

---

117 "Patterns", 51.

118 G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), ch. 14. I. H. Marshall, "Slippery Words: I Eschatology" *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78): 264-69 has a similar breakdown of definitions to Caird

event. In both cases deportation was involved, but in the eighth century Jerusalem was "saved" from being sacked. Both periods could give rise to expressions of hope for Israel, and these could be coupled with warnings of judgment appropriate to the crisis facing the nation. It is not difficult to see in this correspondence a reason why prophetic oracles were re-applied and edited, and later oracles were coupled with earlier ones through intertextual echo and allusion. This may result in a loss of historical context, i.e. determinate historical markers, but it does not eliminate the story. It is the presence of a story that underpins our claim that Luke has made a typological application of prophetic oracles.

If we consider eschatology in Luke's writings rather than those of the OT prophets, scholars[119] have discussed wither Luke holds an "imminent" or "realized" eschatology or builds into his scheme the recognition of a *delay* before the final consummation of God's purposes. Caird discusses these concepts[120] and sees the Lucan Jesus as presenting Israel with the choice of national repentance or national ruin and promising the imminent arrival of a new age if the people repent.[121] Nevertheless, he also acknowledges elements of a realized eschatology in the Lucan story, elements which show that the kingdom of God had *arrived* in the ministry of Jesus.[122] However, whether Luke's eschatology is imminent or realized, such eschatological realization is nevertheless quite *proximate* to Luke the writer. The distance that Childs, Clements and Carroll perceive in the Prophets would not be present in Luke and Acts. If, on the other hand, Luke encodes a delay into his scheme of salvation, then his understanding of the consummation of God's purposes has something of the distance that OT scholars have proposed for the eschatological redactions of the prophetic corpus.

---

119 Powell, *What Are They Saying about Acts?*, 58-62.
120 Caird, *Language*, 250, uses the expression "Eschatology^{K}" as an abbreviation for the German expression „Konsequente Eschatologie", which we have dubbed "imminent eschatology".
121 *Language*, 265-266.
122 *Language*, 253.

A broad consideration of Luke's eschatology is excluded from our study. It is not within our scope to determine whether Luke adopts realized and/or futurist eschatology, or to consider the question of a delay of the Parousia. Our contribution to the debate is limited to a consideration of the eschatological implications of Luke's use of Jewish scriptural texts relating to the bestowal of the Spirit.

Our typological method is applied to Luke's narrative in conjunction with certain prophetic traditions, but we do not presume an actual history. Instead, we are concerned with story elements in prophetic oracles. The basis upon which we suggest Lucan typological use of these materials is the presence in his narrative of multiple disparate elements from the source materials. This method is about narrative and story rather than claims about actual events. Older confessional and apologetic typology asserted typological correspondences between physical objects and "actual" events mentioned in the Old Testament. Our focus is the use of prior written materials and their story elements.

Our methodological emphasis upon story means that we do not need to make an eschatological presumption on the part of Luke, such as that proposed by Clements or Childs. An inability on the part of modern scholarship to fix an historical context for prophetic oracles does not imply that an eschatological reading is the only alternative. A *history-like* story can be constructed which may correspond to an eighth or sixth century setting, but as such, the story is a *mediating construct* between historical and eschatological readings. Of course, Luke's *way of using* those oracles may give away his likely historical reading, but it falls outside the scope of this study to make that argument.

Luke is working with a revisionary interpretative model in respect of Isaiah, Joel and Malachi, rather than a simple "promise-fulfilment" model.[123] There

---

[123] See Litwak, *Echoes*, 155-157, for a discussion of these two models in the context of Luke's use of Joel. For a review of scholarship surrounding the

is an obvious dissonance[124] between the scriptural material Luke uses and his application, and this suggests that Luke is engaged upon a revisionary exercise. Luke offers *some* correspondences in his account that match details in his scriptural material; however, a measure of dissonance remains. Our study endeavours to show that Luke makes a *typical application* of themes from the Prophets in his own "history".

---

issue of whether Luke uses Jewish Scripture along "promise-fulfilment" lines, see Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 27-37.

[124] For a discussion of "dissonance" and an extended explanation of the notion presumed in this study, see Carroll, *When Prophecy Failed*, chs. 2 and 3.

CHAPTER THREE

Pneumatological Traditions

1. Introduction

In this chapter, we will evaluate Jewish Pneumatological traditions of the first century pertaining to the "Spirit of God" and relate these to Luke and Acts. Our concern is with those texts that mention "spirit" and contextually relate such a mention with both the Deity and human beings. Accordingly, we are excluding from our remit "spirit" texts that have a psychological focus relating only to the dispositions of human beings, and those texts that relate "spirit", the Deity, and creation.

It is not our intention to represent any scholarly debate about textual witnesses or the dating of documents; we will adopt consensus views from standard editions of the texts. Rather, our objective is to catalogue texts so as to establish an analytical framework for understanding the Spirit in first century Judaism.[1] We shall argue that the foundational texts of the Jewish scriptures present a multi-levelled variety of effects relating to the Spirit, and that this is reflected in extant traditions of the first century.

The analysis we offer is not intended to produce a new weighting scheme for the evidence, and assert a new nuanced "dominant" functional concept of the Spirit in first century Judaism. Our goals in this analysis are twofold: i) to remove the idea that there was a socio-literary dominant conception of

---

[1] Using common scholarly groupings of first century textual evidence, the following have catalogued the primary sources for Qumran and rabbinical writings—A. E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), and Schäfer, *Vorstellung*. Other textual evidence has been the subject of articles and essays including for example, E. Best, "The Use and Non-Use of *Pneuma* by Josephus" *NovT* 3 (1959): 218-225; and J. R. Levison, "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus" *JSJ* 3 (1995-96): 271-323, and "Josephus' Interpretation of the Divine Spirit" *JJS* 47 (1996): 234-255. This material has been summarised and applied in the context of Lucan Studies by scholars such as Turner, Menzies, and Keener.

the Spirit that would have influenced Luke; and ii) to replace the consensus-generalization captured by the expression "the Spirit of prophecy" with a more variegated view of the primary data that is caught simply by the expression "the Spirit". With this background we can see a complex view reflected in Luke-Acts.

Our principal evidence for determining Jewish pneumatology in the first century takes three forms: i) the Masoretic Text (MT) and translations such as that found in the LXX and Old Greek versions, where interpretation is minimal; ii) interpretation and application of the scriptural texts by individual writers or groups, the material of which is either known or judged likely to have been extant in the first century; and iii) later rabbinical writings including the Targums, which may preserve traditions extant in the first century.

The database of material is large, and full-length studies exist of sections of the database. We need then to state our principles of selection and weighting of evidence. Following recent Lucan scholarship,[2] we include Jewish writings with consensus dating prior to 100 C.E., Tannaitic writings, and Tannaitic citations in post-Tannaitic material.[3] Contrary to recent

---

[2] Turner, *Power*, chs. 3-5; Menzies, *Development*, chs. 2-5; Keener, *Gospel and Acts*, ch. 1.

[3] The main documents to include predominantly Tannaitic material are the *Mishnah*, *Tosefta*, *Mekilta*, *Seder Olam Rabbah*, *Sifre*, *Sifra* and *Abot de Rabbi Nathan*. Regarding the *Mishnah*, the received view is that it came into existence as a written document towards the end of the 2c. and that it mainly cites Tannaim subsequent to Bar Kokhba; see *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (trans. J. Neusner; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), xvi. Similarly, *Sifra* is typically dated to the late 2c./early 3c.; see *Sifra: An Analytical Translation* (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 1:31-32. Of the *Mekilta*, J. Z. Lauterbach comments in *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael,* (ed., J. Z. Lauterbach; 3 vols; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933), 1:xix, that it "shows itself to be one of the older Tannaitic works". H. W. Basser concludes that *Sifre* is Palestinian in origin, written around the same time as the *Mishnah*, utilising earlier Tannaitic traditions grounded on the work of R. Akiba; see *Pseudo-Rabad: Commentary to Sifre Deuteronomy* (ed., H. W. Basser; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), xxi-xxv, and *Pseudo-Rabad: Commentary to Sifre Numbers* (ed., H. W. Basser; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), xiii-xv. Y. Elman in his

scholarship, we exclude Amoraic and Post-Amoraic citations. We implicitly give more credence to writings that are judged to be extant in the first century, followed by Tannaitic writings, and Tannaitic citations in post-

---

Authority and Tradition: Toseftan Baraitot in Talmudic Babylonia. (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1994), 1-6, 275-281, summarises scholarly views about the dating of *Tosefta* and offers the tentative opinion that "conceptually, it seems pre-Amoraic" (276), and that its language points to an early date (281). C. J. Milikowsky accepts the traditional ascription of *Seder Olam Rabbah* to R. Jose ben Halaphta in his *Seder Olam: A Rabbinic Chronography*, (Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 1981), 12-17. A. J. Saldarini, in his *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 12-16, argues for a pre-Mishnaic *'Abot R. Nat.*, commenting on a pre-Mishnaic *Pirḳê Abot* that this developed in two directions represented by the two manuscript traditions (A) and (B), of which (B) is the earlier—3c.

Our interest with these documents is in both their ascriptions to the Tannaim and their anonymous statements. We will adopt as a working hypothesis the tradition (*b. San* 86a, *b. Yev* 82b) that R. Nehemiah (mid-2c.) is the author of anonymous statements of the *Tosefta*, R. Meir (early 2c.) anonymous statements in the *Mishnah*, R. Judah (mid-2c.) anonymous statements in *Sifra*, R. Simeon ben Yohai (early 2c.), anonymous statements in the *Sifre*, and that these works were based on the teachings of R. Akiba (early 2c.).

Following the classification and dating scheme of Jewish Midrashim by M. D. Herr in "Midrash", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (ed., C. Roth *et al.*; Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1971), 1507-1514, we have included citations relating to the holy Spirit attributed to Tannaim from Amoraic and Post-Amoraic Midrashim. This draws in a relatively small number of texts as most citations relating to the holy Spirit in these writings are either anonymous, attributed to Amoraim and later Rabbis, or are insufficiently identified, with the citation lacking a patronym. Thus we exclude, for example, *Pesikta Rabbati*, *Midrash Tanḥuma*, *Pĕsiḳta dĕ-Rab Kahăna*, and *Pirḳê de Rabbi Eliezer*: see W. G. Braude, *Pesikta Rabbati* (trans. W. G. Braude; 2 vols; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968), 3, for its Amoraic characteristics and date; J. T. Townsend, *Midrash Tanḥuma* (trans. J. T. Townsend; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1989), xii, for its Amoraic character: J. T. Townsend, *Pĕsiḳta dĕ-Rab Kahăna* (trans. J. T. Townsend; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1975), xlix, for its dating and preferences for citation of authorities; and G. Friedlander, *Pirḳê de Rabbi Eliezer* (trans. G. Friedlander; London: Kegan Paul, 1916), liv-lv, for its dating. With regard to later anthologies of Midrashim, such as *Aggadat Bereshit* (10c.) and *Midrash ha-Gadol* (14c.), which have been used by Lucan scholars, we follow G. Stemberger's dating in his *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. M. Bockmuehl; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996). 311-312, 354-355, and exclude them. Finally, we have also admitted Tannaitic citations from the *Babylonian Talmud* and *The Mishnah* using the standard editions, *Babylonian Talmud* (ed., I. Epstein *et al.*; London: Soncino Press, 1948) and *Mishnah* (trans., H. Danby; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964).

Tannaitic material. Following the scholarly consensus, we treat first century Tannaim as suggestive witnesses to Pharisaic thinking.[4] As regards second century Tannaim, we ascribe more weight to earlier Tannaim, but only as *secondary* evidence of *possible* first century thought. Finally, we will admit the Targums *Onqelos* and *Jonathan* as evidence of possibilities in popular first century exegesis on account of their likely early 2c. date.

2. The Functions of the Spirit

2.1 Scriptural Texts

The Jewish scriptures use various images to depict the *effects* of the Spirit and are a principal witness to what might have been first century theology. Here we consider those effects that change the human *state* and those that consist in human *behaviour*.

Evaluating the claim that the dominant conception of the Spirit in the first century was *prophetic* critically depends on a definition of "the prophetic". Jewish scriptural traditions about the prophetic are diverse, and include both ecstatic and conventional behaviour, various kinds of speech act, and a diverse range of content. Our framework for analysing this textual evidence derives from Speech-Act theory and the Philosophy of Mind, and we offer it as a way of moving forward the discussion of familiar textual evidence, and because it allows a philosophical definition of "the prophetic".

We propose an encompassing definition of "prophesying" and "prophet" that derives from the work of N. Wolterstorff on the notion of *representative speaking*.[5] The notion of representative speaking can be illustrated with reference to the distinction between locutionary and illocutionary speech

---

[4] Following Moore, *Judaism*, 1:77, 85, and E. P. Sanders, *Judaism, Practice and Belief: 63BCE-66CE* (London: SCM Press, 1994), 399-401, 412.

[5] N. Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), ch. 3. In offering this approach, we are placing to one side traditional theological definitions of prophesying couched in terms of "inspiration".

acts.[6] Locutionary speech acts are acts of uttering or inscribing: illocutionary speech acts are acts done *by* way of locutionary acts such as promising, commanding or predicting.[7] This distinction is one pertaining to the level of analysis being applied to a speech act.

Someone speaking representatively is performing a locutionary act of uttering where this is any one of a number of different illocutionary acts *by another person.* An ass could utter something under the influence of the Spirit, but the utterance would not thereby be representative speaking on behalf of the Deity.[8] A minimum condition for a speech act to be representative therefore would be the existence of a *contextual relationship* between the speaker and the Deity. [9]

J. Blenkinsopp offers a useful discussion of the problems inherent in giving a definition of prophecy.[10] If we range over the use of נבא/προφητεύω in the Jewish scriptures various speech acts come into view and the picture

---

[6] For the introduction of this notion to the philosophy of language, see J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 94-107. For a discussion of the significance of Austin's work see A. Stroll, *Twentieth-Century Analytic Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 160-180. R. S. Briggs, *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 43-72, reviews the development of Austin's work. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 133-146, 201, also applies speech-act theory to our topic area, and for an application of the notion to the analysis of Hebrew prophecy, see Carroll. *When Prophecy Failed*, 69-75.

[7] Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse*, 13, 37. Briggs, *Words in Action*, 51, tables a useful taxonomy of illocutionary acts.

[8] Wolterstorff's examples are those of a secretary or an ambassador speaking or writing representatively for an executive of head of state. *Divine Discourse*, 38-45. He rightly notes that the degree and mode of superintendence of the executive or head of state can vary and the speech act of the secretary or ambassador can still be the discourse of the executive.

[9] Wolterstorff discusses various features that can construct a contextual relationship including acting as an agent, retrospective authorization of words, deputization, and delegation, *Divine Discourse*, 38-45. In this connection, the call and commission of a prophet is central. For a discussion of prophetic calls, see G. von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; London: SCM Press, 1968), 30-49.

[10] J. Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1996), 26-30.

requires some sort of diachronic analysis. If we consider the use of נביא/προφήτης and their speech acts, Blenkinsopp observes of נביא some "standardization of terminology" in a "Deuteronomic redefinition of prophecy and its function".[11] In this redefinition, a prophet may engage in any number of illocutionary speech acts, but what makes his speech acts *prophetic* (the acts of a prophet) is the *representative* aspect of his speech.[12] This is a broad definition of the prophetic, and one that carries forward into the first century and the use of προφήτης by NT writers.

Wolterstorff admits that his analysis was "made with an eye on the biblical notion of *prophet*".[13] Citing Deut 18:15-21, he notes various features of a contextual relationship: i) the prophet speaks in the name of God; ii) the prophet is raised up by God and commissioned; and iii) the words that the prophet utters are given by God. This model of a prophet is instantiated in varying degrees in the call narratives of prophets (e.g. Isaiah 6, Jeremiah 1); it is witnessed by the editorial prophetic superscriptions that are scattered through the Prophets; and it is signalled by various declarations to the effect that the people should hear the Word of the Lord. Such a conception, Wolterstorff observes, is implicit in the formula "as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Luke 1:70; cf. Acts 3:21).[14]

Alongside this distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts,[15] we will also use in our analysis of "the prophetic" the concepts of a *mode of revelation* (which might consist of, for example, a vision, a dream, or consist

---

[11] *A History of Prophecy in Israel*, 29.

[12] Wenk makes a similar point when he affirms that illocutionary acts which rest on institutional roles serve their purpose as acts which point by implication away from the self to some source of authority, *Community-Forming Power*, 139.

[13] *Divine Discourse*, 47.

[14] *Divine Discourse*, 50.

[15] Austin also distinguished perlocutionary acts which describe speech acts with regard to their effects. Wolterstorff uses this notion to describe revelation as an effect of speech acts, *Divine Discourse*, 33-34. This is where Wenk's interest lies in his use of speech-act theory, *Community-Forming Power*, 137, 147-148, 180, and it is where he centres his description of the socio-ethical role of the Spirit.

in a divine encounter),[16] which prophets experience. and that of *propositional content* (which pertains to the semantic content of a speech act, a piece of writing, or a symbolic action).[17] We shall itemise below various Jewish scriptural and non-scriptural texts that link the Spirit to the locutionary act of uttering, to illocutionary acts such as prediction, as well as modes of revelation, and the content of messages.

We have then a fourfold model for interpreting "spirit" texts that Lucan scholars have considered "prophetic". Our argument is that we cannot simply conclude that the dominant conception of the Spirit in the first century would have been prophetic, precisely because the concept of the Spirit is present in descriptions functioning on a variety of levels. We have descriptions focused on *input*, which may include sensory input as well as modes of revelation; we have descriptions of *output* such as various locutionary and illocutionary acts; and, we have descriptions of *content*. Lucan scholars have mixed information from all levels. They have grouped together "Spirit" texts that variously relate content-rich[18] notions such as "wisdom", the locutionary act of speaking, various illocutionary acts, and texts that relate a mode of revelation, and thereby promoted the thesis that the Spirit is prophetic.

2.1.1 Hebrew Scriptures

The purpose in setting out the Hebrew scriptural evidence[19] is not to suggest that the meaning of these texts (as *we* present it) constitutes the *de*

---

[16] Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse*, 22-31, discusses the concept of revelation using the complexities of divine encounter as his worked example. Taking his definition of "propositional revelation" as "knowledge-transmitting" (29), we would define a mode of revelation is medium of this revelation.

[17] Wolterstorff illustrates that this notion is required within Speech Act theory in order to capture *what* is being conveyed in the illocutionary act. *Divine Discourse*, 34.

[18] The term of "content-rich" applies to concepts that describe the kind of propositional content possessed by an utterance. For instance, the focus of a content-rich notion is in describing *what* is being asserted or *what* is being promised.

[19] An itemization of this evidence can be found in C. A. Briggs, "The Use of *Ruach* in the Old Testament" *JBL* 19 (1900): 132-45.

facto Jewish pneumatology of the first century: rather, it is to sketch an initial range of ideas that *would have contributed* to first century thinking.[20]

1) The first idea that was available in the scriptural co-text for Luke is the distinction between *state* and *behaviour*.[21]

Locutions of presence relate the Spirit to the *state* of a person. For example, Pharaoh describes Joseph as "a man in whom there is the Spirit of God" (אשר רוח אלהים בו—Gen 41:38). Bezalel was "filled" with the spirit of God (מלא—Exod 31:3; 35:31; cf. 28:3), and his state is described as being one of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, and practical ability (see also Deut 34:9). The locution "rest" (נוח, Isa 11:2) is used to indicate a state, and the qualities of this state are elaborated in terms of an attitude (יראה, "fear"), various abilities (עצה "counsel", חכמה "wisdom", and בינה "understanding"). In this case, the Spirit also engenders "might" (גבורה), which may connote physical strength and/or courage. This example shows that the possession of the Spirit may not be reduced to the possession of a single corresponding quality.

Other examples of the Spirit affecting the state of a person include engendering visions and dreams (Gen 41:38; Num 24:2-9; Joel 3:1-2;[22] Ezek 8:3). These texts illustrate either a *mode of revelation* (dream, vision), or focus on the *content* of the mental state (wisdom, understanding, artistic skill, etc.).

---

[20] It is important here to note that the textual evidence does not use our analytical concepts; rather, the texts betray our analytical distinctions, and this is evidence of a kind of *thinking*.

[21] For an introduction to this distinction in the Philosophy of Mind see, A. Kenny, *The Metaphysics of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), ch. 1, and his discussion of relevant behaviour as a criterion for a given mental state.

[22] Versification in the LXX and MT differs from English versions; we follow the LXX/MT versification.

An indication that it is the state of the person that is being described is given by the suggestion of *persistence*. This is more explicit in some examples such as the case of Moses from whom God took some of the Spirit that was persisting with him and it came to "rest" (נוח) on Eldad and Medad (Num 11:17-29). The quantitative figure[23] here is employed to ensure that the audience and reader understand a *sharing* of authority has taken place. Another indication of persistence is the length of time envisaged to fulfil the objectives of the bestowal. Thus, for example, the Spirit of the Lord comes upon the anointed individual of Isa 61:1 or the branch of Jesse of Isa 11:1, and their associated socio-political tasks are extensive (see also Isa 42:1; 59:21). Generally, where the relation of "the Spirit" to the individual is stated in terms of a preposition (ב, על, את) there is an implication of persistence in the associated tasks.

Another indicator that the Spirit affects the state of a person is the language of *departure*. There is no reason to suppose that when the Spirit "came upon" the Judges, that this was for longer than the purpose in hand; and in the case of Saul, the Spirit is explicitly said to come and go repeatedly (1 Sam 10:10; 11:6; 16:14). This coming and going is mirrored in the case of the evil spirit that repeatedly comes upon and goes from Saul (1 Sam 16-19, *passim*).

In addition to descriptions of *state*, the Spirit is also related directly to *behaviour*. For example, David is recorded as saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spoke by me" (רוח יהוה דבר בי—2 Sam 23:2), which has its emphasis on the illocutionary *act* of speaking.[24] Or again, Samuel says to Saul that,

---

[23] The same quantitative figure appears in the Elijah-Elisha succession narrative in which Elisha receives a double portion of the Spirit of Elijah. The narrator has been careful to validate this "double" portion by recording twice the number of miracles for Elisha. It also appears in Isa 40:13 where the verb for "measuring" (תכן) is associated with the רוח יהוה.

[24] Insofar as "speaking" approximates to "uttering" this could be analysed as a locutionary act. We are following Wolterstorff's analysis is treating speaking as illocutionary, *Divine Discourse*, 37, 75.

> ...the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee. and you shall prophesy...
>
> וצלחה עליך רוח יהוה והתבית
>
> 1 Sam 10:6

This links the Spirit to the illocutionary act of prophesying.

2) The second idea available to Luke in the literary co-text is that between *instrumental* causation and *conjunctive* association.

An instrumental mention of the Spirit is typically one where a person says or does something *by* the Spirit. This usage of רוח is rare in the Hebrew scriptures, with the only clear example being David's report of his own inspiration (2 Sam 23:2—but see Mic 3:8). However, as we shall note below, it is more common in the Targums.

With conjunctive association being very common in Hebrew narrative, and by far the most common way of making causal connections with the Spirit, direct instrumental linkage is to be noted for its exceptional quality. A typical example of conjunctive association would be the case of Joseph's interpretation of Pharaoh's dreams; this act of interpretation is not related *instrumentally* to the Spirit, even though contextually the narrator invites the reader to make a causal connection, through the perception of Pharaoh that the Spirit of God was in Joseph. Other examples of conjunctive association include Isa 11:2-3; 42:1; 61:1-3.

This observation is important because conjunctive association makes it difficult in some cases to be certain as to *how* the Spirit achieves its effect in relation to the human being. Thus, although the effect of the Spirit might be seen in the narrative as, for instance, an illocutionary act of prophesying, or a representative behaviour of some sort (e.g. leadership in battle), the Spirit may have achieved this by affecting the faculties of the individual, enhancing their abilities, reinforcing "the Will", altering attitudes, changing

sensory perceptions, inducing states of consciousness. controlling the organs of speech, *and so on*.

These two ways in which causality is linked to the Spirit are complemented by texts which place the Spirit into a pro-active role. Thus, for example, the Spirit of the Lord engages in the actions of נוח and נוח (Isa 59:19; 63:14). In Ezekiel, a Spirit transports the prophet (Ezek 3:12, 14, 24; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5; cf. 1 Kgs 18:12). In 1 Kings 22:21-24 (cf. Isa 28:5-6; 29:10), a spirit initiates action from within the divine court; these texts suggest "the Spirit" is an agent.[25]

3) Our third proposal is that the Hebrew scriptures show the Spirit causing a *variety of effects* in the human being. For example,

i) enhancement of human cognitive faculties,[26] augmenting human knowledge, intellectual and practical skills (Exod 28:3; 31:3; 35:31, Deut 34:9; 1 Kgs 7:14; 1 Chron 28:12; Isa 11:2; 28:6);

ii) initiation of certain mental states like dreams and visions (Gen 41:38; Num 24:2-9; Joel 3:1-2; Ezek 8:3);

iii) illocutionary acts such as prophesying (Num 11:25, 26, 29; 1 Sam 10:6, 10; 19:20, 23; Joel 3:1-2; Zech 7:12); blessing (Num 24:2-9); encouragement (1 Chron 12:18); and admonition (2 Chron 15:1-8);[27] and

iv) enhancement of physical strength (Judg 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; Isa 11:2; 28:7).

---

[25] How the Spirit is conceived in terms of an agent is beyond the scope of our study.

[26] The notion of a faculty (and the enhancement of a faculty) pertains to mental *state*, but intimately related to behaviour; see Kenny, *Metaphysics*, 75-83.

[27] Thus a word of encouragement is arguably perlocutionary and illocutionary; see Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 49, 68, and for his general OT treatment, 56-65.

What is noteworthy about this initial list is that the underlying state is often given a description in *modal* terms (dream, vision),[28] *content-rich* terms (wisdom, understanding), or *physical* terms (strength). This however is not the case with the conjunctive association between prophecy, prophesying, or prophets, and the Spirit. Here the *state* is simply one of being "filled" (for want of a better term) with the Spirit from which prophetic behaviour flows. This makes the later popularization of the content-rich expression "Spirit of prophecy" by the Rabbis all the more significant as an innovation upon the scriptural tradition.[29]

Other behaviours can be added to this list, but they are dependent on how the text is read. For example,

i) The Spirit is placed upon the seventy elders so that they might share the burden of leadership with Moses (Num 11:17), but it is unclear how the Spirit gives effect to this leadership; it may have been given to enhance their faculty of judgment. The manifestation of this bestowal is that the elders "prophesied" (Num 11:25), but that they did not add (ולא יספו)[30] to this outburst. This suggests that the phenomenon was ecstatic[31] but the example of Moses' own manifestation of the Spirit in prior story-traditions does not support the conclusion that this is the sole point of the bestowal.[32] Instead the value of the outburst seems to have been evidential. Rather, the Spirit

---

[28] These are descriptions of *form* to which *content* may be added. Thus, for example, the visionary state is a form of experience, the content of which will vary.

[29] The innovation consists in taking a behavioural concept (prophesying) and changing it to describe a cognitive *state*—(typically by saying that the Spirit of prophecy rested upon someone). We discuss this notion further below.

[30] Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy*, 47. The LXX has καὶ οὐκέτι προσέθεντο for the Hebrew clause which supports this interpretation.

[31] Comparison with 1 Sam 10:10, 11, 13 suggests ecstatic utterance in a public display.

[32] This is reminiscent of Pentecost and Luke may be aware of this exegetical tradition in which group bestowal of the holy Spirit immediately leads to an outburst of speech. Eldad and Medad prophesy, and Joshua objects, but Moses expresses the wish that all would be prophets, see R. Le. Déaut, "Targumic Literature and NT Interpretation", *BTB* 4 (1974):243-289 (259).

makes the elders *representative* of the Deity in the administration of his will for the people. It is probably this incident of bestowal that is picked up in Neh 9:20, "You gave your good Spirit to instruct them". The verb נתן occurs in Num 11:25, 29, and the purpose of "instruction" (שכל. cf. Deut 29:8) is consistent with the purpose of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the elders, viz. to judge and direct the people (cf. Neh 9:30).[33]

ii) The Spirit comes upon Othniel, and he judges Israel and goes to war (Judg 3:10). It is not clear whether the Spirit is given to enhance Othniel's faculty of judgment or military skills. The same question can be addressed to all the Judges upon whom the Spirit of the Lord descends (Judg 6:34: 11:29). Moreover, the Spirit may be given in these cases to impart *courage* in the face of the enemy, which would affect the will[34] rather than the faculty of judgment. In the case of each judge, the Spirit is given and this enables the judge to deliver the people as the *representative* of God. This identifies his behaviours as representative of the Deity in action.

iii) The Spirit is related to the illocutionary act of prophesying, but in the case of Saul it is also said that he would be "turned into another man" (1 Sam 10:6—ונהפכת לאיש אחר), which the narrative develops as *ecstatic behaviour* (cf. 1 Sam 19:23-24).

iv) The Spirit may be related to changes in human *attitudes* that then result in different behaviours. Thus Zechariah records that the house of Jacob will have "a spirit of grace and supplication" (רוח חן ותחנונים) poured out upon them and they will mourn (Zech 12:10). In the case of Saul's campaign against the Ammonites, the Spirit appears to directly engender his anger (1 Sam 11:6).

---

[33] The expression רוחך הטבה may be a variation of the idiom "the good hand of the Lord is upon me" (Ezra 8:18, Neh 2:8, 18).
[34] For an outline of this notion, see Kenny, *Metaphysics*, ch. 3 and 83-85.

v) Micah states that he is full of "power" (כח) by the Spirit of the Lord (Mic 3:8), which echoes the traditions associated with the Judges: this is expanded to include "might" (גבורה) and "judgment" (משפט), but the purpose of these qualities is directed towards declaring to Jacob his transgression. There would appear to be an implication here of both the physical strength and courage needed to represent the Deity's will to the people.

vi) The book of Isaiah contains an assertion (Isa 61:1) which states, again echoing Judges, that the Spirit of the Lord is upon a deliverer, because (יען) of an anointing to deliver news (בשר) and proclaim liberty to prisoners, which are diverse illocutionary acts.

This brief review of the functions associated with the Spirit in the Hebrew scriptures may support the conclusion that representative speaking is dominant, but there are a significant number of other representative behaviours to take into account in our picture, particularly those involving leadership. The texts do not support the conclusion that the dominant function of the Spirit is the illocutionary act of prophesying. While in quantitative terms, prophesying (נבא) is mentioned more often than any other single function, it does not outweigh the other functions combined. Further, even where prophesying is mentioned, the Spirit is often related in those contexts to more than just prophetic speech. Thus, for example, there is more going on in the transfer of the Spirit from Moses to the Seventy Elders than their immediate prophesying; Saul's behaviour is not just prophetic but also ecstatic; and Joel predicts dreams and visions as well as prophecies.

In any event, a quantitative measure that the narrower prophetic function is the most frequent does not amount to the qualitative judgment of value that one particular idea is dominant in the socio-literary context of the first century. The story-traditions and predictions that mention the Spirit have the strength to sustain a broader pneumatology than simply the prophetic, one that relates to Israel's future as well as its past (as is shown in other

first century Jewish literature). Different first century social groups may have valued different emphases.

Furthermore, the Hebrew scriptures do not conform to a singular conception of the illocutionary act of the prophetic. The traditions convey a different flavour for prophetic behaviour as it pertains to Moses and the elders, to Saul, and to the writing prophets; and the Deuteronomic tradition preserves yet another aspect. Thus, we cannot simply assert that the dominant function of the Spirit was prophetic without qualification. Which understanding of prophetic behaviour (if any) was *typical or dominant* in the first century is not settled by a consideration of the Hebrew scriptures alone.

4) The fourth idea available to Luke was a linkage between the Spirit and the future. Joel 3:1-2 links dreams, visions and prophecies to a time of deliverance (Joel 3:3). Ezek 36:27 makes a conjunctive association between God's spirit[35] and the people being enabled to walk according to his statutes in a restoration context (Ezek 36:24). The book of Isaiah links the Spirit to the people in contexts that include mention of deliverance and restoration (Isa 32:15; 44:3; 59:21).[36] The Spirit is also associated with the agent of deliverance and restoration in Isaiah 11:2, 11-12; 42:1; 61:1. Finally, the Spirit is associated with the "resurrection" of the nation (Ezek 11:19; 37:14; 39:29). Ideas such as these were also available to Second Temple Judaism(s).

The existence of this cluster of ideas illustrates our argument that we cannot simply assert that there was a dominant conception of the Spirit in first century Judaism that influenced Luke.

---

[35] The text has "my Spirit" (רוחי) rather than just "spirit" (v. 36); we take the possessive suffix to indicate more than a dispositional change is intended.
[36] On this see, Wenk's discussion, *Community-Forming Power*, 58-61.

2.1.2 Septuagint

There are differences to be observed in the mention of the Spirit in the LXX; however, generally, its translators offer a close rendering of the Hebrew text that we have represented in the MT. Consequently, the variety we have already observed pertains also to the LXX. Thus it cannot be said that "for the translators of the LXX the characteristic activity of the Spirit was prophecy".[37] Nevertheless, there are points to observe about the LXX that add to the mix of ideas already listed above available for use by first century writers such as Luke.

1) The titles πνεῦμα θεοῦ and πνεῦμα κυρίου correspond to their Hebrew equivalents, but there is an occasional cross-over. Thus the "Spirit of God" comes upon Saul in 1 Sam 11:6 (MT), but it is the "Spirit of the Lord" in the LXX (see also Isa 11:2). This may be equivocation or it may indicate recognition of an identity in reference between the two expressions. More significantly, in the case of Bezalel, it is not the πνεῦμα θεοῦ with which he is "filled", but πνεῦμα θεῖον (Exod 31:3; 35:31). This adjectival locution may have been chosen because of the broader itemization of gifts associated with Bezalel.[38]

2) While retaining the conjunctive association between the Spirit and a subsequent happening, the LXX introduces direct action upon a person in some cases. Thus the Spirit "directs" Samson (κατευθύνω—Judg 14:6, 19 (A)), and the Spirit makes Gideon strong (ἐνδυναμόω—Judg 6:34 (B)).

3) The LXX renders רוח יהירה in relation to Daniel (5:12) as a πνεῦμα ἅγιον and relates this to some sort of political counsel—καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστι καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ πατρός σου τοῦ βασιλέως συγκρίματα ὑπέρογκα ὑπέδειξε Ναβουχοδονοσορ τῷ πατρί σου.

---

[37] Menzies, *Development*, 54.

[38] However, Josephus and Philo use πνεῦμα θεῖον in connection with prophecy, so this distinctive use in the LXX is not typical; see Levison, "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit", 274-280.

Theodotion's additions to Daniel, although 2c. C.E.,[39] are of interest because they show a contrast with the LXX[40] and, in their multiple usage of the expression "holy Spirit", they bear comparison with the Palestinian Targums and the New Testament.

In our texts, Theodotion replaces רוח אלהין קדישין, in the mouth of Nebuchadnezzar, with πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἅγιον (Dan (Th) 4:8-9, 18), which appears to *interpret* the character's perspective, shifting the adjective "holy" to "Spirit" and removing the polytheistic implication. The use of πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἅγιον partly agrees with Dan 5:12 and 6:4 LXX πνεῦμα ἅγιον, from which it may derive. The function associated with the holy Spirit of God in this case is the interpretation of dreams. In Dan 5:11 and 14 (Th), we have πνεῦμα θεοῦ predicated of Daniel in the mouth of the king and queen, but here the functions associated with the Spirit are broader and include perception, wisdom, and understanding.[41]

2.1.3 Conclusion

Scholarship has shown the centrality of the Jewish scriptures to first century thought. It is to be noted, however, that the LXX follows the MT closely and has not introduced the Spirit into many more texts (although see, Num 23:7; Zech 1:6), or chosen alternative explanatory expressions for the Spirit such as the "Spirit of prophecy".

---

[39] If underlying the Theodotion hexaplaric readings there is an "Ur-Theodotion" from the first century, as indicated by S. Jellicoe in his summary of scholarship, this makes the preference for πνεῦμα ἅγιον in Daniel more significant for our study, see S. Jellicoe, "Prolegomenon", in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (ed., S. Jellicoe: New York: Ktav Publishing, 1974), xiii-liv (xxviii-xxix).

[40] Theodotion and his Danielic additions have been judged more popular than the LXX reading in a first century context; see H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 47-49, 260-262, and K. H. Jobes and M. Silva *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), 41-42.

[41] Compare here Susanna 45 (Th), καὶ ἀπαγομένης αὐτῆς ἀπολέσθαι ἐξήγειρεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον παιδαρίου νεωτέρου ᾧ ὄνομα Δανιηλ, which may also indicate a gift of discernment.

Given that the subject-material of the Spirit is the human being, it should not be surprising that the effects of the Spirit encompass the scope of human behaviour. Accordingly, we propose that the notion of *representative behaviour* can be used to characterize most of the effects of the Spirit, i.e. the Spirit engenders various human behaviours that represent the requirements of the Deity in a given situation. We propose the following findings:

1) The Spirit is mentioned in relation to locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, modes of revelation, content-rich specifications of mental states, and broader representative behaviours.
2) The Spirit is linked with the enhancement of various cognitive and physical abilities.
3) The Spirit engenders various states including visions and dreams.
4) The Spirit is associated with a moral objective in some restoration prophecies.

Accordingly, we suggest that the Jewish scriptures do not present "the Spirit" as predominantly the "Spirit of prophecy".

2.2 Traditions of Interpretation in the First Century

Scholars dispute the dating of writings in the 1c. and 2c. C.E., and therefore we have selected writings which, while sometimes dated to the 2c., are thought nevertheless to include traditions of interpretation that reflect the first century.[42] The writings we have included are ones often discussed by scholars in respect of the background of Luke's pneumatology.

The literature is substantial and our principle of organization will be thematic; the writings may encode influential ideas, but they may also be

---

[42] Unless otherwise noted, references to these documents and their presumed dating, are taken from the standard editions: *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed., J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985); *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (eds., Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997); and editions of the Loeb Classical Library listed in the bibliography.

idiosyncratic.[43] We will treat the literature in three groups: i) material concerned with the *past*, principally scriptural interpretations; ii) material concerned with contemporary events, principally sapiential or philosophical writing; and iii) material concerned with the *future*, principally writings that invoke restoration themes.

The representative writings that we have included in our survey are: *2 Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, *Testament of Job*, *Jubilees*, *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Testament of Abraham*, *Testament of Moses*, *1 Enoch*, *2 Enoch*, *Psalms of Solomon*, *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah*, *Sibylline Oracles*, *Assumption of Moses*, as well as Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, Josephus' writings, Philo's writings, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.[44]

2.2.1 Scriptural Interpretations

A number of texts "re-write" and thereby interpret Jewish scriptural stories mentioning the Spirit. Our interest here is to determine the extent to which the ideas we have already noted in the Jewish scriptures are picked up, enlarged, discarded, or changed.

1) Representative Behaviours: The link between the Spirit and representative human behaviours is maintained. For example, Kenaz is clothed with the "Spirit of the Lord" which is contextually defined as the "Spirit of power" (Ps.-Philo 27:9-10) before he fights the Amorites; similarly,

---

[43] Research has moved away from the distinction between Diaspora Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism, see P. Borgen, *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 15 n. 1, and scholarship there cited. Accordingly, we avoid generalizations about the Spirit and "Diaspora" literature or "Palestinian" literature such as those that Menzies offers, *Development*, 56-57, 76.

[44] References to the "Spirit of God" in the non-Biblical scrolls are a matter of interpretation, particularly in relation to 1QS and 1QH. For our purposes, we have assumed the analysis and catalogue listing in Sekki, *Ruah*, 225-239. A different listing is given in J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts" *RevQ* 5 (1965): 345-60.

Gideon puts on the Spirit of the Lord and is "strengthened" (Ps.-Philo 36:2) before delivering Israel from the Midianites.[45]

Ps.-Philo 3:2 translates Gen 6:3 as "My Spirit shall not judge those men forever";[46] Ps.-Philo 9:8 translates it as "My Spirit will not be a mediator among these men forever". The original Hebrew is דין and this word is used in contexts of judgment, so Ps.-Philo is following the MT or a related Jewish tradition rather than the LXX,[47] which has "My Spirit shall certainly not remain among these men forever". While the Genesis text could be taken to be a reference to the disposition of God—viz. that *he* will not strive, Ps.-Philo 9:8 refers to God revealing his Law to Amram, and this sets the context for the interpretation of "my Spirit"—this is God's spirit in Amram mediating between God and humanity.

A more miraculous example is the jibe of Zedekiah to Micaiah in *Ant.* 8.408, "you shall know whether he is really a true prophet, and has the power of the Divine Spirit; let him right now, when I strike him, disable my hand".[48] This is a miracle of judgment delivered by God to identify the true and the false prophet. Of particular importance in this category of representative behaviour is the association between the Spirit and power in relation to the agent of the restoration of Israel. Thus, for example, 4Q161 Frags. 8-10, lines 19-20 reads, "God will support him with [the spirit of c]ourage [...] [...thro]ne of glory, h[oly] crown".[49]

---

[45] See also Ps.-Philo 39:8 (Jephthah), which could indicate a moral strengthening.

[46] *m.Sanh* 10.3 also follows this rendering, and the Targums interpret Gen 6:3 in terms of the bestowal of the Spirit among men.

[47] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 69-72.

[48] Contrary to Turner, *Power*, 113, and Menzies, *Development*, 59, this is not the "prophetic spirit" enacting a miracle, but the "Divine Spirit" behind both miracle and prophecy; see Levison, "Interpretation", 249.

[49] See also 4Q246 I, 1. We should also include here the effect on Saul's leadership of the presence of the Spirit of the Lord—Ps.-Philo 60:1-3, which is broader than ecstatic prophesying—Ps.-Philo 62:2.

These are examples of behaviour in the individual that in some sense represents the will of the Deity.

2) Modes of Revelation: The understanding of dreams and visions as modes of revelation involving the Spirit is continued. For example, Ps.-Philo 9:10 records that Miriam foresaw the birth of Moses when "the spirit of God came upon Miriam one night, and she saw a dream". Or again, *T. Ab.* (A) 4:8 states, "And I shall send my holy spirit upon his son Isaac, and I shall thrust the mention of his death into Isaac's heart so that he will see his father's death in a dream. Then Isaac will relate the vision". A vision is probably indicated in *1 En.* 91:1 which records Enoch admonishing his children, "for a voice calls me and the spirit is poured over me so that I may show you everything that shall happen to you forever".[50]

3) Ecstatic Behaviours: Second Temple texts also carry on the connection between ecstatic prophetic behaviours and the Spirit. For example, Ps.-Philo 28:6 comments upon Num 24:17, "And when they had sat down, a holy spirit came upon Kenaz and dwelled in him and put him in ecstasy, and he began to prophesy". This kind of effect is not just about speaking, but ecstatic behaviours involve the body and manifest the *physical power* of the Spirit.[51]

4) Writing: One text, *4 Ezra* 14:22, makes the process of writing an indirect work of the Spirit. Ezra requests, "If then I have found favour before you, send the Holy Spirit to me, and I will write everything that has happened in the world from the beginning". 4 Ezra 14:25 describes the effect of the holy Spirit as a "lamp of understanding" which leads to the scribe dictating writing to his assistants.

5) Speaking: An indirect link with the act of speaking is common. For example, in Ps.-Philo 18:10-11, Balaam says, "I am restrained in my speech and cannot say what I see with my eyes, because there is little left of the

---

[50] See also Sir 48:24 (vision), and Ps.-Philo 31:9 (possibly angelic encounter).
[51] See also Ps.-Philo 62:2 (Saul); *Ant.* 4.119 (Balaam), *Ant.* 6.166 (David), and *Ant.* 6.222 (Messengers of Saul).

holy spirit that abides in me".[52] The description of this incident indirectly links a mental state engendered by the Spirit to the act of speaking, which appears to be an illocutionary act of prophesying and blessing.[53] In *Jub.* 31:12, a link is made between prophecy and the mouth: "And a spirit of prophecy came down upon his [Isaac's] mouth". The expression "spirit of prophecy" is a content-rich specification of the Spirit that descends upon Isaac's mouth, and the language of descent is theophanic language. The point is to identify Isaac's speech as the illocutionary act of prophesying. Thus, some of these examples illustrate representative speaking (Isaac), while others (Balaam) are deliberately couched in terms that distance the speaker from the Deity.

6) Praise: A connection between the Spirit and the illocutionary act of praise can also be found. For example, Ps.-Philo 32:14 reads, "But you, Deborah, sing praises, and let the grace of the holy spirit awaken in you, and begin to praise the works of the Lord", and *T. Job* 48:3 reads, "She [Hemera] spoke ecstatically in the angelic dialect[54]...And as she spoke ecstatically, she allowed 'The Spirit' to be inscribed on her garment".[55]

7) Revelation and Wisdom: Texts continue to use *content-rich* words to describe the effects of the Spirit. Thus, the revelation of God's will through the prophets is emphasized. For example, 1QS VIII, 15-16 states of the Way of Isa 40:3 that it is, "the study of the Law wh[i]ch he commanded by the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and according to what the Prophets have revealed through

---

[52] See also *Ant.* 4.108 (Balaam's Ass), 4.119 (Balaam).

[53] See also *Jub.* 25:14 (Rebecca's blessing).

[54] The "tongues of angels" is a common concept in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, for example, 4Q400 2 1, 6-7. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, in his "Introduction" to the Songs states, "They lift one up emotionally and imaginatively into the midst of heavenly choirs", *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd Edition; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 153. It is possible that both the *Songs* and the *Testament* are evidence of ecstatic praise. For further discussion see G. Hovenden, *Speaking in Tongues: The New Testament Evidence in Context* (JPTSup 22: Sheffield: Continuum, 2002), 47-52.

[55] See also *T. Job* 43:2 and 51:2 (Mss. P).

his holy spirit".[56] This text is about the content of communication from the Deity, viz., that it is revelation. Or again, Pharaoh attributes Joseph's wisdom and knowledge to the Spirit of God when he says in *Jub.* 40:5, "We will not find a man wise and knowledgeable as this man because the spirit of the Lord is with him". The Qumran hymns make the same connection: thus, 1QH VI, 25, "You have favoured me with the spirit of knowledge", and 1Q34^{bis} II, 6-7 states, "You established them, isolating them for yourself in order to make them holy among all nations. And you have renewed your covenant with them in the vision of glory, and in the words of your holy [spirit]".[57] This appears to be an allusion to the exodus and the inspiration of the holy Spirit delivering the words of the covenant.[58]

8) Scope: While the main focus of the foregoing texts has been on the effect of the Spirit upon the individual, Second Temple texts also show an awareness of a relationship between the Spirit and the nation. This can be seen in the case of the Qumran sectarians, who regarded themselves to be, in a sense, the true Israel. Thus 4Q504 V, 15 records an address to God on behalf of the nation, "[Fo]r you have poured your holy spirit upon us, [to be]stow your blessings on us, so that we would look for you in our anguish".[59]

This evidence shows that the ideas that we have noted in the Jewish scriptures about "the Spirit" were still vibrant in Jewish thought of the first century. The effects of the Spirit relate to various aspects of the physical and the mental: physical prowess (actions), mental state (dreams, visions), mental faculties, attitudes (courage), behaviour (ecstasy), locutionary acts (uttering, writing), illocutionary acts (praise, prophesying), and content (revelation, wisdom).

---

[56] See also CD II, 12 and 4Q504 Frag. 4.
[57] 1QM X, 10-11 describes Israel at Sinai as "hearers of the glorious voice, seers of the holy angels".
[58] See also 1QH VI, 25; XX, 11-12.
[59] See Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 106, who also cites 1Q28b II, 24 and V, 24-25.

2.2.2 Sapiential and Philosophical Writings

Sapiential and philosophical writings principally use the language of "spirit" in relation to human dispositions. The key writings here are Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach and the works of Philo and Josephus. The Sapiential traditions add to our picture of first century thought by tying the Spirit to the moral pre-requisites and salvific goals. Philosophical writings are valuable because they supply *theoretical*[60] thinking about the Spirit in relation to the processes of inspiration.

1) A clear expression of an ethical pre-requisite for receipt of the Spirit is found in Wis 1:5, "For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and will not abide when unrighteousness cometh in". Here the holy Spirit is presented with personal language insofar as it is unable to abide with the sinful person; depending on how we read the personifying figure, it may locate the sphere of operation for the Spirit as the will or the faculties of the individual.

In Sirach, nomistic wisdom is made a pre-requisite:

> But he that giveth his mind to the law of the most High, and is occupied in the meditation thereof, will seek out the wisdom of all the ancient, and be occupied in prophecies...When the great Lord will, he shall be filled with the spirit of understanding (πνεύματι συνέσεως): he shall pour out wise sentences, and give thanks unto the Lord in his prayer. Sir 39:1-6

This text illustrates a change in the *mental state* of the student of Torah, which then issues in the *illocutionary act* of prayer.[61]

---

[60] Because we have limited our review to Jewish materials, we are excluding consideration of the influence of Greco-Roman philosophical ideas upon Jewish thought. For a discussion of Plutarch and Cicero (as compendia of popular views) see Levison, *Judaism*, 7-17.

[61] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 69, sees in this text evidence of the ethically transforming power of the Spirit.

2) A text that clearly links the Spirit to salvific goals is Wis 9:17-18. "And your counsel who has known, except you give wisdom, and send your Holy Spirit from above? For so the ways of them which lived on the earth were reformed, and men were taught the things that are pleasing unto you, and were saved through wisdom".[62]

Several texts in 1QH can also be placed in this category. The Qumran sectarian hymns make an explicit link between the Spirit of God and the moral life. Thus, 1QH XV, 6-7, "you have spread your holy spirit over me so that I will not stumble", 1QH VIII, 15 "to be strengthened by [your] ho[ly] spirit, to adhere to the truth of your covenant", and 1QH XX, 11-12, "And I, the Instructor, have known you, my God, through the spirit which you gave in me, and I have listened loyally to your wonderful secret through your holy spirit", make the connection between the Spirit and faithful observance of God's requirements.

Menzies interprets these 1QH texts as referring to a novitiate's "initiation into the community" and "granted to every member".[63] However, the language may equally refer to the *maintenance* of the spiritual life, that is, through the Spirit the member is being drawn ever nearer to God. While 1QH XX, 11-12 refers to the Spirit which "has been given", and this may well indicate the time of initiation,[64] the focus of these texts is nevertheless upon the ongoing maintenance of the spiritual life—the ongoing work of the Spirit.[65] This pneumatology of 1QH bears obvious comparison with Luke-Acts, as its pneumatology is community-focused.

---

[62] See also Wis 7: 7, 27, 9:17-18. Philo also develops this connection between the Spirit, Wisdom, and the ethical life; for example, see *Gig.* 55, and Turner's discussion of Philo's ethical approach to the Spirit, *Power*, 124-126.
[63] *Development*, 84-85.
[64] In this connection see 1QH IV, 26, and 1QH Frag. 2 line 9.
[65] Menzies' reading emphasizes initiation but not maintenance. However, that maintenance and enhancement of the spiritual life is a function of the Spirit is indicated in 1QH XVII, 32, "You have delighted me with your Holy Spirit".

Turner's reading of these texts is that the moral life is the result of the Spirit of prophecy: "the Spirit of prophecy is the power of true ethical and spiritual understanding".[66] His argument is that the moral life is related to content-rich specifications of the work of the Spirit such as "understanding. wisdom or knowledge",[67] and that such effects are properly understood as "prophetic".[68] However, Turner does not justify why the content-rich specification "prophecy" should be the preferred grouping expression: he relies on an analysis of the Targumic texts that sustain (in his view) an equation between the Spirit and the Spirit of prophecy. Consequently, it is open to us to structure our presentation of these sapiential and philosophical texts using just the category of "the Spirit".

3) Philo and Josephus supply philosophical information about the Spirit and inspiration. Philo offers a clear example of his thinking in his re-telling of the story of Balaam in *Mos.* 1.277,

> He advanced outside, and straightaway became possessed, and there fell upon him the truly prophetic spirit which banished utterly from his soul the art of wizardry. For the craft of the sorcerer and the inspiration of the holiest might not live together. Then he returned, and, seeing the sacrifices and the altars flaming, he spake these oracles as one repeating the words which another had put into his mouth.

Balaam is filled by divine inspiration, no longer in control of his faculties (*Mos.* 1.281-283). Similarly, Josephus describes the "inspiration" of Balaam

---

[66] *Power*, 126.
[67] *Power*, 132.
[68] See also Sir 48:12. Turner, *Power*, 126-128, also uses some *Testaments'* texts to establish a link between the Spirit of prophecy and the ethical life, however, apart from *T. Ben.* 8:3, it is not certain that the texts he cites have not been subject to Christian interpolation.

as a loss of mental control, and as God entering a person (*Ant.* 4.119).[69] Josephus' description precludes the possibility of Balaam speaking as a *representative* of the Deity or behaving in a representative manner. Josephus' apologetic motive for this approach is to introduce a kind of daemonic inspiration without making a *pagan* representative of the Deity.[70]

Levison distinguishes this kind of inspiration from one where the individual retains his rational faculties. Philo treats the inspiration of Moses in this category. Thus, he comments, "Philo was careful, however, to deny that Moses' possession entailed the vitiation of his rational capacities".[71] The continued possession of a rational capability under inspiration ensures that the individual retains autonomy, and is therefore enabled to participate in the *intentionality* of the utterance. This in turn ensures that an individual is speaking representatively for the Deity. This second type of inspiration predominates in the Jewish scriptures. Contrary to Levison, who comments that the non-rational category "cannot be attributed to Philo's biblical foreground",[72] the non-rational kind of inspiration has incidence in the Jewish scriptures in those examples that we have labelled "ecstatic".

2.2.3 Restoration Prophecies

The restoration prophecies that mention the Spirit in the Jewish scriptures are a source of reflection and theological development. Here it is important to distinguish, i) texts which still regard the restoration as a future event; ii) texts which see restoration as a present reality; and iii) texts which specify the spirit endowments of the agent(s) of such a restoration.

1) Restoration texts with a focus on the future are about ethical renewal. Ezek 36:25-27 is an important text, being utilised in various writings. For example, it is echoed in *Jub.* 1:23, "And I shall create for them a holy Spirit,

---

[69] On this, see Levison, "Interpretation", 235-240. For this reason, Josephus cannot simply be cited as a supporter of a biblical concept of the "Spirit of prophecy".
[70] "Interpretation", 238.
[71] "Prophetic Spirit", 197.
[72] "Prophetic Spirit", 192.

and I shall purify them so that they will not turn away from me from that day and forever", transposing the quotation to a Mosaic setting (*Jub.*1:21).

Ezekiel 36 is also found in the Community Rule text, 1QS IV, 20-21, where it has an eschatological and universal focus: "Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds...cleansing him with the spirit of holiness".[73] Or again, 1QH VIII, 19-20 states, "I have appeased your face by the spirit which you have placed [in me,] to lavish your [kind]nesses on [your] serv[ant] for [ever,] to purify me with your holy Spirit...".

Creation motifs are also used to describe the future restoration of the nation. Thus, 4Q521 Frag. 2 II, 5 alludes to Gen 1:2, "and his spirit will hover upon the poor, and he will renew the faithful with his strength", and sets this among echoes of Isa 11:2 and Ps 146:7-8.

2) Certain Qumran community texts suggest that they perceived that they were in the last days. In this context, they applied Ezekiel's restoration prophecy to themselves. Thus, 1QS III, 7 echoes Ezek 36:25-26 in its description of the prospective member, "And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth, that he is cleansed". Here the novice submits to the counsel of the community and to the sprinkling and cleansing of his flesh, and in this submission he is united to the truth of God and is thereby "cleansed" by the spirit of holiness.[74] The metaphor of "cleansing" along with a mention of the "Spirit" secures an allusion to Ezekiel's restoration prophecy, and suggests that this text is not just about the disposition of the

---

[73] *Contra* W. D. Davies "Paul on Flesh and Spirit" in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed., K. Stendahl; New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1992), 157-182 (173), who comments that "the reference to the Spirit here somehow lacks that connotation of empowering energy which we associate with the eschatological gift of the Spirit in both the Old Testament and the New"; Menzies also denies that 1QS IV, 21 refers to the Spirit of God in *Development*, 81.

[74] For a recent discussion, see B. Smith, "'Spirit of Holiness' as Eschatological Principle of Obedience" in *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds., J. J. Collins and C. A. Evans; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 75-99.

individual being invigorated by the effects of a pious life.[75] The holy Spirit lies behind the truths presented by the community, and the change effected in the novitiate can be equally attributed to the rules of the community or the holy Spirit. Accordingly, we read of community members in 1QS IX, 3. that "these exist in Israel in accordance with these rules in order to establish the spirit of holiness in truth"; the presence of the holy Spirit is established through obedience.[76]

Scholars have debated the relationship between the pneumatology of 1QH and 1QS. However, there is no necessary conflict between the two viewpoints, if the initiation and maintenance of the spiritual life by the Spirit of God, which we saw above in 1QH, *presupposes* an eschatological context of the bestowal of the Spirit.[77]

3) The Spirit continues to be related to the agent of the future restoration of the nation. For example, Isa 11:2 appears in *1 En.* 49:2-3,[78] "In him dwells the spirit of wisdom, the spirit which gives thoughtfulness, the spirit of knowledge and strength, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness". While this text has multiple "spirits", a text such as *Pss.*

---

[75] So Sekki, *Ruach*, 92-93, who notes that in the sectarian scrolls the work of inner moral purification is the work of God. He also observes that the manuscript variation 4Q255 Frag. 2, lines 1-2 has, "And by his holy spirit which links him with his truth he is clea[nsed of all] his sins", and makes the point that רוח קודשו is used in the scrolls to refer to God's spirit, *Ruach*, 72. This reading is noted by M. A. Knibb in *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 93, who nevertheless adopts a dispositional view, which is followed by Menzies, *Development*, 81-82. A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 139, also sees a reference to the Spirit of God. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 102, favours the "external" reading, but is unwilling to exclude the dispositional element. He sees 1QS III, 18 in dispositional terms but 1QS IV, 20b-21 in terms of the Spirit of God. It is outside the scope of this thesis to discuss the doctrine of "the Two Spirits" in 1QS; there is a case to be made for both a cosmological reading and a dispositional reading and Wenk presents a balanced mediating position.

[76] A relationship between the holy Spirit and the community may be indicated in the fragment, 4Q287 Frag. 10, "...against [or "upon", על] the anointed ones of [His] hol[y] spirit".

[77] Turner, *Power*, 129, speculates that 1QH may be proleptic.

[78] See also *1 En.* 62:2.

*Sol.*17:37[79] reflects the Jewish scriptural emphasis on the singular "Spirit of the Lord" with its reading, "And he will not weaken in his days (relying) upon his God, for God made him powerful in the holy spirit and wise in the counsel of understanding, with strength and righteousness". These texts associate a broad range of work with the agent of Israel's future restoration and ascribe this work to the Spirit either directly or by allusion.[80]

2.2.4 Conclusion

Extant writings in the first century have been used to establish the view that the dominant conception of the Spirit was prophetic.

Menzies separates Diaspora, Qumran, and Palestinian literature, and develops generalizations appropriate to each body. With regard to Diaspora literature, he argues that it shows "experience of the Spirit was virtually identified with prophetic inspiration",[81] and that "miraculous events not associated with inspired speech or special revelation are always attributed to other sources".[82] Of Josephus, he concludes, that he "viewed the Spirit exclusively as the source of esoteric wisdom and inspired speech",[83] and exhibited a "remarkable reluctance to attribute miraculous deeds to the Spirit".[84] His comment on Palestinian literature is that it has a "tendency to identify the Spirit of God with prophetic inspiration".[85]

Adopting this grouping strategy affords Menzies the opportunity to provide piecemeal generalizations. The question raised by his approach is whether grouping literature by geographical provenance is appropriate. Menzies recognizes the limitations of this method citing Martin Hengel's judgment that "Jewish Palestine was no hermetically sealed island in the sea of

---

[79] See also *Pss. Sol.* 18:6-8.
[80] See also 1Q28b V, 24-25, 11Q13 Frag. 3 II, 18.
[81] *Development*, 56.
[82] *Development*, 57.
[83] *Development*, 60.
[84] *Development*, 61.
[85] *Development*, 74.

Hellenistic oriental syncretism".[86] Our presentation of the evidence, with Turner, has therefore been more holistic.

Thus, our presentation concurs with Turner's critique[87] of Menzies, although for different reasons. Since the Jewish scriptures clearly link "the Spirit" with representative behaviours such as human acts of power and strength, we cannot conclude that experience of the Spirit is "virtually identified with prophetic inspiration" in first century thought as a whole. Such a view is reinforced by Palestinian scriptural interpretations such as *Pseudo-Philo*,[88] which links the Spirit to the miraculous.[89]

The treatment of the Spirit in Sapiential literature is also inconvenient for Menzies' thesis, and it is illicit for him to bracket this material by asserting that in the Wisdom of Solomon the author has "transformed the concept of the Spirit",[90] as if there was some singular concept waiting to be transformed. Rather, the author of the Wisdom of Solomon is developing an effect of the Spirit that arises out of his interests and concerns with the role of Wisdom. This effect pertains to how ethical behaviour representing the will of the Deity is engendered by the Spirit.

Similarly, it is illicit for Menzies to suggest that "the process of development, both within the Qumran community and Jewish sapiential thought as a whole, culminates in the attribution of soteriological significance to the gift of the Spirit".[91] He does not demonstrate a process of development. The unique character of 1QH in respect of its pneumatology does not require a *dynamic* hypothesis such as that proposed by Menzies. In

---

[86] *Development*, 52, Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 1:312.
[87] *Power*, ch. 4.
[88] Menzies states that Ps.-Philo 27:9-10 (Kenaz) is the *only* instance of the Spirit being associated with miraculous activity, *Development*, 76. However, we have identified other texts that associate the Spirit with representative behaviours involving strength and power.
[89] See Turner's critique of Menzies on this point, *Power*, 111-114.
[90] *Development*, 63.
[91] *Development*, 87.

the first instance, the unique character of 1QH, assuming it is in conflict with 1QS, only requires the *static* hypothesis that there were conflicting pneumatologies in evidence at Qumran. However, we have proposed instead that the pneumatology of 1QH can be accommodated within the framework of 1QS, once it is realized that 1QS *includes* an eschatological bestowal of the Spirit alongside its dualistic account of the "two spirits" in man.

Thus, our approach, following Turner, has been to give equal weight to the sapiential philosophical and eschatological traditions about the Spirit, where the Spirit is linked to both moral pre-requisites and salvific goals. Similarly, we have given equal emphasis to the role of the Spirit in eschatological texts. Here the restoration prophecy of Ezek 36:24-26 is important because of its creative and ethical emphasis; and Isa 11:1-4 is important for its description of the restoration of Israel under its future Messiah; such work is directly attributed to the Spirit.

Strategies for *preferring* a notion of "prophetic inspiration" (Menzies), or the content-rich notion, "Spirit of prophecy" (Turner), as the dominant view of the Spirit in Jewish thought, are flawed. Rather, we need to work with a genre specific notion of dominance. "Judaism" is too broad a category to be of value in assessing the influence of any background upon Luke. A more realistic strategy would investigate whether (in addition to the influence of narrow prophetic categories) the dominant notion of the Spirit in restoration prophecies was of influence, or whether Luke is influenced by any sapiential emphasis, or again, whether Luke carries over the idea of the Spirit as the catalyst of representative behaviour or representative speaking.

2.3 Rabbinical Materials

The third block of evidence for Jewish pneumatology of the first century is rabbinical. B. Chilton describes the standard approach to rabbinical materials: "Mishnah, Midrash and Talmud present us, in the main, with intramural rabbinic discussion. Targums provide us with some insight into how those discussions found expression in a more public, less expert

context, i.e., in the worship of the faithful".[92] Accordingly, we have divided our treatment into two parts.

2.3.1 Targums

Targumic traditions developed in the day-to-day synagogue application of Scripture (as Hebrew ceased to be the vernacular), and they are a witness for identifying *common* theological conceptions. However, the Targums as we have them are professional translations,[93] which involved rabbinical schools *after* the first century. Accordingly, their value as evidence of first century thought is qualified. However, as Geza Vermes notes, the Targums have an advantage as to evidence compared with other rabbinical literature because the Aramaic texts were "probably subjected to a less thorough updating than the *Mishnah*, *Tosefta*, Talmud and halakhic Midrashim".[94] We will examine the Palestinian Pentateuchal Targums, *Neofiti*, *Fragment Targum*, *Pseudo-Jonathan*, along with the Pentateuchal Targum *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*.[95]

As interpretations of the Hebrew scriptures, the Targums present a functional picture of "the Spirit" that matches the variety in their primary source material. In the case of the Pentateuchal Targums, the Hebrew scriptures have relatively little mention of the Spirit, and here the various Targums disagree in where the Spirit is to be added and how the Spirit is to

---

[92] B. D. Chilton, *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSup 23; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 4.

[93] Unless otherwise noted, citations from the Targums are taken from editions published in *The Aramaic Bible Series* (ed., M. J. McNamara; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988—). For an overall introduction to the Targums, see P. S. Alexander, "Jewish Aramaic Translations" in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed., M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 217-253. Chilton cautions that "allowance must be made for the influence, and even the direct composition, of the Rabbis within the extant witnesses", "Reference", 78.

[94] G. Vermes, "Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis: Reflections on Methodology" *JJS* 33 (1982): 361-376 (361).

[95] We are excluding the Targums devoted to the *Ketubim* because of their relative late dates; see M. J. McNamara, "Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim" in *A History of Biblical Interpretation* (eds., A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 167-197 (169).

be construed. In the case of *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, there is closer textual correspondence between the Hebrew scriptures and the Targum in the mention of the Spirit.

It has been held that the Palestinian Targums "preserved many exegetical traditions which would have circulated in the Jewish community of the first century".[96] However, an early date for the Palestinian Targums *as a whole* cannot be an assumption in a comparative investigation of the motif of "the Spirit" in these texts.[97] Following M. J. McNamara,[98] we will assume that the language of *Neofiti* and *Fragment Targum* suggests a 3c. C.E. date, includes earlier tradition, and does not preclude there having been a "proto-Palestinian" Targum in the first century from which *Onqelos* and *Neofiti* derive. Following S. A. Kaufman, we will treat *Pseudo-Jonathan* as a late post-Talmudic composite Targum based on *Onqelos* and Palestinian Targum traditions.[99] McNamara's (2004) latest summary of scholarship is that, "it is now generally recognized that *Pseudo-Jonathan* should not properly be

---

[96] R. Le Déaut, *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982), 24. Menzies uses this older scholarship to justify his use of Targumic texts as evidence of first century Jewish thought, *Development*, 99 n. 2. Turner recognises the probability that the Palestinian Targums are "later and freer" than *Onqelos* or *Targum Jonathan*, *Power*, 87. Turner weights the Targums above other rabbinical documents, *Power*, 110.

[97] A. D. York in "The Dating of the Targumic Literature" *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49-62 (59), discusses the arguments for the priority of the Palestinian Targums over that of *Onqelos* and concludes, "the prior antiquity of the Palestinian Targum, must be, if not abandoned altogether, modified drastically to say simply that the PT includes some quite ancient traditions".

[98] M. J. McNamara, "Some Targum Themes" in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (eds., D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid; 2 vols; WUNT 2/140-141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001-2004), 1:305-356 (303-306).

[99] S. A. Kaufman, "Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and their Use in the Study of First Century C.E. Texts" in *The Aramaic Bible* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 117-141 (124); see also M.J. Maher, "Introduction" to *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (ed., M. J. Maher; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1992), 1-14 (12), who comments that "both the content and the language of *Tg. Ps.-J* allow us to accept with confidence the view that this Targum in its final form cannot be dated before the seventh or eighth century". Compare also G. J. Kuiper, *The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and its Relationship to Targum Onqelos*, (Rome: Institutum Patristicum, 1972), ch. 1.

classified as representing the Palestinian Targum...it is the work of a scholar and was not intended for synagogue use".[100] This will be our position, and it is important because Lucan scholars have made critical use of *Pseudo-Jonathan* in their use of the Targums as evidence of first century thought about the Spirit.

Scholars locate *Onqelos* in either Babylon or Palestine.[101] Grossfeld adopts the latter view speculating that there was a *Proto-Onqelos* "containing older Palestinian traditions which were preserved throughout the final redaction process in Babylonia".[102] McNamara notes that several scholars date the language of *Onqelos* to the early 2c.[103] On this basis, we will assign *Onqelos* greater weight as evidence of first century views. Our assumption will be that the Palestinian Targums, including *Onqelos*, represent *alternative* though not necessarily competing traditions.

The date and place of origin for *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* has been assigned to Palestine and late first century or early second century. Because of the linguistic affinity between *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan*, the two Targums are often given the same provenance.[104] L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, after reviewing scholarship on the question of dating, conclude that *Targum Jonathan* "is a late first century-early second century work which originated and was first developed in the land of Israel before being brought to Babylonia where it was redacted prior to the Arab invasion".[105]

---

100 "Interpretation", 169.

101 For a review of the two schools of thought, see E. M. Cook, "A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan", in *Targums in their Historical Context* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 142-156.

102 B. Grossfeld, "Introduction", *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (ed., B. Grossfeld; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1-39 (18), and for a summary of arguments, 30-35.

103 "Some Targum Themes", 306.

104 For a description of the historical background to *Targum Jonathan* and its relationship to *Onqelos*, see Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), ch. 1.

105 L. Smolar and Moses Aberbach, eds., *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1983), xxviii.

This will be the assumption of this study, and as such, it admits *Targum Jonathan* as evidence of first century Judaism.[106]

2.3.1.1 Codex Neofiti

The mention of the Spirit in *Neofiti* is only partly controlled by the Hebrew scriptures. *Neofiti* introduces the Spirit into many more narrative accounts, and the expression "holy Spirit" is far more common. There are, however, the same kinds of idea: *Neofiti* illustrates a *state-behaviour* distinction, as well as *instrumental causation* and *conjunctive association*. The Spirit is related instrumentally to human behaviour in far more cases, and it links a wider variety of behaviours to the Spirit.

The data is given in the table below:

---

[106] The multi-volume nature of *Targum Jonathan* requires us to be aware of the issues concerning the dating and authorship of each of the volumes; accordingly, the conclusion of Smolar and Aberbach is only indicative. Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini, "Introduction", *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (eds., Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-15 (3), favour a date for the *Former Prophets* of 135 C.E., but recognise the need to take into account a period of redactional composition. B. D. Chilton, "Introduction", *The Isaiah Targum* (ed., B. D. Chilton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), xiii-xxxv (xxiv), argues that, "it is impossible to know whether a complete Targum was produced at the Tannaitic phase, and reworked at the Amoraic phase, or whether both phases were partial affairs". R. D. Hayward, *The Targum of Jeremiah* (ed., R. D. Hayward; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 38, argues that there are "sufficient grounds for discerning the origins of *Tg. Jeremiah* in the land of Israel during, or slightly before, the first century A.D.". R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart, "Introduction", *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (eds., R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-25 (18), argue for a literary composition after 70 C.E.

Neofiti uses "holy Spirit" for "Spirit of God" in the MT.	*Tg. Neof.* Gen 41:38: Exod 31:3; 35:31: Num 24:2
Neofiti prefers verbs of seeing to describe the instrumental effects of the Spirit, for example, Jacob "had seen in the holy Spirit" that liberation would be achieved for Israel at Gilead.	*Tg. Neof.* Gen 31:21 mg.,[107] cf. *Tg. Neof.* Gen 42:1: Exod 2:12 mg. 1, Exod 2:12 mg. 2
Neofiti attributes the making of the priestly vestments to a divinely bestowed "spirit of wisdom".	*Tg. Neof.* Exod 28:3
Neofiti explicitly attributes prophetic *speech* (as opposed to the vision implied in foresight) only in the episodes of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the seventy elders and Balaam.	*Tg. Neof.* Num 11:25: 24:2
Neofiti may attribute moral[108] behaviour to the Spirit in its description of Caleb's credentials, "my servant Caleb, because a holy spirit was with him and he followed my Memra faithfully".	*Tg. Neof.* Num 14:24, cf. *Tg. Neof* Gen 6:3

The restricted number of episodes and the variety of effects with which *Neofiti* involves the Spirit of God prevents any generalization that the main effect of the Spirit is the illocutionary act of prophesying.[109] This is supported by the fact that *Neofiti* only uses the expression "Spirit of prophecy" once (*Tg. Neof.* Exod 2:12 mg. 1). The data does not even support the conclusion that the main effect of the Spirit is the broader illocutionary

---

[107] M. J. McNamara suggests in "Introduction" *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (ed., M. J. McNamara; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 1-45 (9, 15). that the marginal glosses of *Neofiti* represent other Palestinian Targums.

[108] This is an innovation upon the MT as the MT uses moral value-words in connection with the Spirit only in restoration prophecies.

[109] *Contra* Menzies, *Development*, 100, who focuses only on the additions that *Neofiti* makes to the MT as a way to establish *Neofiti's* pneumatological perspective. For a discussion of Menzies' treatment of the Targums. see Turner, *Power*, 86-88.

act of representative speaking. Rather, the picture is a balance of information about modes of revelation, mental states, prophetic speech, and possible moral effects.

2.3.1.2 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan

A similar varied picture emerges in *Pseudo-Jonathan*. The main characteristic about this recension is the greater use of the expression, "Spirit of prophecy" (רוח נבואה, *Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 41:38; 45:27; Exod 33:16; 35:31; Num 11:17, 25, 26, 28, 29; 24:2; 27:18). This usage raises the question as to the relationship between the holy Spirit and the Spirit of prophecy.[110]

The expression "Spirit of prophecy" is used to indicate the *state*[111] of a person. Thus *Pseudo-Jonathan* prefers locutions of presence with the "Spirit of prophecy" such as it "rests upon" or is "in" an individual (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 41:38; 45:27; Num 11:17, 25, 26, 29; 24:2; 27:18), and an individual is "filled" with the Spirit of prophecy (*Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 35:31). However, from a narrative perspective, the expression is used when the status and credentials of a person for a specific task are in view. Thus, we find uses of the expression occurring in the appointment of the Seventy Elders (*Tg. Ps.-J* Num 11:17f); Bezalel's appointment and presentation to the congregation (*Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 35:31); Pharaoh's validation of Joseph's status as an interpreter of dreams (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 41:38); and finally, it is used to legitimate both Balaam and Joshua (*Tg. Ps.-J* Num 24:2; 27:18).

In contrast, the use of "holy Spirit" is wider: in addition to being associated with locutions of presence (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 6:3, Exod 31:3), the expression is used in *instrumental* descriptions of the mechanics of human behaviour indicating a specific mode of revelation, and with personifying language.

---

[110] For a discussion of this question see, P. Schaffer, "Die Termini 'Heiliger Geist' und 'Geist der Prophetie' in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim zueinander" *VT* 20 (1970): 304-14.

[111] An exception to this rule may be *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 37:8, which reads, "by the wisdom of the Spirit of prophecy, he [Bezalel] made the cherubim on its two sides". However, the instrumentality is once removed from the expression "Spirit of prophecy".

Thus, Rebekah "hears" through the holy Spirit the conversation between Isaac and Esau (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 27:5); Jacob "speaks" in the holy Spirit about the future of the house of Jacob (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 30:25); he "sees" in the holy Spirit that his descendants would experience liberation at Gilead (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 31:21); he "sees" by means of the holy Spirit that Potiphar's wife stands before Joseph in Egypt (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 37:33); and finally, the holy Spirit "replies" and "informs" (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 35:22; 43:14).

Pseudo-Jonathan also makes the moral effect of the "holy Spirit" on the antediluvians more explicit. It presents God's antediluvian complaint, "Did I not put my holy spirit in them, that they might perform good deeds" (*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 6:3). Such a moral linkage is not made with the expression "the Spirit of prophecy".

2.3.1.3 Fragment Targum[112]

This recension is similar to *Neofiti*, although because of its fragmentary nature, there are only eight parallel passages to consider (*Frg. Tg.* Gen 6:3; 27:1; 37:33; 42:1; 43:14; Exod 2:12; Num 11:26, 28; 24:2), some of which do not mention "the Spirit". Thus *Fragment Targum* does not mention "the Spirit" in connection with Jacob's lament about Simeon and Benjamin, whereas *Pseudo-Jonathan* has the holy Spirit "inform" Jacob about his two sons (*Frg. Tg./Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 43:14); and it does not mention the holy Spirit in connection with Balaam, whereas *Neofiti* makes the holy Spirit rest upon Balaam (*Frg. Tg./Tg. Neof.* Num 24:2).

The expression "Spirit of prophecy" occurs only once, in connection with Eldad and Medad (*Frg. Tg.* Num 11:28); otherwise *Fragment Targum* prefers "holy Spirit" (*Frg. Tg.* Gen 27:1; 37:33; 42:1, Exod 2:12; Num 11:26). One additional episode mentions that Isaac was deceived because "the holy Spirit departed from him" (*Frg. Tg.* Gen 27:1). *Fragment Targum* has the same preference for verbs of perception with the holy Spirit as *Neofiti*. Thus Jacob "sees" that Potiphar's wife stands before Joseph in Egypt (*Frg. Tg.*

---

[112] Citations are from M. L. Klein, *The Fragment Targums of the Pentateuch* (2 vols; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980).

Gen 37:33); he "sees" that there is grain in Egypt (*Frg. Tg.* Gen 42:1); and Moses "looked" through the holy Spirit (*Frg. Tg.* Exod 2:12) before striking the Egyptian.

2.3.1.4 Targum Onqelos

This Targum is quite different in its presentation of "the Spirit". *Onqelos* includes only one[113] of the references to the holy Spirit found in the other Targums so far considered (*Tg. Onq.* Gen 45:27). Instead of introducing an alternative expression to "holy Spirit", *Onqelos* has no reference to "the Spirit" in many texts where the "holy Spirit" features in other Pentateuchal Targums.[114] For instance, whereas *Onqelos* omits any reference to the Spirit of God in Gen 6:3, *Neofiti* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* have linked the Spirit to moral effects.[115]

Onqelos does use the expression "Spirit of prophecy" as an *alternative*[116] to the expression "holy Spirit" for passages concerned with status and where the effects of the Spirit relate to prophetic speech. It is used in all manuscripts in relation to Joseph, the Seventy Elders, Joshua, and Balaam, and some manuscripts use it in relation to Bezalel and his fellow-artisans. This usage is in keeping with the pattern we have noticed in *Pseudo-Jonathan* and its treatment of these episodes. *Onqelos* is therefore more sharply distinguishable from *Neofiti* on this count, because *Neofiti* eschews the expression "Spirit of prophecy" and presents an exegetical focus that links the Spirit to specific human behaviours that are deemed extra-

---

[113] Even this example has been questioned regarding the authenticity of the reading. Menzies rehearses the evidence, *Development*, 101.

[114] Compare the following texts with their equivalents in the other Pentateuchal Targums: *Tg. Onq.* Gen 6:3, 27:1, 5, 30:25, 31:21, 35:22, 37:33, 43:14, and Exod 2:12.

[115] R. Le Déaut's comment on *Neofiti* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* concerning this text is that "this conception of the gift of the Spirit in view of good works disagrees with the rabbinic tradition as a whole, for which it is the good works that make possible the gift of the Spirit", "Targumic Literature", 258-259.

[116] Grossfeld suggests that *Tg. Onq.* introduces the phrase "Spirit of prophecy" to "avoid the situation of God's spirit resting directly on man", *Targum Onqelos to Genesis*, 138 n. 15.

ordinary. The sharp differences between *Onqelos* and *Neofiti*, and the mixed picture of *Pseudo-Jonathan*, acutely raises the question of whether any or all preserve varied Jewish interpretations current in the first century.

2.3.1.5 Targum Jonathan to the Prophets

The picture of the Spirit in *Targum Jonathan* is controlled by the primary source material.

Former Prophets

The expression "holy Spirit" is absent in the *Former Prophets* (showing an affinity with *Onqelos* rather than *Neofiti*), and there is no dominant conception. Approximately half of the references to the Spirit are to the "Spirit of power" from before the Lord (*Tg. Neb.* Judg 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 14:19; 15:14; 1 Sam 11:6; 16:13, 14). The texts where this expression occurs have a theme of action, often engagement with the enemies of Israel. The case of Elisha's request to Elijah to have a "double share in the spirit of your prophecy" (*Tg. Neb.* 2 Kgs 2:9) should also be included with the "power" group as the narrator goes on to record twice the number of miracles for Elisha compared with Elijah.

In contrast, the expression "Spirit of prophecy" occurs where there is a specific mention of judgment (Othniel, *Tg. Neb.* Judg 3:10), or speech behaviour (Saul, *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 10:6, 10; 19:23; messengers of Saul, *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 19:20; the last words of David, *Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 23:2; Zedekiah's reproach of Micaiah, *Tg. Neb.* 1 Kgs 22:24; and Elisha's words to Gehazi, *Tg. Neb.* 2 Kgs 5:26). The case of Saul should be noted because it relates human transformation to the Spirit of prophecy: "And the Spirit of prophecy from before the Lord will reside upon you, and you will sing praise with them, and you will be changed into another man" (*Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 10:6).

Generally, the expression "Spirit of prophecy" is linked with any effects only indirectly through conjunction. Thus, a typical example would be, *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 19:20, "and a spirit of prophecy from before the Lord resided upon the messengers of Saul and they too were singing praise". The only clear

exception is *Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 23:2, which reads. "By a spirit of prophecy before the Lord I am speaking these things and the words of his holiness in my mouth I am ordering".[117] Here the Spirit of prophecy is connected instrumentally with the words of David's mouth. The use of the personal pronoun in this example secures it as an illustration of representative speaking.

The *Former Prophets* then closely follows the pattern in the Hebrew scriptures: the Spirit is associated with "power" and "speech behaviours".

Latter Prophets

The picture of the Spirit in the *Latter Prophets* is dominated by prophetic categories of thought. *Tg. Isaiah*, *Tg. Ezekiel*, *Tg. Joel* and *Tg. Micah* have texts that mention the Spirit, and their treatment shows both a different hand and a different subject matter.

1) *Tg. Micah* is of relatively minor importance. This Targum makes a contrast between Micah and false prophets who do not have the "Spirit of prophecy" (*Tg. Mic* 3:7-8).

2) *Tg. Isaiah* has an "association between the holy spirit and prophecy".[118] Thus, we have *Tg. Isa* 40:13, "Who established the holy spirit in the mouth of all the prophets, is it not the Lord?"; *Tg. Isa* 42:1, "I will put my Holy Spirit upon him, he will reveal my judgment to the peoples"; *Tg. Isa* 59:21, "And as for me, this is my covenant with them, says the Lord, my holy spirit which is upon you, and the words of my prophecy which I have put in your mouth"; and possibly, the metaphorical *Tg. Isa* 44:3 "For just as waters are

---

[117] There are one or two disputable examples of the "Spirit of prophecy" being instrumentally linked to human behaviour: *Tg. Neof.* Exod 2:12 mg. 1, "Moses looked in a spirit of prophecy" and *Tg. Neb.* 2 Kgs 5:26, "in a spirit of prophecy it was revealed to me". Even if these were accepted, the language is very different from typical examples of instrumentality associated with the "holy Spirit" such as *Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 27:5, "Rebekah heard through the holy Spirit".

[118] Chilton, "Introduction", xxvii.

provided on the land of a thirsty place. and flow on the dry ground. so I will bestow my Holy Spirit upon your sons. and my blessing upon your sons' sons".

A contrast can be noted between *Tg. Isaiah*, the *Former Prophets* and *Onqelos*. *Tg. Isaiah* has no preference for the expression "Spirit of prophecy", which only occurs once at *Tg. Isa* 61:1, "The prophet said. A spirit of prophecy before the Lord God is upon me". Instead, there is an affinity with *Neofiti* insofar as *Tg. Isaiah* associates the holy Spirit with the mechanics of human behaviour (the use of the mouth) and locutions of presence.

Tg. Isaiah also preserves the linkage in the MT between the Spirit and restoration (*Tg. Isa* 11:2; 32:15; 42:1; 59:19; 61:1, 3). These prophecies convey various effects of the Spirit including power, judgment and ethical renewal.

3) *Tg. Ezekiel* and *Tg. Joel* use the expression "holy Spirit". *Tg. Ezekiel* uses it in connection with an anticipated future deliverance and restoration of the nation in the land: *Tg. Ezek* 36:27, "And my holy spirit will I put deep inside of you and I will act so that you shall walk in my statutes", see *Tg. Ezek* 36:24 for context; *Tg. Ezek* 39:29, "And never again will I remove My Shekinah from them, for I have poured out my holy spirit on the House of Israel". *Tg. Joel* uses it an eschatological context: *Tg. Joel* 3:1-2, "After that I will pour out my Holy Spirit on all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams and your young men shall see visions. I will even pour out my Holy Spirit upon menservants and maidservants in those days".

This usage of the expression "holy Spirit" in *Tg. Ezekiel* and *Tg. Joel* is distinct from that found in other Targums insofar as it concerns a predicted future bestowal of the Spirit in respect of a delivered and restored Israel. The effects of the Spirit are, however, different: *Tg. Ezek* 36:27 ascribes an

explicit moral function to the Spirit, whereas *Tg. Joel* 3:1-2 concerns prophetic speech and modes of revelation. However, unlike *Neofiti*, *Tg. Joel* and *Tg. Ezekiel* do not make an instrumental link between human behaviour and the "holy Spirit".

Tg. Joel has no occurrence of the expression "Spirit of prophecy" unlike *Tg. Ezekiel*. Of the occurrences of this expression in *Tg. Ezekiel*, S. H. Levy comments that "The hand of God is usually rendered by *Tg. Ezek* as 'the spirit of prophecy' (*Tg. Ezek*.1:3; 3:14, *passim*[119]), or 'the striking power of God's might' (*Tg. Ezek*. 6:14; 14:9; 25:7, *passim*); or simply 'might' (*Tg. Ezek*. 39:21); or to swear an oath (*Tg. Ezek*. 20:5; 44:12)."[120] This observation is interesting in that it shows the Targumist was not averse to translating a *single* figure in the Hebrew text associated with acts of power and prophetic speech into appropriate distinct circumlocutions. The expression "Spirit of prophecy" is used with the locution of presence, "rested upon" (*Tg. Ezek* 1:3; 3:22; 8:1; 11:24; 37:1; 40:1), except for one instance (*Tg. Ezek* 11:24—"in a vision by the prophetic spirit"). The Targumist always prefers to have the Spirit of prophecy "speak" directly to the prophet, for example, *Tg. Ezek* 11:5, "Then the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord rested upon me, and he said to me, 'Say, Thus says the Lord'".

2.3.1.6 Evaluation of Evidence

A. D. York has commented that "no effective method has as yet been devised to distinguish between the recension of a particular Targumic text and the tradition that underlies that text".[121] J. Bowker has claimed that there can only be "arguments of probability"[122] sustaining a link between the Targums and the first century because there are no direct written connections.

---

[119] Other references are *Tg. Ezek* 8:1; 37:1; 40:1.

[120] "Introduction", *The Targum of Ezekiel* (ed., S. H. Levey; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 14. The elimination of the anthropomorphism "hand of God" is also common in *Targum Jeremiah*, e.g. 6:12; 15:6; 16:21; and 51:25, where it is rendered, "the plague of my strength/power".

[121] "Dating", 49.

[122] J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), 14. See also Chilton, "Reference", 79. and his fourth thesis.

Within Targumic[123] and Lucan scholarship, the redaction-critical work to achieve identification of traditions current in the first century has not been done for passages that mention "the Spirit".

Chilton advocates that the tradition-historical method be used for the identification of possible parallels between later Targumic material and the New Testament. However, his judgment is that, "Once the history of Targumic development is reckoned with, it becomes obvious that their greatest use for the student of the New Testament lies in their provision, not of antecedents, but analogies".[124] Therefore, in respect of "the Spirit", following Chilton, our approach will not be tradition-historical, but rather the identification of analogies drawn at the theological level.

1) One analytical approach offered by Lucan scholars is the assumption that the Targums can be treated as a witness to a *single* interpretative tradition. In order to sustain an equation between the expressions, "Spirit of prophecy" and the "holy Spirit", Turner treats the Pentateuchal Targums as a collective witness. For example, his argument, based on the text of Gen 41:38, is that whereas in *Onqelos* and *Pseudo-Jonathan*, Pharaoh "attributes Joseph's charismatic revelation to the 'Spirit of prophecy from before the Lord', in *Neofiti* we have an almost exact parallel to the wording, but here the charisma is attributed to the Holy Spirit instead".[125] This is presented as evidence of an equation at the level of *conceptual understanding* of the two expressions. Menzies follows a similar undifferentiated approach and, after discussing *Neofiti* and *Onqelos*, concludes that there is a "tendency in the Targum tradition to equate the activity of the Spirit with prophetic inspiration".[126]

---

[123] In the critical editions of the Aramaic Bible, only Chilton argues that "spirit" texts such as *Tg. Isaiah* 11, 42, 63 displays Tannaitic thinking. "Introduction", xxiv.
[124] "Reference", 80.
[125] *Power*, 93. Turner's notion of "revelation" here is not a *mode* of revelation but a term descriptive of *content*, akin to the notion of charismatic wisdom.
[126] *Development*, 101.

However, Turner and Menzies do not discuss the question of whether instead these Targums are *alternative* (and competing) exegetical approaches rather than equivalent ones. If these Targums could be shown to have originated in the same school at the same time, perhaps a case could be made for equivalence in these expressions. However, they are separated by centuries in their relative dates. We cannot therefore simply treat the Targums as an undifferentiated witness.

2) Turner brings the Targumic evidence together as a collective witness, but this is not an arbitrary conflation of the Targumim. Turner is well aware of the different Targumic traditions and also argues that "A similar phenomenon (equating the 'Spirit of prophecy' and the 'Holy Spirit') is found *within* the individual targums",[127] and he cites *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 31:3 and 35:1 as an example. He brings together a synoptic view of the Targums and a recognition of their individual distinctiveness when he states, "It is this sort of regular matching of evidence *across* [my emphasis] and within the targums that allows us to say the Targumists see the Holy Spirit (in part or in whole) as the 'Spirit of prophecy'".[128]

Matching evidence within a Targum would allow us to say that the Targumists *of that Targum* saw some sort of equation in terminology; this however does not allow us to say that the Targumists *as a whole* saw some sort of equation. Targumic scholars regard *Pseudo-Jonathan* as late and an eclectic composition involving *Onqelos* and Palestinian traditions. If this consensus is correct, it is dubious to argue for an equation across *Neofiti*, *Onqelos* and *Pseudo-Jonathan*.

The use of the expressions 'holy Spirit' and 'Spirit of prophecy' within a Targumic tradition varies in quantity. *Neofiti* has one marginal use of 'Spirit of prophecy' (*Tg. Neof.* Exod 2:12). Given this lack and its consistent choice of "holy Spirit" in the main body of the text, we would argue that it

---

[127] *Power*, 93-94.
[128] *Power*, 94.

preserves a distinct exegetical tradition. *Onqelos* has one example of the holy Spirit "resting" on an individual (Jacob—*Tg. Onq.* Gen 45:27), which bears comparison with the Spirit of prophecy "resting" upon the seventy elders, Balaam and Joshua (*Tg. Onq.* Num 11:25; 24:2; 27:18). However, it is not clear that these three cases are similar in the *effect* engendered by the Spirit. In the case of Jacob, the MT describes his spirit reviving, and the Targum records Jacob saying next, "Great is my joy" (*Tg. Onq.* Gen 45:28). The seventy elders engage in some kind of prophesying and Balaam takes up a parable regarding Israel. If the effect engendered is different, and with only one example of the expression 'holy Spirit' in *Onqelos*, we do not have a secure basis for asserting an equation of terminology within this Targumic tradition.

There are however more examples of 'holy Spirit' and 'Spirit of prophecy' within *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* to allow an equation in this tradition. Nevertheless, given the paucity of evidence in *Neofiti* and *Onqelos*, we would argue that *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* are an insufficient basis upon which to conclude that the "Targumists see the Holy Spirit (in part or in whole) as the 'Spirit of prophecy'".[129]

3) The generalization offered by Lucan scholars is that the expressions "Spirit of prophecy" and "holy Spirit" are to be equated because they are both associated with the same functionality. Both Menzies and Turner use the late and eclectic *Pseudo-Jonathan* to generate this proposal, because it is a Targum that has several examples of the two expressions.[130]

Menzies claims that *Onqelos* "explicitly states what is implied" in *Neofiti*, "the Spirit of God is 'the Spirit of prophecy'",[131] and that all the Pentateuchal Targums "agree on a fundamental point: the Spirit of God is

---

[129] *Power*, 94.
[130] Menzies, *Development*, 101-102; Turner, *Power*, 93-94.
[131] *Development*, 101.

the Spirit of prophecy".[132] Turner acknowledges that "the precise terminology 'Spirit of prophecy' (רוח נבואה) is barely to be found in the rabbinic literature",[133] and "rare in earlier Palestinian literature",[134] and only "regular in the Targums".[135] Nevertheless. he argues that while the Targumic expression "Spirit of prophecy" is rare in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, the linkage in that literature between similar functionality and the "holy Spirit", allows us to assert that the *concept* of the "Spirit of prophecy" is present.[136]

On this basis, Turner prefers the rubric "Spirit of prophecy" as the principal term of reference. Accordingly, he structures his presentation, not in terms of there being a variety of functions in this literature (prophetic, ethical, miraculous, etc.) associated with the "holy Spirit" or "the Spirit", but rather that there are a variety of functions associated with the "Spirit of prophecy".[137] Turner offers a historical generalization (Spirit of prophecy = holy Spirit) in terms of a conceptual understanding. However, the absence of the expression "Spirit of prophecy" in the literature of Second Temple Judaism casts doubt on his proposal. This doubt can be reinforced by a different analysis of the Targumic textual evidence he puts forward for his equation.

We can arrange these texts into three groups:

---

[132] *Development*, 102.
[133] *Power*, 87
[134] The expression is absent from the LXX and its additions; he cites only *Jub.* 31:12, *Fug.*186 and *Mos.* 1.277 as extant first century Palestinian texts with the expression, *Power*, 86.
[135] *Power*, 87.
[136] *Power*, 94.
[137] *Power*, 91, and chs. 4 and 5.

i) Texts describing the same episode linking charismatic phenomena with the "Spirit of prophecy" and the "holy Spirit" are:

Tg. Ps.-J Exod 33:16	Turner comments, "Moses bids God remove the Spirit of prophecy from the nations, but continue to speak to him, and to Israel, through the 'holy spirit' (effectively equating the terms)".[138]
Tg. Ps.-J Exod 31:3; 35:31	"'spirit of holiness from before the Lord, with wisdom and intelligence, and with knowledge in every craft' while (according to the same Targum) Moses can relay the message almost verbatim to the children of Israel in 35:31, but now in terms of God having 'filled him with *a spirit of prophecy from before the Lord*, with wisdom, with intelligence, etc.'".[139]
Tg. Neof., Tg. Ps.-J and Tg. Onq. Gen 41:38	*Neofiti* states of Joseph "upon whom there dwells a holy Spirit from before the Lord" and *Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Onqelos* read "in whom [there] is the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord".[140]

[138] *Power*, 93.
[139] *Power*, 94, 95.
[140] *Power*, 93.

ii) Texts associating the "Spirit of prophecy" with the "Spirit of power" or with miraculous deeds are:

Tg. Neb. Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6	"Here the 'Spirit of prophecy from before the Lord' that comes upon Othniel is virtually indistinguishable from the 'Spirit of power from before the Lord' that comes upon Gideon...Jephthah...and...Samson".[141]
Tg. Neb. 1 Sam 10:6; 16:14	In the story of Saul a "Spirit of prophecy" resides but a "Spirit of power" departs.[142]
Tg. Neb. 2 Kgs 2:9, 15	The "Spirit of prophecy" was upon Elijah which Elisha requests. After miraculously *dividing* Jordan. the sons of the prophets comment that Elijah had the Spirit of Elijah.[143]
Tg. Neb. Ezek 8:3; 11:1; 37:1	The "Spirit of prophecy" lifts up Ezekiel and transports him from one place to another, which is an action regularly attributed to "the Spirit".[144]

These cases motivate Turner to say that the expression "Spirit of prophecy" has become "a rather more general term for the Spirit" and a "descriptive synonym" for the holy Spirit.[145]

---

[141] *Power*, 108.
[142] *Power*, 108.
[143] *Power*, 109.
[144] *Power*, 109.
[145] *Power*, 108.

iii) Texts describing different episodes are more important to Turner's case. This evidence consists of those texts which relate "Spirit of prophecy" and "holy Spirit" or other expressions involving "the Spirit" to similar gifts. Turner identifies four kinds of "prototypical" gift[146] and the following is a representative selection of the texts he cites:

Gift	**Texts with "holy Spirit" or "spirit"**	**Texts with "Spirit of prophecy"**
Charismatic Revelation or Guidance	*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 27:5, 42; 30:25; 31:21; 35:22; 37:33; 43:14; *Tg. Neof.* Gen 42:1.	*Tg. Ps.-J* Gen 45:27: *Tg. Onq.* Num 11:25-29: *Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 23:1-2: 2 Kgs 5:26; *Tg.. Ezek* 8:1-3.
Charismatic Wisdom	*Tg. Onq./Tg. Neof./Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 31:3; *Tg. Onq./Tg. Neof.* Exod 35:31; *Tg. Onq.* Exod 35:30; *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 31:6; *Ps.-J/Tg. Onq.* Deut 34:9.	*Ps.-J/Frg. Tg.* Num 11:17-29; *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 35:31; 37:8; *Ps.-J/Tg. Onq.* Num 27:18.
Invasive Speech	*Tg. Neof./Frg. Tg.* Num 11:26-27.	*Tg. Onq./Tg. Ps.-J Num 11:26-27*; *Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 23:2.
Invasive Praise		*Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 10:6, 10; 19:20-23

Turner's conclusions from his selection include that, "Charismatic revelation, charismatic wisdom, invasive prophetic speech and invasive charismatic praise are then the four prototypical gifts of what the Targum tradition calls the 'Spirit of prophecy'",[147] that "such a match suggests that in the Targum tradition 'the Holy Spirit' is effectively the 'Spirit of prophecy'",[148] and that the expressions "Spirit of wisdom" and "Spirit of

---

[146] *Power*, 92-101.
[147] *Power*, 101.
[148] *Power*, 101.

prophecy" "were understood as co-referential expressions for the inspiration of such gifts".[149]

Turner's observation about similar gifts being attributed to "the Spirit" and the "Spirit of prophecy" in the Targumic literature is correct, but this does not justify our *equating* these expressions in that literature, nor does it justify our taking such an equation into the first century and preferring the expression "Spirit of prophecy" as our dominant term of analysis for that century. We need to highlight a number of problems with Turner's treatment:

1) Turner is able to cite parallel Targumic texts containing "Spirit of prophecy" and "spirit" for the gifts of charismatic revelation/guidance and charismatic wisdom,[150] but relies mainly on parallel texts from Second Temple literature (which we have not listed in the table above), containing "spirit" for the gifts of charismatic speech and praise.[151] For example, only the Spirit of prophecy is associated with praise in the Targumic texts (*Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 10, 19). This weakens his equation: in terms of the Targumic corpus, the expressions "Spirit of prophecy" and "spirit" are really only equally associated with the gifts of charismatic revelation/guidance and charismatic wisdom.

2) Turner does not advertise the differences in the usage of the two expressions. For example, in *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 33:16, the expression "Spirit of prophecy" is used in a locution of presence: "remove the Spirit of prophecy", whereas "holy Spirit" is used with a behavioural concept of "speaking". In *Tg. Ps.-J* Exod 31:3, 35:31, the two expressions share a locution of presence and behavioural expressions are absent, as is the case in Gen 41:38 for *Neofiti*, *Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Onqelos*. Accordingly, it cannot be held that *Pseudo-Jonathan* deploys an identity in conceptual function between the "holy Spirit" and the "Spirit of prophecy". Thus, Turner is wrong to argue

---

149 *Power*, 96.
150 *Power*, 92-97.
151 *Power*, 100.

from the evidence in *Pseudo-Jonathan* that the two expressions are used "interchangeably" where the Spirit engenders revelation or guidance. inspires praise, or imparts wisdom.[152] There is semantic overlap with shared locutions of presence, but not with shared expressions denoting an instrumental link between the Spirit and human behaviour.[153] A simple equation is therefore not possible on the basis of these texts.

3) Schäfer outlines an opposing view and, despite citing Schäfer's work, Turner has not addressed Schäfer's argument. Schäfer observes that *Onqelos* translates "Spirit of prophecy" where there is a corresponding referring expression in the MT. Where *Pseudo-Jonathan* does not follow *Onqelos*, of the four places where it uses "Spirit of prophecy", two have corresponding referring expressions in the MT.

In contrast, the expression "holy Spirit" in *Neofiti*, *Fragment Targum* and *Pseudo-Jonathan* frequently lacks a direct point of contact with the MT. Schäfer concludes, „Daraus ergibt sich zunächst einmal, dass der Terminus „Geist der Prophetie" formal enger an den MT anschliesst als der Terminus „hl. Geist"".[154] He also notes that where *Onqelos* uses the term "Spirit of prophecy", „dass auch sachlich ein Zusammenhang mit der Prophetie sich in fast allen Fällen direkt aus dem biblischen Kontext ergibt".[155]

Schäfer, however, does not offer a definition of prophecy, and he does not take into account those texts where "Spirit of prophecy" is associated with gifts that are not obviously about kinds of speech act, i.e. *Tg. Onq.* Exod 31:3, 35:31. His conclusion that, „Der Terminus „Geist der Prophetie" bezeichnet einen eng begrenzten und fest umrissenen Sachverhalt, nämlich

---

[152] *Power*, 88.

[153] Although we cite three examples, this distinction generally applies except for one clear case—*Tg. Neb.* 2 Sam 23:2, and two disputable cases, *Tg. Neof.* Exod 2:12 mg. 1, and *Tg. Neb.* 2 Kgs 5:26.

[154] "...the term 'Spirit of Prophecy' is formally more closely connected to the MT than the term 'holy Spirit'", *Vorstellung*, 310.

[155] "...there is also an objective connection with prophecy itself in nearly all cases directly arising out of the biblical context", *Vorstellung*, 310.

den von Gott dem Menschen gesandten Geist, der prophetische Gaben vermittelt",[156] cannot be completely upheld. Nevertheless, his reading of the data is sufficient to warrant a contrast between the two expressions, one in which, as he states, „Der Terminus „hl. Geist" geht in seiner Bedeutungsbreite über den Terminus „Geist der Prophetie" hinaus".[157]

4) Turner does not explicitly discuss his equation in terms of a sense/reference distinction,[158] but he does suggest at one point that "Spirit of wisdom" and "Spirit of prophecy" are *co-referential*.[159] It is trivially true that identity in reference need not be the result of an identity in sense: indeed, the attractiveness of Turner's equation, "the holy Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy" depends upon the constituent expressions having different senses.

On the question of the reference of "holy Spirit" and "Spirit of prophecy", Turner only considers the descriptions of functional phenomena associated with the expressions when establishing his equation. It is not clear what his equation implies in terms of the referent of these expressions. At one point he suggests that the referent of "Spirit of prophecy" is the *process* of "inspiration of those charismata that fuelled prophecy, or were traditionally closely related".[160] In this he partly agrees with Menzies, who asserts that the Rabbis "equated experience of the Spirit with prophetic inspiration".[161] At another juncture he seems to indicate that the referent of "Spirit of prophecy" is such that it can be ascribed a variety of "actions", which would

---

[156] "...the term 'Spirit of Prophecy' describes a narrowly restricted and sharply delineated fact, namely, the man to whom the Spirit of God has been sent mediating prophetic gifts", *Vorstellung*, 310.
[157] "...the term 'holy Spirit' carries with it a broader significance than the term 'Spirit of Prophecy'", *Vorstellung*, 311.
[158] For an introduction to this notion and its application to Biblical language see A. Gibson, *Biblical Semantic Logic* (2nd ed.; Sheffield: Continuum, 2001), 47-48.
[159] *Power*, 96.
[160] *Power*, 88.
[161] *Development*, 91.

suggest a *personal* referent.[162] This is perhaps reinforced by speaking of the "gifts belonging to the concept of the 'Spirit of prophecy'".[163] We might add to this mix the possibility that the expression "Spirit of prophecy" sometimes refers to a *mental state* and that "of prophecy" uniquely adds a *content-rich* characterization of that state.

The question of reference is critically affected by any *personifying* language such as the language of movement, the language of personal action, or the language of presence.[164] Such language is only associated with the expression "holy Spirit" in the Pentateuchal Targums, whereas personifying language is used with "Spirit of prophecy" in *Targum Jonathan* and *Tg. Ezekiel*. Accordingly, it would seem that a different story about reference is required for the expression "Spirit of prophecy" in the various Targums. A simple equation between expressions for the Spirit on the basis of the Pentateuchal Targums is therefore not possible.

5) Turner's attempt to *broaden* the concept of the Spirit of prophecy is his main contention with Menzies. In respect of acts of power, his position is too dependent on *Tg. Neb.* Judg 3:10, and its mention of the "Spirit of prophecy", which ought to be treated as exceptional. Further, his use of the story of Saul is open to challenge: *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 11:6 has a "mighty spirit" rest upon Saul, and this may be the spirit that departs in *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 16:14, rather than the "Spirit of prophecy mentioned in *Tg. Neb.* 1 Sam 10:6. In the case of the Spirit of Elijah, Elisha specifically requests, "May there be a double share in the spirit of *your* prophecy with me" (*Tg. Neb.* 2 Kgs 2:9), which while a close expression, is not the same concept as "Spirit of prophecy". Likewise, the *Tg. Ezekiel* texts can be read differently: *Tg. Ezek* 11:24 suggests a visionary interpretation for acts of transport rather than a literal transport by some power—"And the spirit lifted me up and brought

---

[162] *Power*, 91.

[163] *Power*, 91.

[164] A discussion of issues surrounding personification and linguistic hypostatization in respect of the Spirit is beyond the scope of our study; see Turner's introduction of the issues in *Power*, 42-45.

me to the country...in a vision by the prophetic spirit which had rested upon me from before the Lord".

Accordingly, our contention is that while the concept of "the Spirit" is as broad as Turner wants, it is not clear that the Targums should be used to establish an equally broad concept of the "Spirit of prophecy": Schäfer's strictures here seem correct.

6) Turner's argument for preferring the expression "Spirit of prophecy" in an historical analysis of first century Jewish pneumatology is that "gifts characteristically attributed to the 'Spirit of prophecy' in the Targumim"[165] are attributed to the Spirit elsewhere in Judaism and this "justifies speaking of a 'traditional Jewish understanding of the Spirit' as the 'Spirit of prophecy'".[166] Thus, because these characteristic gifts account for "more than half of the references to the divine Spirit"[167] in the Second Temple literature, the use of the expression "Spirit of prophecy" is justified for this material even though it is absent. There are two problems with this strategy:

i) The prior logical question is that, if in an historical explanation it is asserted that a=b, what are the grounds for preferring either 'a' or 'b' as the dominant term in the historical analysis? Further, if 'b' occurs in one body of literature *B*' and 'a' in another body of literature *A*', why should 'b' become the preferred term in an analysis of *A*'?

Turner is arguing that "Spirit of prophecy" should be the dominant term, in virtue of it being a dominant concept, and yet it is a minority expression, principally confined to the Targums and, moreover, in them it sits alongside other equally common expressions for the divine Spirit. We doubt Turner's "same functionality" argument is a sufficient basis for applying this term to an earlier body of material.

---

165 *Power*, 88.
166 *Power*, 88.
167 *Power*, 101.

ii) Turner's analysis crucially depends on a generalization in which certain functions (charismatic phenomena) associated with the Spirit are grouped and labelled. Thus Turner denotes a concept of "charismatic revelation"[168] by grouping functions such as visions, the hearing of words, and dreams: his other groups are "charismatic wisdom", "invasive speech" and "invasive praise" (see table above). He relates all groupings and labels them as "prophetic"—the "Spirit of prophecy". Turner then claims that the concept of the "spirit of prophecy" is (statistically) the socio-literary dominant concept in First Century Judaism.

However, Turner is only able to make this claim because of *his* initial grouping of functionality. To assert that the dominant concept of the spirit was prophetic is self-fulfilling if you so group functions so as to produce a quantitative majority. Menzies follows a similar strategy, except that his functional grouping is narrower; thus Menzies includes visions, dreams, and inspired speech in the "prophetic".[169] The question to pose in regard to this analytical strategy is whether the collecting process is arbitrary and whether the preferred grouping expression "Spirit of prophecy" is sufficiently embracing to be justified. This question needs to be addressed because the strategy stamps its character upon his whole historical project.[170]

---

[168] *Power*, 92-95. Turner affirms that there are several concepts of the "Spirit of prophecy" in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, and that charismatic revelation is one such concept, *Power*, 90.

[169] Thus Menzies declares, "the Joel passage explicitly declares what can be deduced from a survey of Luke-Acts: the Spirit, as the Spirit of prophecy, produces inspired speech—intelligible and unintelligible (10:46; 19:6)—and grants special insight, often through visions and revelatory dreams". *Development*, 224.

[170] This can be seen in *Power,* where having argued for the equation "the holy Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy" in ch. 3, the expression "Spirit of prophecy" dominates his discussion of the relationship of the Spirit to power and ethics in chs. 4 and 5, where the expression is actually *absent* in the primary source texts.

It is open to us to group primary data in alternative ways. We have proposed a fourfold model in which the effects of the Spirit are distinguished. Rather than mix together content-rich concepts such as *charismatic wisdom* and *charismatic revelation* with concepts of various illocutionary acts like *guidance*, *praise* or *prediction*, along with concepts describing *modes* of revelation such as dreams and vision, we propose to keep these *levels* of description distinct. This prevents us from grouping the effects of the Spirit into a single *content-specific* group (like "prophecy") in order to assert that such a group was dominant. In this way we give primacy to the variety of effects produced by the Spirit and seek to preserve the complexity of the concept. Our alternative overarching proposal to compete with the view that the Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy is that the Spirit is concerned with *representative behaviours*. As a strategy in historical explanation this allows us to use an expression such as "the Spirit" as the major term of reference to explain Jewish pneumatology in the first century and avoid importing the later *content-specific* emphasis of "prophecy" into our historical project.

Although the generalizations offered within Lucan scholarship about the Targumic evidence cannot be sustained, the question remains as to what can be offered as an alternative. We propose the following findings:

1) Following the current consensus of Targumic scholars, we should treat *Pseudo-Jonathan* as a late eclectic mixture of Palestinian Targum traditions and the tradition represented by *Onqelos*; its value is limited. We cannot use it to promote an equation between the expressions "holy Spirit" and "Spirit of prophecy".

2) *Onqelos* can be used as evidence for Jewish ideas in the first century. Schäfer is correct to note the link between the contextual use in *Onqelos* of "Spirit of prophecy" and a mention of prophecy or a revelation. This represents evidence of *theological development* of the MT. This development is one where a behavioural concept of an illocutionary act of prophesying in

the Jewish scriptures is broadened to include the description of the human *state* of having a Spirit of prophecy.

Contrawise, *Onqelos* prefers "Spirit...for wisdom" for the inspiration of Bezalel and the variegated cognitive and physical capabilities that resulted. This suggests that the meturgemanim were sensitive to the benefit of different cognitive characterizations of the Spirit, and that *theologically* they thought in terms of "the Spirit" in various manifestations rather than just the "Spirit of prophecy".

3) *Targum Jonathan* can be used as evidence for Jewish ideas in the first century. In the *Former Prophets* there is close correspondence with the MT. and where there is an occurrence of "Spirit of prophecy", there is a contextual mention of prophecy or a revelation in the context of the MT. The *Former Prophets* continues to preserve the instrumental use of "the Spirit" by the MT in relation to the inspiration of David, as well as the more common conjunctive association between the Spirit and its effects. It continues to preserve the link between the Spirit and praise, even when it uses the expression "Spirit of prophecy". It also continues to preserve the notion of the Spirit as imparting power, and various cognitive and physical capabilities.

4) The expression "holy Spirit" is rare in *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan*, but its usage has a thematic unity to do with deliverance and restoration prophecies in Ezekiel and Joel, and this represents evidence of *theological development* of the MT. In the book of Isaiah the expression is associated with prophecy, both in Israel's past and in a future anticipated deliverance and restoration, but it is eliminated in connection with the rebellion of Israel. Both of these preferences are distinctive theological emphases that develop the MT.

5) It has not been shown as yet by Targumic scholars that *Neofiti* preserves exegetical traditions from the first century in respect of the Spirit. As such

it cannot be admitted as evidence. This means that we lose the way that it links the holy Spirit instrumentally to various human behaviours from our picture. *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan* maintain the common MT pattern of conjunctive association.

6) Finally, there continues to be no moral vocabulary associated with the Spirit in *Onqelos* and *Targum Jonathan*, except in some restoration prophecies.

2.3.2 Mishnah, Midrash and Talmud

Scholars have warned about the dangers of using rabbinic material for determining first century Jewish thought.[171] There are several problems to be highlighted, which prevent our applying the generalization that the Rabbis understood the Spirit as primarily prophetic inspiration[172] in any *simple* way to an analysis of the first century background to Luke-Acts.[173]

1) The first problem concerns selection of material and whether to include Tannaitic, Amoraic and post-Amoraic citations in an undifferentiated

---

[171] See the specific bibliography to Chapter Five in Stemberger's *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*.

[172] In addition to Schäfer's study, *Vorstellung*, which remains the most recent monograph to lay out the evidence, classic studies that have created the consensus include those of A. Marmorstein, "The Holy Spirit in Rabbinic Legend" in *Studies in Jewish Theology* (eds., J. Rabbinowitz and M. S. Lew; London: Oxford University Press, 1950), 122-144 (124); Moore, *Judaism*, 1:421; N. N. Glatzer, "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy" in his *Essays in Jewish Thought* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1978), 15-35; Bowker, *Targums*, 44; and J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1912), 258.

[173] Within Lucan scholarship, Menzies offers a tradition-historical analysis of the rabbinical texts that he uses, *Development*, 92-99, but he relies on just two texts to produce a "rabbinical view". Turner and Keener simply use the rabbinical material as a whole without regard to any tradition-history. Keener comments, "Rabbinic literature, late though it may be, provides the most voluminous source for discussion", *Gospel and Acts*, 6. Turner remarks, "I have decided to include any relevant Jewish material up to 200 C.E., and even post-Tannaitic (200 C.E. or later) rabbinic material, provided there is no reason to suspect a profound shift in pneumatological perspectives...these traditions provide useful illustrations of how Jews actually understood the Spirit", *Power*, 84.

analysis of "Rabbinic Judaism". In seeking to derive a first century perspective for New Testament scholarship. it is not sufficient to collect a range of texts from chronologically diverse documents. Such an approach would suggest that we can uncover a systematic theological idea belonging to a valid historical construct identified as "the Rabbis". This fails to take into account both historical development and divergence of ideas. This methodological problem can be addressed by application of a tradition-historical method to determine the earliest compositional layers of the rabbinic traditions, but without this prior work, any generalization about "Rabbinic Judaism" that we take into the distinct historical period of Judea prior to 70 C.E. is flawed.

The generalizations about "rabbinical understanding" of the holy Spirit in Lucan scholarship have masked the prior questions as to which Rabbis held such an understanding (their relative importance), whether such attribution is accurate, what effect the redactional process has had upon the material, for what length of time the understanding prevailed, and what contrary understandings exist in the materials (the rival schools).

E. P. Sanders has noted that, in the Tannaitic Halakhic material, the Rabbis deal with relatively minor details and present no systematic theological analysis;[174] it is the scholar who derives a theological scheme. J. Neusner has warned that previous "theologies" of rabbinical Judaism have assumed an "absence of historical development",[175] and read the

---

[174] E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 235. Schäfer also notes the lack of system in connection with the motif of the holy Spirit, *Vorstellung*, 15, „finden sich auch keine geoordneten Äusserungen über den hl. Geist".

[175] J. Neusner, "The Use of Rabbinic Sources for the Study of Ancient Judaism" in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (ed., W. S. Green; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 1-17 (4). Neusner's point about "historical development" is twofold: scholars need to take account of i) the harmonization of forms of speech in the attributions that redactors make to earlier rabbinical authorities, and ii) the different historical periods of the rabbinical authorities cited. J. Neusner applies his strictures to the topic of prophecy in his essay "What 'The Rabbis' Thought" in *Pursuing the Text* (eds., J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 303-320.

rabbinical documents without a concern for their halakhic interests and with only systematic theological objectives.

2) P. S. Alexander has argued that "we must reckon with" the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. and possible discontinuity between pre-70 C.E. Pharisees and post-70 C.E. Rabbis when using rabbinical material as evidence for first century Judaism or Pharisaism.[176] The sociological conditions that gave rise to the *Mishnah* and the rabbinical baraitot were not the same that engendered the various groups and sects of pre-70 C.E. Judaism. One sociological indicator of the period is messianic expectation, and how this was affected by the events of 70 C.E. and the failed messiahs of the period. H. G. Perelmuter argues[177] that in the light of this experience, rabbinic Judaism adopted *long-range* messianic views. This critically affects any concomitant views about the Spirit, given the linkage between the Spirit and messianic restoration in the Jewish scriptures. So, while there is continuity of tradition[178] between the Pharisees and the later rabbis, we cannot simply assume this continuity for aspects of theology that may have been affected by the destruction of the Jewish state.

This raises the question (in its sharpest form) of how a developmental thesis in early Christian pneumatology bridges the gap between the earliest

---

He notes, "it does not suffice to cite a statement we deem relevant to our topic, for example, concerning the cessation of the Holy Spirit. We have to take a close look at what else the sages say in the same context, how they say it, and the order in which they make their statements", 307.

[176] P. S. Alexander, "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament" *ZNW* 74. (1983): 237-246 (244). Sanders affirms in *Palestinian Judaism*, 60, that he does "not suppose that it [the traditional Tannaitic literature] provides an accurate picture of Judaism or even of Pharisaism in the time of Jesus and Paul, although it would be surprising if there were no connection".

[177] See H. G. Perelmuter, *Siblings: Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity at Their Beginnings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 55-57.

[178] For an introduction to the relationship between the Pharisees and the post-70 C.E. Rabbis, see H. Maccoby, *Early Rabbinic Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 11-16. For a discussion of the problems surrounding the literary evidence that connects the Rabbis with the Pharisees, see G. Stemberger, *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), ch. 5.

Tannaim and the pre-70 C.E. religious milieu. A predominant concept of the Spirit in the *Mishnah* and the baraitot may not reflect a similar dominance in the Second Temple period. Neusner's pessimistic assessment is that the rabbinical corpus is "marginal" to New Testament scholarship.[179] Therefore we cannot *simply* bring the rabbinical material to bear on our understanding of the pneumatological background to Luke-Acts.

3) N. N. Glatzer has shown that rabbinical views on the phenomenon of prophecy and the role of the holy Spirit were partly framed in reaction to the early Christian teaching.[180] Keener also supposes that the Rabbis "developed the concept of the Spirit as the prophetic Spirit, almost to the exclusion of other possible models"[181] because of their agenda to promote Torah as the only sound "epistemological base"[182] from which to derive Halakhah and Haggadah. This may have been a tendency in Pharisaic groups prior to 70 C.E.; on the other hand, the rabbinical evidence does not all point in this direction—the possession of the Spirit is *also* attributed to Tannaitic rabbis.

We can extend this supposition backwards: if groups, such as those at Qumran and the early Christians, emphasized *another understanding* of the Spirit, which included its application in the life of their own communities, did this engender a contrary reaction from other Jewish groups such as the Pharisees, and did that reaction pass down into rabbinical literature? Such an extrapolation critically affects the perspective we take on the Jewish background to Luke's concept(s) of the Spirit. No longer are we viewing a neutral and passive socio-literary co-text, but one which is (supposedly) reacting to early Christian pneumatological agendas. Accordingly, we cannot simply proffer the view that there was a *dominant* socio-literary

---

179 "Rabbinic Sources", 14.
180 "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy", 18.
181 *Gospel and Acts*, 13; see also Menzies, *Development*, 107, for a similar point.
182 *Gospel and Acts*, 13.

concept of the Spirit in the first century which influenced Luke on the basis of the rabbinical evidence.

4) If the rabbinical evidence has one particular slant on the Spirit (prophetic), we may suppose that this is the result of their interests and concerns, which were principally in Halakah and its derivation from Torah. Accordingly, we cannot *simply* take a dominant idea from this body of literature and affirm its dominance in first century thought *per se*: we have at least to qualify such a claim, by saying that it might be representative of first century thought where such thought is preoccupied with the *same interests and concerns*. In making this observation, we give priority to a socio-literary analysis. Other genres of literature extant in the first century may illustrate other interests and may, within their terms of reference, illustrate different dominant concepts of the Spirit. Accordingly, we cannot work with a notion of dominance *simpliciter*; it has to be qualified according to genre.

5) If the pro-genitors of the Rabbis are the Pharisees, and if the eventual dominance of Rabbinic Judaism *ipso facto* produced a dominant idea of the Spirit, Pharisaic Judaism was not theologically or socially dominant prior to 70 C.E. It is fallacious to argue from the later dominance of one form of Judaism to the earlier dominance of one of its ideas. We could at best only affirm that the prophetic concept of the Spirit was likely to have been the dominant expression within Pharisaic circles. This supposition acutely raises the issue of whether the rabbinical evidence is representative of Judaism as a whole in the first century, or only one strand of Judaism in competition with other Judaisms.

2.3.2.1 Tannaitic Texts

These methodological problems limit the value of the use that has been made of rabbinic material by Lucan scholars. Thus, we propose to determine only what Tannaitic "spirit" texts *add* to the picture of the Spirit that we have built up from the Jewish scriptures and Targums.

1) Tannaitic texts broaden the social and geographical scope of the Spirit, so that it includes not only the prophets and leaders in their history, but other individuals and the nation as a whole, and its effects take place outside the land of Israel.[183] Thus in *Mekilta Beshallah* 3.1.10[184] an anonymous interpretation of Exod 14:13, "stand firm, and see the salvation of the Lord" is recorded: "The Israelites said to him, 'When?' Moses said to them, 'Today the Holy Spirit rests upon you'. For the sense of 'stand firm' in all passages is to encompass the Holy Spirit".[185] *Mekilta Shirata* 1.1.13 records comments on the Song of Moses by R. Nehemiah and R. Akiba (mid. 2c.). "R. Nehemiah says: The Holy Spirit lighted on Israel, so they recited the song the way people cite the *Shema*. R. Akiba says: The Holy Spirit lighted on Israel, so they recited the song the way people cite the *Hallel-Psalms*".[186] These texts relate the holy Spirit to the deliverance of Israel at the Red Sea.

The scope of reception here is clearly Israel, but the effect of the holy Spirit is different in each case. In *Mekilta Beshallah* 3.1.10 the people go on to pray, but the passage also indicates that a theophany took place, as suggested by parallel passages where the Lord "stands" (Amos 9:1; 1 Sam 3:10), and where the Lord comes and meets Moses and Joshua in the Tent of Meeting (Deut 31:14). In *Mekilta Shirata* 1.1.13 the effect of the Spirit is praise.[187]

---

[183] W. D. Davies draws a comparison with early Christianity here and its "geographically and nationally indifferent" Spirit—see his "Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion", in his *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (London: SPCK, 1984), 72-83 (83). He also notes (significantly) that the later *Exodus Rabbah* removes these references to the Spirit.

[184] Citations are from *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Analytical Translation* (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988). In the absence of any redactional study, we will ascribe anonymous comments to the school of R. Ishmael (1-2c.).

[185] See also *Mekilta Pisha* 13.3.8, where the effect of the Spirit seems to be the discernment to take plunder.

[186] See also *Mekilta Beshallah* 7.1.25, *Tosefta Sotah* 6.2.

[187] W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Mifflintown: Sigler Press, 1998), 107, notes the significance of the presence of the effects (gifts) of the Spirit after the "baptism" of the Red Sea as a parallel for Pauline teaching about the "new community" in Christ. See also *'Abot R. Nat. (B)* 11, which

A separate line of evidence indicating the social scope of the Spirit consists of those texts which exclude the holy Spirit from certain Rabbis because of the unworthiness of the community. Thus in the anonymous *Tosefta Sotah* 13.3[188] it is stated, "Sages gathered together in the upper room of the house of Guria in Jericho, and a heavenly echo came forth and said to them. 'There is a man among you who is worthy to receive the Holy Spirit. but his generation is unworthy of such an honour'. They all set their eyes on Hillel the Elder".[189] W. D. Davies' comment on this line of evidence is that "community is essential to the activity of the Holy Spirit".[190] That the worthiness of the community and the individual are conditions for the reception of the holy Spirit is indicated in *Mishnah Sotah* 9.15[191] which comments that, "saintliness leads to [the gift of] the Holy Spirit". Or again. *Sifre Deuteronomy*[192] 173.1.3 records the comments of R. Eliezer (1c.) that. "Upon someone who cleaves to the presence of God, it is logical that the Holy Spirit should rest", and that the cessation of the Spirit was due to the sins of Israel, citing Isa 59:2.[193] This evidence supports the conclusion that the Spirit is an *end* of the moral life rather than a pre-requisite for its initiation or maintenance.

2) Tannaitic texts indicate the cessation of prophecy upon the destruction of the first temple, and after the end of the canonical prophets; still other texts admit some continuation of prophecy. With any claim to a resurgence of prophecy within a sect of Judaism, such as that evidenced in Luke-Acts, the

---

comments upon Zech 3:8 that Joshua's friends were "fit to have the Holy Spirit rest upon them".

[188] Citations are from *The Tosefta: The Third Division, Nashim* (ed., J. Neusner; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1979).

[189] See also the parallels in *b. Sotah* 48b and *b. Sanh.* 11a, and compare *'Abot R. Nat. (B)* 28.

[190] *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 207, n. 3.

[191] Citations are from *The Mishnah* (ed., H. Danby; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964).

[192] Citations are from *Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation* (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

[193] See also *Tosefta Sotah* 6.2; *J. Sheqalim* 3.4; *Canticles Rabbah* 1.1.9 (R. Phinehas ben Jair, late 2c.); and *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 2.1 (R. Eleazar ben Azariah, early 2c.). The theme becomes more pronounced in the Amoraic and Post-Amoraic citations.

view that prophecy had ceased adds a contextual significance to such a claim.

i) Texts which indicate the cessation of prophecy upon the destruction of the First Temple include *Mekilta Pisha* 1.4.6. In this text. Rabbi Simon ben Azzai (a disciple of Akiba, (2c.)) reproduces a comment of Baruch. Jeremiah's disciple, "Joshua served Moses, then the Holy Spirit rested on him; Elisha served Elijah, then the Holy Spirit came to rest on him. But as for me, why have I been treated differently from all of the other disciples of the prophets"? The reply to Baruch is, "Baruch b. Neriah, if there is no vineyard, what need for a fence? If there is no flock, what need for a shepherd?" and, "You find therefore that the prophets prophesy only on account of the merit of Israel". The point here is that the phenomenon of prophecy is linked to the continued existence of Israel as a nation state. and in Baruch's time this was coming to an end.

The same point of view is put forward in *Mekilta Pisha* 1.3 which is an extended presentation about how God had restrictively chosen, first the land, then Jerusalem, and finally the temple for the Divine Presence. Such a selection created a problem of how to explain the incidence of prophecy outside the land, which the text then goes on to address.[194] More particularly, it created the problem of how to explain the inspiration of the prophets of the restoration, which the text does not address, the fact of which led the Tannaim to assert more generally that prophecy ceased after the death of the restoration prophets.[195]

ii) Texts which indicate the cessation of prophecy after the canonical prophets are in the majority, the main one of which is the anonymous *Tosefta Sotah* 13.3, "When the later prophets died, that is, Haggai,

---

[194] See also *Mekilta Pisha* 1.1.1 and discussion by Davies in "Reflections". Other texts which detail the cessation of the Spirit upon the destruction of the First Temple include *Numbers Rabbah* 15.10 (R. Levi b. Rabbi (late 2c.))

[195] Other texts linking the cessation of prophecy to the First Temple include *Numbers Rabbah* 15.10 (R. Levi ben Rabbi late 2c.).

Zechariah, and Malachi, then the Holy Spirit came to an end in Israel. But even so, they made them hear [Heavenly Messages] through an echo".[196] This opinion has a precursor in 1 Macc 9:27, "So was there a great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time (ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας) that a prophet was not seen among them".[197] Glatzer notes[198] that this view is also reflected in the process of the canonization of the prophetic books in the Maccabean period.

However, communication continued through other means after the canonical prophets, principally through an "echo".[199] Such communication

---

[196] Marmorstein comments in "Rabbinic Legend", 123, that this may be the source of *b. Yoma* 9b, *b. Sotah* 48b, *b. Sanh.* 11a, *m. Hor.* 3:5, *m. Sotah* 9:12, and *Cant. R.* 8.9 and his opinion is that these traditions "were almost certainly of Tannaitic origin", "Rabbinic Legend", 124. Menzies offers a redactional analysis and is more certain of the dependency and asserts the priority of *Tosefta Sotah* 13.3, *Development*, 93-95. Neusner in *Song of Songs: An Analytical Translation* (ed., J. Neusner; 3 vols; Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989), 2:234, comments on this tradition that, "How this fits with the allegation that in the Second Temple period there was no Holy Spirit is quite clear, and, in context, an effective statement: the Holy Spirit, Urim and Thumim, and other means of access to heaven have now been succeeded by the echo".

[197] Other texts that are used to make the same point include 1 Macc 4:26: 14:41; *2 Baruch* 85:3; *Prayer of Azariah* 15; and Josephus' *Against Apion* 1.37-41. However, Levison has shown that these texts do not refer to a general cassation of prophecy, but rather the local absence of a prophet or a local anticipation of the emergence of a prophet, see "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data" *NTS* 43 (1997): 35-57. Levison's proposal about 1 Macc 9:27, however, is not persuasive. He suggests that ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας refers to a specific day of great distress, which was also noted for the fact that a prophet did not appear to the people on that day. However, while this expression can introduce quite specific relative temporal clauses, it can also be more generic in its time indication, see the LXX texts—Exod 9:18; 10:6; 1 Sam 7:2; 1 Kgs 8:16; Jer 7:25; 32:31. Barton in *Oracles*, 105-116 offers a similar discussion to Levison, and observes that the texts seem to differ in what is thought to have ceased or to be absent—the activity of *ad-hoc* prophesying by individuals, or a more formal type of temple prophet, or the delivery and writing of prophecy by great figures; it is this last category that Barton thinks is the rabbinical view—"there was no prophetic canon, but there was a prophetic age", 115.

[198] "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy", 16.

[199] Examples of the "echo" are recounted in *Tosefta Sotah* 13.4-6, *b. Mak.* 23b (R. Eleazar, 2c.).

though was not certain. In *Genesis Rabbah*[200] 37.7. a comment of R. Simeon ben Gamaliel (2c.) is recorded: "The ancients, because they could avail themselves of the Holy Spirit, named themselves in reference to [forthcoming] events; but we, who cannot avail ourselves of the Holy Spirit, are named after our fathers." On the other hand, *Numbers Rabbah* 9.20 records a tale from R. Zechariah, son-in-law to R. Meir (2c.) that R. Meir anticipated an assault by a woman "by means of the Holy Spirit".[201] Neusner summarizes this evidence by saying,

> In the view of rabbinic Judaism, nothing ended with the cessation of prophecy—not direct communication from heaven to earth, not prediction of the future, not divine guidance for especially favoured persons concerning the affairs of the day. Canonical prophecy ended, but the works of prophecy continued in other forms, both on heaven's side with the Holy Spirit and later on with the echo, and on the earth's side with the sages joining in conversation through the echo, on the one side, and through Torah learning, on the other.[202]

---

[200] All citations are from the edition *Midrash Rabbah* (ed., I. Epstein *et al.*; London: Soncino Press, 1951).

[201] Other examples of revelation by the Spirit include *Tosefta Pesahim* 2.15 (Gamaliel).

[202] "What 'The Rabbis' Thought", 319. Neusner's view is to be preferred over that presented by Levison in "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel?" as Levison argues that there is nothing definitive about the cessation of the Spirit after the canonical prophets; rather, the Holy Spirit would return once there was a righteous man worthy to receive the Spirit, which *Tosefta Sotah* 13.2-4 indicates for Hillel and Samuel the Small. However, the text does not say that Hillel and Samuel did receive the Spirit, *contra* Levison, 56, only that they were *worthy* to do so; their generation, (of whom they were part) was unworthy. Accordingly, the principle of individual righteousness which Levison makes the sole necessary and sufficient condition for reception of the Spirit does not override the fact that the people were not worthy. The perspective of the *Tosefta* text is not individualistic but nationalistic—hence, we need to apply a reading which has national significance. Levison's argument does not cohere with the Rabbis' perception that the period of scriptural prophecy was different to their own time; see Glatzer, "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy", 22.

The rabbinical opinions that the holy Spirit ceased upon the destruction of the First Temple, or subsequently upon the ending of the canonical prophets, are not necessarily inconsistent views, once it is recognized that the return from exile and the rebuilding the temple imply a need for the *restoration* of the Spirit. Accordingly, when the Tannaim assert that prophecy (in a sense) ended with the canonical prophets, they are recognising that the post-exilic restoration of the nation *broke down*: the Davidic monarchy was not restored, the Shekinah did not return to the temple, and the restoration of prophecy faded away.[203]

We take this view to reflect first century opinion amongst those with an interest in matters of canon, scriptural authority and prophecy. As such it is a critical element of the Jewish background to Luke-Acts (one not supplied by the scriptural or Targumic evidence so far considered), insofar as Luke presents Jesus as a prophet and depicts the earliest Christian communities as prophetic. If it was thought by some that the post-exilic restoration of the nation had broken down, and the Spirit had ceased, then any claim by Luke for the restoration of the Spirit is a competing agenda.[204]

Wenk has recently discussed the issue of the withdrawal of the Spirit in rabbinical texts, adding texts that show a rabbinical recognition of prophetic activity.[205] Wenk cites the work of R. A. Horsley who has detailed the evidence that there were popular prophetic movements and claims to prophecy on the part of leaders of such movements.[206] These findings are important as they demarcate those who propounded a cessation of prophecy as likely to have been those with an interest in sources of legitimate

---

[203] Similarly, 1 Macc 14:41 refers to an anticipated prophet who would arise and validate the Hasmonean restoration.

[204] In the next chapter, we discuss whether Luke sees the bestowal of the Spirit as part of a restoration of the nation.

[205] *Community-Forming Power*, 122-133 (123).

[206] R. A. Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements" in *New Testament Backgrounds* (eds., C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter; The Biblical Seminar 43; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 124-148.

authority.[207] Luke's presentation of Jesus as a prophet contrasts with this tradition.

3) While there are relatively few Tannaitic texts that recount incidents from the Jewish scriptures mentioning the Spirit, those that exist present some variety in the *level* at which the work of the Spirit is pitched. For example,

i) Commenting upon how the Israelites knew of the Egyptians' revengeful intent, *Mekilta Shirata* 7.1.8 records the anonymous interpretation of Exod 15:9, "Then how did the Israelites know what Pharaoh was thinking about them in Egypt? But the Holy Spirit rested on them, so they knew what Pharaoh was thinking about them". This text most likely indicates a revelation by the Spirit which changed the *state* of knowledge on the part of the recipients.

ii) In *Sifre Deuteronomy* 22.1.2 the anonymous comment is recorded, "And so Rahab said to Joshua's agents, 'Go to the mountain. Lest the pursuit party find you' [Josh 2:16]. This shows that the Holy Spirit rested on her, for had the Holy Spirit not rested on her, how should she have ever known that they were going to return after three days? But this teaches that the Holy Spirit came to rest on her". This interpretation also presumes a change in Rahab's belief-state, but it does not indicate how the holy Spirit effected such a change.

iii) In *Genesis Rabbah* 84.12, a comment of R. Hiyya (late 2c.) about Jacob's reaction to Joseph's dream is recorded, "But his [heavenly] Father—the divine spirit—bade him: Keep the saying in mind—the matter will be fulfilled". This text suggests communication between God and Jacob, but the means is unspecified.

iv) In addition to such locutions of presence, some texts make an instrumental link between the Spirit and human speech. Thus *Sifre*

---

[207] *Community-Forming Power*, 131-132.

Deuteronomy 176.3.1 states, "the Holy Spirit is put into the mouth of the prophet".[208]

This evidence needs to be distinguished from those texts which use the expression "holy Spirit" as a device for citing Scripture. For example, the anonymous *Mishnah Sotah* 9.6 has, "But the Holy Spirit proclaims to them", citing Deut 21:8, or the anonymous *Mekilta Shirata* 3.1.6 has, "And the Holy Spirit cries out from heaven", citing 1 Chron 17:21 and Deut 33:29.[209] This emphasis on communication and revelation should be placed alongside the evidence of some Tannaitic texts, which portray the holy Spirit as involved with miracles of power and other human behaviours. For example, *Mekilta Shirata* 7.1.13 records an anonymous comment on Pharaoh's declarations of vengeance at the Red Sea (Exod 15:9), "And on these five counts, the Holy Spirit responded in kind: You did blow with your wind, the sea covered them; they sank as lead in the mighty waters" and proceeds to attribute the miraculous acts of God at the Red Sea, quoting Exod 15:10.[210]

4) The final theme that we want to highlight is the relative absence in Tannaitic writings relating the Spirit to the restoration of Israel. Menzies' notes that eschatological cleansing is mentioned "almost always without reference to the activity of the Spirit",[211] and that the eschatological

---

[208] See also *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 3.21 (R. Jose ben Halaphta, 2c.)

[209] See also *Sifre Deuteronomy* 355.17.1, 356.4.1, *Tosefta Sotah* 9.2-8, and *'Abot R. Nat. (B)* 25. J. Neusner's comment on this quotational device in *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Introduction to Judaism's First Scriptural Encyclopaedia* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 85, is that "The Torah's verses may be read in such a way that different voices speak discrete clauses of a single verse. One of these will be the Holy Spirit, another, Israel, and so on". It is possible that this written device has its oral conversational analogue in those passages in Acts where speech and thought is attributed to the holy Spirit.

[210] That the text is attributing the miraculous acts to the holy Spirit, and not just the inspiration of the text of Exodus 15:10, is indicated by the subsequent anonymous comment (*Mekilta Shirata* 7.1.14), which does attribute the inspiration of the utterance "You did blow..." to the holy Spirit.

[211] *Development*, 105, 226. Menzies, along with Amoraic and Post-Amoraic texts, cites two Tannaitic texts, *Genesis Rabbah* 34.15 (R. Isi (late 2c.)) and *Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 2.1 (R. Phineas, Mid. 2c.); see also *m. Yoma* 8:9.

outpouring of the Spirit is generally interpreted as a "restoration of the Spirit of prophecy".[212] The evidence he cites is primarily Amoraic and post-Amoraic, but his view is correct for Tannaitic texts. This indicates a development away from the Jewish scriptures and Targums. Whether such a disassociation of the Spirit and eschatological ethical renewal is indicative of general opinion in the first century cannot be asserted on the basis of this evidence. There are too many interfering variables: it may reflect one strand of thought in the first century, or it could just as well be a second century reaction to Christian claims about the Spirit, or it could be a view that was engendered by the destruction of the Jewish state and dispersal of the Jews between 70-135 C. E.

2.3.3.2 Evaluation of Evidence

Tannaitic evidence adds some key ideas to scriptural and Targumic evidence: i) that there had been in the past a community focus for the holy Spirit, and any future presence of the Spirit would be related to both individual and community worthiness; and ii) that canonical prophecy had ceased, but pending a return of this kind of presence for the Spirit, divine communication by the Spirit took place in various reduced ways.

2.4 The Effects of the Spirit in Luke-Acts

The points of contact between Luke's pneumatology and the Jewish background can now be outlined. The verbs, nouns and adjectives Luke associates with "the Spirit" provide data for this outline, and these are set out in Tables I and II. Two questions arise from this data: first, is there any significance to Luke's anarthrous and articular usage with πνεῦμα, and secondly, what is the range of effects associated with τὸ πνεῦμα?

2.4.1 Referring Expressions

What significance attaches to the articular use of πνεῦμα? Are such uses anaphoric or is the article a constituent part of a title, the sense of which

---

[212] *Development*, 104, 226. Along with Amoraic and Post-Amoraic texts, Menzies cites *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 6.14 in support, which may be Tannaitic.

determines an extra-linguistic reference? What significance attaches to anarthrous uses of πνεῦμα? Are such uses impersonal?

Referring Expression		**Associated Verb**	**Associated Noun/Adjective**
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	3:22	καταβαίνω	
τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου	2:26	χρηματίζω	
τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ	10:21	ἀγαλλιάω	
τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα	12:10	βλασφημέω	
	12:12	διδάσκω	
τοῦ πνεύματος	4:14		δύναμις
τῷ πνεύματι	4:1	ἄγω	
	2:27	ἔρχομαι	
πνεῦμα ἅγιον	1:35	ἐπέρχομαι	
	11:13	δίδωμι	
πνεύματος ἁγίου	1:15	πίμπλημι	
	1:41	πίμπλημι	
	1:67	πίμπλημι	
	4:1		πλήρης
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ	3:16	βαπτίζω	
πνεῦμα κυρίου	4:18	χρίω	
πνεῦμα	2:25	ἦν	

Table I: Luke

Referring Expression		Associated Verb	Associated Noun/Adjective
τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	1:16	προλέγω	
	5:3	ψεύδομαι	
	5:32		μάρτυς
	10:44	ἐπιπίπτω	
	10:47	λαμβάνω	
	11:15	ἐπιπίπτω	
	13:2	λέγω	
	15:8	δίδωμι	
	19:6	ἔρχομαι	
	20:23	διαμαρτύρομαι	
	20:28	τίθημι	
	21:11	λέγω	
	28:25	λαλέω	
τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ	7:51	ἀντιπίπτω	
	15:28	δοκέω	
τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου	2:33	λαμβάνω	
τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου	5:9	πειράζω	
τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος	1:8	ἐπέρχομαι	
	2:38	λαμβάνω	
	4:31	πίμπλημι	
	9:31		παράκλησις
	10:45	ἐκχέω	
	13:4	ἐκπέμπω	
	16:6	κωλύω	

Table II: Acts

Referring Expression		Associated Verb	Associated Noun/Adjective
τὸ πνεῦμα	8:18	δίδωμι	
	8:29	λέγω	
	10:19	λέγω	
	11:12	λέγω	
πνεύματος ἁγίου	1:2	ἐντέλλομαι	
	4:25	λέγω	
	2:4	πίμπλημι	
	4:8	πίμπλημι	
	9:17	πίμπλημι	
	13:9	πίμπλημι	
	6:5		πλήρης
	7:55		πλήρης
	11:24		πλήρης
	13:52	πληρόω	
πνεῦμα κυρίου	8:39	ἁρπάζω	
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ	1:5	βαπτίζω	
	11:6	βαπτίζω	
τοῦ πνεύματός	2:17	ἐκχέω	
	2:18	ἐκχέω	
	11:28	σημαίνω	
	21:4	λέγω	
πνεύματος	6:3		πλήρης
πνεῦμα ἅγιον	8:15	λαμβάνω	
	8:17	λαμβάνω	
	8:19	λαμβάνω	
	19:2	λαμβάνω	
	19:2	ἀκούω	
πνεύματι ἁγίῳ	10:38	χρίω	
τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ	16:7	ἐάω	

Table II: Cont. Acts

Scholars[213] have discussed articular uses of πνεῦμα and considered whether the use of the article conveys reference to a *person* as opposed to a "power". This question for determination has been whether the article is anaphoric and parasitic upon "power" uses of πνεῦμα, or whether the presence of an article is explicable by way of grammar. The discussion has produced no consensus. C. F. D. Moule cautions, "it is hard to avoid the impression that usage is arbitrary".[214] Dunn concurs that "there is no significant difference"[215] between articular and anarthrous expressions. N. Turner observes, "one does not always know whether the article is inserted theologically (i.e. to indicate the Holy Spirit) or whether it is due to the grammatical device of anaphora",[216] but nevertheless argues that the fuller articular use indicates "the third person of the Trinity".[217] F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk state that such usage indicates "more or less a person".[218] D. Pitt-Francis affirms that "'power' references to the Holy Spirit do not contain the definite article, but references to the Holy Spirit as a person invariably do",[219] and S. Swartz concludes that "the presence of the article at the first mention of *pneuma* within a particular context signifies a definite and theological reference to the Holy Spirit conceived as a person".[220] S. H. Levinsohn[221] has used discourse analysis to argue that typical articular sentences would feature the Spirit as the *topic* or the focus

---

[213] This topic has been explicitly treated by N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965), 17-22, S. Swartz, "The Holy Spirit: Person and Power. The Greek Article and *Pneuma*" *The Bible Translator* 44 (1993): 124-138, Dunn, *Baptism*, 68-70, and D. Pitt-Francis, "The Holy Spirit: A Statistical Inquiry" *ExpTim* 96 (1985): 136-137.

[214] C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 111.

[215] *Baptism*, 69.

[216] *Insights*, 20.

[217] *Insights*, 19.

[218] F. Blass, A. Debrunner and R. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 134.

[219] "Statistical Inquiry", 137.

[220] "Person and Power", 136.

[221] S. H. Levinsohn, "Anarthrous References to the Holy Spirit: Another Factor" *The Bible Translator* 44 (1993): 138-144.

of the sentence, and that anarthrous usage is often due to the informational role that the expression has in the comment being made about the subject.

Elsewhere, G. D. Fee[222] has strongly advocated that no theological significance can be attached to articular and non-articular usage of πνεῦμα in the canonical Pauline epistles. Rather, usage is a matter of style and conventional patterns of use in relation to grammatical case. Fee does not offer an analysis of Luke's usage, but he does explicitly reject N. Turner's analysis (which is largely based on Lucan texts) as giving us "no grammatical insight into this matter at all".[223]

While considerations of grammar, anaphora, and discourse prevent a generalization about Luke's articular and anarthrous usage of πνεῦμα, some observations can be made about the verbs that Luke conjoins with articular and anarthrous uses of πνεῦμα.

1) Case variations of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον are mostly conjoined with "personal" verbs including, χρηματίζω, προλέγω, ψεύδομαι, λέγω, διαμαρτύρομαι, λαλέω, ἀντιπίπτω, τίθημι, and δοκέω. Other verbs may be "personal" including ἀγαλλιάω, which may be a "joy with the holy Spirit" (Luke 10:21), while καταβαίνω is used in a bird-like simile (Luke 3:22). There are 12 possible examples of this pattern,[224] but Luke also uses this lexical combination 5 times with verbs that have no clear "personal" aspect including ἐπιπίπτω, λαμβάνω, and ἔρχομαι.

2) Case variations of τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα include "personal" verbs such as βλασφημέω, διδάσκω, ἐκπέμπω, and κωλύω.[225] An equal selection of "non-personal" verbs are also found with this form of words including, ἐπέρχομαι, λαμβάνω, πίμπλημι, and ἐκχέω.

---

[222] G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody; Hendrickson, 1994), 14-24.
[223] *Empowering Presence*, 15.
[224] The use of μάρτυς is consistent with this pattern (Acts 5:32).
[225] The use of παράκλησις is consistent with "personal" verbs (Acts 9:31).

3) Case variations of τὸ πνεῦμα include the "personal" verbs. ἄγω.[226] ἔρχομαι. λέγω, but an equal number of non-personal verbs: δίδωμι, ἐκχέω. and σημαίνω.

4) Articular and anarthrous expressions for πνεῦμα κυρίου utilize "personal" verbs, πειράζω, ἁρπάζω, and the "impersonal" χρίω.

5) Anarthrous expressions only use "non-personal" verbs (ἐντέλλομαι. πίμπλημι, πληρόω, βαπτίζω, λαμβάνω, ἀκούω, χρίω) with the exception of λέγω (Acts 4:25).

Luke's usage is significant for the preponderance of "personal" verbs. Moreover, the classification that we have made could be augmented if it is held that there is nothing necessarily "impersonal" in verbs such as ἐπιπίπτω. λαμβάνω, and ἔρχομαι if the influence of a spirit upon an individual needs to be described.

2.4.2 Effects

There are both continuities and discontinuities in the functionality ascribed to the Spirit between Luke and his literary co-text.

1) Luke illustrates a distinction between *state* and *behaviour*. His use of πίμπλημι is consistent with ἐμπίμπλημι in Exod 28:3 or 31:3. This verb is appropriate for describing states. The idea of *persistence* is conveyed by Luke in explicit time references such as "he will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (Luke 1:15) or in the elapse of narrative time between instances of the exercise of the Spirit (Luke 4:1. 14).

---

[226] This pattern also occurs in Luke 4:14, ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, and this usage may be anaphoric with Luke 4:1, if ἄγω is taken in the same vein as verbs of physical transport (e.g. Judg 13:25; 2 Kgs 2:16; Ezek 11:1). For a discussion of the leading of Jesus in the wilderness see Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 197-199.

Luke also deploys a concept of *mode of revelation* in his use of Joel (dreams, visions), as well as the use of χρηματίζω (Luke 2:26), which further implies a concept of *state*. Luke is also comfortable with employing typical prepositions in connection with the Spirit that imply *persistence* of a state (e.g. ἐπί, Luke 1:35; 4:18; Acts 1:8; 2:17). However, in respect of the co-textual evidence, Luke also innovates in his emphasis on reception of the Spirit and in his metaphor of baptism (βαπτίζω) in respect of the enduring presence of the Spirit in a human life.

In terms of characterizing the state of individuals, Luke offers incidental specifications of *abilities*, *attitudes* and *emotions* through his conjunctive association of "joy", "faith", "wisdom", and "comfort" with the Spirit (Luke 10:21; Acts 6:3, 5; 9:31; 11:24; 13:52). These descriptions specify the *content* of the state of the individual.

In terms of specific behaviours connected with the Spirit, Luke explicitly connects the Spirit with locutionary acts such as "crying out" (ἀναφωνέω, Luke 1:41), and "speaking" (λαλέω, Acts 2:4, 19:6). In contextual terms, such acts could be further characterized as illocutionary acts of prophetic praise (Acts 2:11, 17). However, Luke also explicitly connects the Spirit to illocutionary acts such as "prophesying" (προφητεύω, Luke 1:67; Acts 2:17; 4:31) and "blessing" (εὐλογέω, Luke 2:25-32).

As with the Jewish scriptures, *conjunctive causation* is common in Luke-Acts, but Luke also connects the Spirit in an *instrumental* way to various acts, for example, physical transport (Acts 8:39), speaking (Acts 1:16; 4:25; 21:4; 28:25), and prophesying (Acts 11:28).

2) The volume of information about the Spirit in Acts is centred on the reality of the reception of the Spirit. In terms of the incidence of the word πνεῦμα, approximately half of Luke's uses relate to reception, and he uses a variety of verbs—δίδωμι, βαπτίζω, λαμβάνω, ἐπέρχομαι, ἐκχέω, and πίμπλημι to describe the reality of the reception. Lucan scholarship has offered

explanations of this reality in salvific terms. The soteriological significance of the reception of the Spirit is explained in terms of the *position* that such reception has among surrounding narrative detail about conversion and initiation into the church. Salvific significance is not itself derived from the inherent meaning of Luke's choice of verb. Apart from βαπτίζω, Luke's choices of verb are unexceptionable and copy parallel examples in his co-text.

Previous discussion of the soteriology of the Spirit has therefore focused on impinging contextual factors including: i) the relationship of the bestowal of the Spirit to aspects of conversion, such as the engendering of faith, the recognition of sin and repentance, and water-baptism; ii) the role of the Spirit in initiation and whether the reception of the Spirit signals or enacts initiation into the church; iii) the role of the Spirit in effecting entry into a new covenant or a new age; iv) the effects of the Spirit vis-à-vis mission through the church; and v) the place of the Spirit in the everyday life of the believer.

Here our comments are limited to the baseline that Luke encodes in his *choice of verbs* for the Spirit:

i) Luke's citation of Joel 3:1-5 (Acts 2:17-21) shows a *third-person* emphasis in his pneumatology. Thus the Spirit is related to i) the witness of the disciples to others (Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:8; 2:4; Acts 4:31; 16:7; 18:25; 20:23); ii) the right things to say in a public defence (Luke 12:10; Acts 4:8); iii) the giving of commandments and instructions (Acts 1:2; 6:10; 10:19; 11:12; 13:2-4; 15:28; 16:6-7; 20:28; 21:4); iv) the performance of miracles (Luke 4:14; Acts 10:38); and v) prophecies and visions (Acts 7:55; 11:28; 19:6; 21:11). These effects are broader than the terms of Joel, and have a wider purpose than mission insofar as they involve ethical instruction, but they do not step outside the *third-person scope* of Joel's prophecy.

ii) Luke does not describe episodes that relate the Spirit to *first-person* soteriological effects such as directly[227] initiating a state of belief or of empowering the will to make a commitment to follow Jesus or his successors. In this regard, the role of the Spirit in Luke and Acts, beginning with John the Baptist[228] and continuing after Pentecost, is one of working through spirit-gifted individuals. Although Luke does not explicitly deploy a notion of "eschatological sonship" in relation to the Spirit, a role of bringing people to faith and discipleship is plausibly summarized in such terms.

Luke's language of possession implies persistence of a state in which individuals have the Spirit, and this implies an experiential dimension. This understanding comes through in incidental detail when Luke conjoins attitudes and emotions to "the Spirit" (e.g. "comfort", Acts 9:31; "faith", Acts 11:24; "joy" Luke 10:21, Acts 13:52; "boldness" Acts 4:31; and "fervour" Acts 18:25).

Luke's interests are therefore disclosed in his choice of verbs. The narrative space that is given over to eschatological reception of the Spirit contrasts with the interests of contemporary texts. Thus, while Luke shares with Qumran a linkage between the holy Spirit and community, he does not extend his treatment to *describe* effects of purification or moral strengthening; he does not relate the presence of the Spirit to the accomplishment of salvific goals. Similarly, Luke shows no interest in the mechanics of inspiration or ecstatic behaviour.

Neither does Luke use "restoration" texts such as Isa 44:3, Ezek 36:26-27, 39:29, and Zech 12:10, texts which are important in *Jubilees*, the Community Rule and Pauline writings (2 Cor 3:3), and which have

---

[227] Here we follow Turner, when he says the Spirit is "a divine power active through the messenger (in a variety of ways) giving conviction to the message, and so prompting repentance and belief even if not mechanistically ensuring it", *Power*, 435; the key point denied is that of a *mechanism*.

[228] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 161, makes this point in his emphasis on the Baptist's "turning" individuals to wisdom (Luke 1:16-17).

"transparent soteriological force".[229] While Luke paints an eschatological picture in Luke 17:20-37 and 21:6-36, he does not anticipate an eschatological bestowal *in* these two discourses. Even if Luke knew such restoration texts, we do not know whether and how they impacted his thinking, because they have not found their way into Luke-Acts.

3) Finally, Luke's ascription of some functions to πνεῦμα is distinctive when compared to those portions of his literary co-text that we have so far reviewed in that they convey a personification. Here the functions that the Spirit performs include leadership and direction of the activities of mission, as well as church discipline. This is a prominent and defining characteristic of Luke's pneumatology. Here we can observe that such a characteristic is in keeping with Jewish traditions about the role of the "Spirit of the Lord" effecting leadership and direction through Israel's leaders.

2.4.3 Evaluation of Evidence

Luke's interests are focused on narrating the phenomenon of the last days' bestowal of the Spirit. The functions that Luke associates with the Spirit are broad and variegated and reflect his literary co-text. Along with this co-text, there is therefore no basis for preferring a single rubric "Spirit of prophecy" as a catch-all generalization for his pneumatology.

3. Conclusion

In order to state the relationship of Luke-Acts to its Jewish background, we require a description of that background. The current consensus is that the Spirit is the "Spirit of prophecy", either narrowly (Menzies) or broadly (Turner) conceived. We have argued against this view and promoted "the Spirit" as the principal umbrella term of reference for an historical description of the first century background.

In terms of the selection of rabbinic evidence, the descriptions offered by Lucan scholars are skewed because of the use of Amoraic and post-Amoraic

---

[229] Turner, "Spirit and Salvation", 104; Menzies, *Development*, 225-226.

citations,[230] and the use of the late and eclectic Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan*. Whether it is the Targums or the rabbinic citations, the evidence cannot be treated in an undifferentiated manner. The analytical strategy that is employed crucially depends on a *grouping* of functionality from the evidence of rabbinic Judaism, which *ipso facto* yields a dominant concept of the Spirit. We have argued that this is an unsound basis on which to take into the first century any concept of the Spirit (*qua* the "Spirit of prophecy").

Our contention has been that the extant first century documents largely consist of expressions other than the later "Spirit of prophecy", and therefore it is illicit to utilise this expression as the principal term of analysis. The semantics of the various expressions involving the Spirit are too complex to admit of any simple equation based on functional criteria which might promote "Spirit of prophecy" as a suitable catch-all term. There is a broad range of function associated with the Spirit, and any notions of dominance are best applied on smaller scales—within a social group, or in relation to the genre of a literary unit. It is methodologically unsound, as Neusner and others have argued, to apply the notion of dominance on a scale the size of Judaism and draw inferences for Luke-Acts.

It is insufficient to sketch Jewish views about the Spirit in the first century without considering the question of how they may be relevant as an exegetical background to Luke-Acts. It is fallacious to argue that a socio-literary dominant concept of the Spirit *must* have influenced Luke-Acts without taking into account the likely requirements, in terms of ideas, of Luke's two books. It seems reasonable to propose a hypothesis that the *interests* of Luke-Acts dictate the background traditions to which the work may be related. Within a framework that extensively uses the Jewish scriptures, Luke associates a variety of effects with the Spirit.

---

[230] Here we might well ask: How can anyone apply a thesis of dominance to the 1c. from Rabbis of the 3c. and onwards, who may well reproduce an idea extant in the first century but give it a different balance? Surely, even 2c. Rabbis *only* reflect a balance that is their own.

In the next two chapters, we will show how Luke supports this pneumatology by presenting the bestowal of the Spirit in terms of the "last days" of a Jewish Commonwealth and for the purposes of enabling a prophetic mission of deliverance for the renewal of the people.

CHAPTER FOUR
The Bestowal of the Spirit in Luke

1. Introduction

Many scholars argue that Luke 4:16-30[1] and Acts 2:1-47[2] are programmatic episodes in Luke's story. Scholarship is extensive on each passage,[3] but our interest in these passages is limited to how Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to position the bestowal of the Spirit within an eschatological framework.[4] In this chapter, we are principally concerned with Luke, and in the next chapter we will discuss Acts.

Luke uses Isa 61:1-2a to legitimate Jesus' claim to the Spirit. Our interpretation of Luke's use of Isaiah has three elements. First, we will show that the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus, John the Baptist, and others in Luke 1-3 is part of the *same eschatological event* as Pentecost.[5] Thus, while it is conventional to consider Luke's use of Joel only in relation

---

[1] For a recent example, see R. C. Tannehill, "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke 4:16-30", in *The Shape of Luke's Story* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2005), 3-30 (4). Turner, *Power*, 213, 215, and Menzies, *Development*, 161, supply bibliography for scholars who see the passage as programmatic. Pao, *New Exodus*, 78-84 offers a summary of reasons for the programmatic quality in terms of Luke's relocation of the Nazareth Pericope, the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, and the inclusion of the Gentile stories of Elijah and Elisha.

[2] For example, Turner, *Power*, 267; Menzies *Development*, 205; G. Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT 5; 2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1980), 1:266; and Carroll, *Response*, 128.

[3] For a survey on Luke 4:16-30 up to 1989, see C. J. Schreck, "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study" in *L'Evangile de Luc—The Gospel of Luke: Revised and Enlarged Edition of L'Evangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (ed., F. Neirynck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 399-471.

[4] Although we will refer to source and redaction critical questions, a contribution to such issues lies outside our scope, as we are following the methodological principle that Luke has intentionally included his scriptural citations whether this is *sui generis* or from a source.

[5] In this sense, our argument complements Wenk's insofar as he shows that the Baptist's ministry has a socio-ethical effect of renewal: the same is true of the apostolic ministry; see *Community-Forming Power*, ch. 9.

to Pentecost, its terms of reference also embrace the happenings of Luke 1-3 and the explanation of Isa 61:1-2a.

Secondly, we will argue that Luke's use of Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2a in Luke 4:18-19 suggests a common Isaianic purpose for an eschatological bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus and his apostles; this purpose has to do with the need for deliverance. On the surface, this proposal of an *eschatological framework of deliverance* for Luke's understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit stands in tension with Luke's use of Isaianic prophecies of restoration. This tension is clearly seen in that the need for deliverance in the story of Luke-Acts is set against the prediction of forthcoming *destruction* rather than *restoration*.[6]

The third element in our interpretation is a resolution of this tension which proposes that Luke sees the full restoration of Israel as *prospective*. In making a selective quotation of Isaiah 61, Luke advertises to the reader that he does not consider the full Isaianic program of restoration to have been realized; rather, some elements have begun while others are seen *proleptically* in the ministry of Jesus.

2. Pentecost in the Gospel of Luke

Our purpose in this section is to show how the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus is part of the same *event* as the last days' bestowal prophesied in Joel.

---

[6] Fuller, *Restoration*, 203, 209, recognizes this tension. Whereas we do not presume a date for Luke and Acts in our narrative analysis, Fuller formulates the tension in the light of a post-70 C.E. date for Acts, "...the author of Luke-Acts claims Israel's reconstitution in a time *when the Land lies in ruins*"; see also *Restoration*, 266. Pao may also see this tension when he states, "With such an appreciation of the Isaianic New Exodus behind Lukan writings, one can begin to notice the critical deviation from the Isaianic scheme at the very end of the narrative", *New Exodus*, 109. Pao's comment relates to the use of Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27 in respect of the rejection of the message of salvation by the Jews. Our qualification of Pao would be that this rejection is advertised in Luke 1-4, and that therefore any "critical deviation" is there at the beginning for the implied reader.

2.1 Eschatological Bestowal

The manifestation of the Spirit features strongly at the beginning of Luke's story. Luke narrates a prophetic witness in terms that evoke Joel 3:1-5, which predicts dreams, visions and prophecies for old men and young men, sons and daughters, handmaids and servants. Zacharias, an old man, has a vision (Luke 1:22), utters charismatic praise (Luke 1:64-65[7]), and prophesies (Luke 1:64); Mary, a handmaid, sees an angel and utters the Magnificat; Elisabeth, an old woman, prophesies (Luke 1:41-42); shepherds experience a theophany (Luke 2:9); Simon, an old man, has a revelation (Luke 2:26), and Anna, an old woman, is declared to be a prophetess. This explosion of prophecy, vision and praise, is as much a fulfilment of Joel as Pentecost, and as such, part of the "last days" (Acts 2:17).[8] Hence, Luke's distinctive use of πίμπλημι in relation to the Spirit is found in relation to the apostles (e.g. Acts 2:4) as well as John the Baptist, Elisabeth and Zacharias (Luke 1:15, 41, 67).

John the Baptist and Jesus are presented as prophets in Luke' story (Luke 1:76; 4:24; 7:16, 26; 13:33; 20:6; 24:19; Acts 3:22-23; 7:37), and as such their possession of the Spirit falls within the compass of Joel's latter day bestowal of the Spirit. The principal term for their preaching is one employed in Joel's prophecy. Joel 3:5 (LXX) uses εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ("they that have the good news preached to them") as the corresponding term for שרוד ("the survivors"). The same verb, εὐαγγελίζω is used by Gabriel to announce the birth of John the Baptist (Luke 1:19), as well as the preaching of the Gospel (e.g. Luke 4:18), and the apostolic mission (e.g. Acts 5:42). This commonality ties the three ministries of Luke-Acts together as an activity directed to the same generation rather than separate actions belonging to different epochs.

---

[7] The invasive nature of this charismatic praise (like that of Pentecost) is indicated by the aorist passive "his mouth was opened" (ἀνεῴχθη); in the same way that Pentecost led to discussion by those round about, so too Zacharias' praise was discussed by those all around; and similarly too, Zacharias' praise leads to a question by the "hearers" and an answer through proclamation.

[8] It is possible that the availability of the holy Spirit to those that ask also reflects this "last days" stage in the purpose of God (Luke 11:13).

Luke's use of the concept of "power" also suggests that he was writing the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy into the terms of his story opening. The expression, δύναμις ὑψίστου (Luke 1:35) strikes an echo with Luke's later expression, ὕψους δύναμιν (Luke 24:49),[9] which refers to the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost. Similarly, this language of "power" is used in connection with Jesus (Luke 4:14; Acts 10:48), which suggests that Luke does not regard Jesus' anointing with the Spirit as different *in kind* to that of other characters in his story, even if there is a difference of *degree* in the range of its effects. Accordingly, Luke retains the same metaphor for his main character's possession of the Spirit (πλήρης, Luke 4:1; πίμπλημι, Luke 1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4).

If Luke regarded the "last days" as beginning with the advent of John the Baptist, it is likely that he viewed the manifestation of the Spirit throughout Luke-Acts as fulfilling the terms of Joel's prophecy.[10] The utterance by Peter, ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ (Acts 2:16), does not exclude other instances of fulfilment. Three considerations can be offered in support of the view that Luke saw all of the narrative time of Luke-Acts as the "last days":

1) Luke's gospel explicitly notes a "beginning" (Luke 1:2), and Acts a "continuation" (Acts 1:1). The assertion, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, suggests a continuation of Jesus' work in the story of Acts.[11] This

---

[9] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 166, notes the link with Isa 32:15 ("upon us" "from on high" / "upon you" "power of the highest") which reinforces the connection with Luke 24:49.

[10] It is possible that Luke read the oracle of Isaiah 61 (Luke 4:18-19) with reference to the "last days". This is the explicit interpretation in 11QMelch II, 4-9 (לאחרית הימים), which applies the text to the Melchizedek deliverer of the last days.

[11] Witherington, *Acts*, 9-10, 106, suggests that ἤρξατο here is idiomatic and offers "all that Jesus did and taught". He thinks it is "overpressing the verb" (10) to suggest it implies continuation. He cites Luke 4:21, "But he began (ἤρξατο) to say..." as a comparable example, where we should infer nothing more than "Jesus said". M. C. Parsons and M. M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on*

continuity does not suggest that Luke thinks that there has been a "change in the times" and that therefore the "last days" have now begun and a corresponding bestowal of the Spirit can now be identified.

On the contrary, Luke has Jesus express the view that, "The law and the prophets were until[12] John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached" (Luke 16:16). This suggests that something new began with John, and that its defining characteristic was the preaching of the kingdom in which Jesus also shared. Conzelmann,[13] and those that have followed his exegesis,[14] have misread Luke on this point in making John the Baptist the last of "the prophets". Luke closes John's ministry before starting the ministry of Jesus, but this is just the closure of a sub-plot within the overall plot; it is too much to argue[15] that this closure indicates a transition to a new age. This "beginning" with John is the beginning of the "last days".

---

the Greek Text (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003), 2, note that many scholars follow our reading, but offer no syntactical considerations for or against Witherington. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:67, observes that with Luke having referred to his former work, there is no reason why Luke should not have intended "began". Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 66, likewise regards the verb as emphatic, as does Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Epworth Commentaries; Peterborough: Epworth, 1996), xi, 5. Moreover, contrary to Witherington, Luke may intend "began to say" in Luke 4:21. In Acts 2:4, the expression ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν seems to imply the beginning of speaking and seems to be part of what Luke is describing. Wenk's discussion in *Community-Forming Power*, 242-246, shows that considerations of literary unity between Luke and Acts support the sense of continuation implied in "began to do and teach".

[12] The preposition μέχρι is used by Luke to indicate the duration of something up to a point, after which it ceases: thus Cornelius fasts until a certain hour (Acts 10:30), Paul preaches until midnight (Acts 20:7); this exclusive sense is consistent elsewhere in the NT.

[13] *Theology*, 22-27. Minear wryly observes of Conzelmann's exegesis, "rarely has a scholar placed so much weight on so dubious an interpretation of so difficult a logion", "Birth Stories", 122. Minear's thesis is that Conzelmann's approach is flawed because he ignores the birth stories and how they parallel John the Baptist and Jesus as part of the same epoch. Turner, *Power*, 172, calls Conzelmann's approach "a wild goose chase".

[14] For example, Dunn, *Baptism*, 25.

[15] Dunn, *Baptism*, 25.

2) Luke's summaries and speeches provide a synopsis of events and his gathering of events together in such overviews shows that he regarded the Gospel story as the beginning. Thus, his summaries and speeches start with Jesus' ministry (e.g. Acts 2:22, 5:31, and 10:36-37). integrate John's ministry (Acts 13:24), and end with Jesus' glorification (e.g. Acts 3:13). This holistic perspective does not suggest that Luke saw any transition in "the times" between John and Jesus, or Jesus and the apostles.

3) Luke uses the prophecies of Malachi to interpret the work of John the Baptist and Jesus (Luke 3:16, 7:27). Malachi closely couples the work of the forerunner and the Coming One, and this does not allow for a change in the characteristics of the "times" that the two individuals enter—they address the same problematic. In Luke, the message about the "times" appears to be the same from both prophets. Thus John the Baptist warns of the "wrath to come" on that "generation" (Luke 3:7); likewise, Jesus warns of "wrath" to come "to this people" (Luke 21:23[16]) in the destruction of Jerusalem, and he frequently warns his "generation" (e.g. Luke 7:31; 9:41).[17] This language shows that Luke viewed John the Baptist and Jesus as living in the same "age", a leading characteristic of which was wrath and the need for escape—the "last days". The preaching of both prophets was likewise one that centred on the need for "repentance" (e.g. Luke 3:3; 5:32), and this message is carried forward into Acts (e.g. Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38-40).[18]

---

[16] It is significant that Luke only uses ὀργή twice in Luke-Acts (Luke 3:7; 21:23).

[17] See J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), 115-127, for further discussion of the evidence.

[18] This is our leading notion of "deliverance": the message to the people was to escape from the wrath to come. We do not develop the motif of deliverance beyond this eschatological posit. Fuller, *Restoration*, 205, notes themes of deliverance from demonic powers, adversaries such as Rome or Jewish opponents. Turner, *Power*, 214, sees an aspect of the motif in terms of deliverance from Belial, and Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 214, sees deliverance from demonic bondage. These proposals represent lines of development for our study, but lie outside its current scope.

Our proposal therefore is that Luke has a *holistic* view of his narrative in respect of the bestowal of the Spirit. An implication of this perspective is that Luke does not restrict the effects of the Spirit to the prophetic but includes also the miraculous. This can be shown in the case of Jesus, but it is also an implication of the motif of the "spirit and power of Elijah".

2.1.1 The Spirit and Power of Elijah and Pentecost

Luke anticipates the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost with Jesus' assertion, καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς[19] (Luke 24:49). There may be an allusion here to the terms of the Elijah prophecy of Mal 4:5, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω/הנה אנכי שלח, and the close parallel, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω/הנני שלח, of Mal 3:1.

Scholars have not normally proposed an analogy between the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost and the "spirit and power of Elijah" (Luke 1:17). Such a proposal has consequences for Luke's eschatological framework, as it imparts a particularly Jewish emphasis to Pentecost, and it requires us to apply a "last days" framework across the entire story of Luke-Acts. It also has implications for Luke's presentation of the Spirit, since Elijah was a prophet both of word and miracle.

The use of ἀποστέλλω in Luke 24:49 is distinctive on two counts. First, it contrasts with the Johannine tradition, which uses πέμπω (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7) for the sending of the Holy Spirit; and secondly, Luke has used ἀποστέλλω in relation to commissions, whether these concern the disciples and apostles (Luke 9:2, 52; 10:1, 3; 19:29, 32; 22:8, 35), prophets (Luke 11:49; 13:34), angels (Luke 1:19, 26), Jesus (Luke 4:18, 43; 9:48; 10:16), John the Baptist (Luke 7:27), or miscellaneous characters (Luke 7:3, 20; 14:17, 32; 19:14; 20:10, 20). The pattern is regular and repeated in Luke and Acts.

---

[19] This is the text in GNT with the most textual support, but the word ἰδού is omitted from some important manuscripts such as Codex Siniaticus, and $_{p}75$. However, Metzger states that there is no reason why καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ should have been omitted by copyists, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 188.

This choice of verb therefore is distinctive because it carries a *phrase-personification of commission and delegation* in respect of τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός. This personification would be consistent with a bestowal of the Spirit upon the apostles as a bestowal of the "spirit and power of Elijah".

A number of elements in Luke's narrative present Pentecost as another fulfilment of Malachi's forerunner prophecy:[20]

1) The "Elijah prophet" comes *before* the messiah; the holy Spirit comes at Pentecost *before* any return of Jesus (Acts 1:11; 3:19-21). The principal function of the bestowal of the Spirit is "prophecy", as shown by the quotation of Joel,[21] and Elijah was an archetypical prophet of witness as shown by Luke's story of the Transfiguration (Luke 9:30).[22] The "Elijah prophet" is a personal "messenger" ("my" messenger) from the one sending; the disciples are likewise personal messengers sent forth to preach (Acts 1:8, "witnesses unto me").

2) The "Elijah prophet" is sent before ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ/לפני בוא יום יהוה הגדול והנורא (Mal 4:5, 3:22 LXX), and the pouring out of the Spirit is likewise before ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ (Acts 2:20; Joel 3:4 LXX). "Elijah" has the function of turning (Mal 4:6,

---

[20] C. F. Evans has also noted that the operation of the Spirit in the early chapters of Acts has "some counterpart in the Gospel in Luke 1 and 2". *Saint Luke*, 87. He describes the parallel in terms of a resumption of prophecy, but he does not explore the Elijah parallel that we propose. For example, Luke's sense of *pun* may be present in the comparison he makes between John the Baptist and the bestowal of the Spirit—in both accounts the question of "drink" and drunkenness appears (Luke 1:15; Acts 2:13).

[21] Brawley notes that Joel evokes an "honorable tradition of servants of God" including prophets, *Text to Text*, 82.

[22] H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT 3; 2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 1:557-558; Marshall, *Luke*, 384. D. L. Bock, *Luke* (ECNT 3a/3b; 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994-1996), 1:868, reviews suggestions that have been made as to why Elijah appears in the Transfiguration and disagrees with the proposal that it is because Elijah is viewed as the representative of the Prophets, preferring the idea that Elijah is present as the hope of the eschaton; this possibility cannot be excluded.

שוב/ἀποκαθίστημι) the people (children to fathers) before the day of the "lord" (Mal 3:1).[23] Luke does not use ἀποκαθίστημι of Elijah's mission. though Matthew does (Matt 17:11). However, Luke does strike an echo with the "fathers and children" aspect of the forerunner's ministry with regard to John the Baptist and the apostles (Luke 3:8; Acts 3:25).

3) The "messenger" prepares a "way" (Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3, דרך/ὁδός) and this is applied to the work of the Baptist (Luke 3:4). Scholars have long noted that ὁδός is a significant term of identity in Acts and disputed its background and sources.[24] If Malachi is the background, Luke may be using ὁδός as a group boundary marker[25] to identify disciples and their beliefs, and in this manner show the apostles' ministry as a continuation of the work of John the Baptist in bringing out a people from the nation (Luke 1:16-17).

4) The "messenger" has a function of "comforting" the people (Isa 40:1. נחם/παρακαλέω). Luke reflects this when he asserts that Simeon is waiting for the "consolation" (Luke 2:25, παράκλησις) of Israel. Johannine tradition (subsequent to the death of John the Baptist) describes the coming of the holy Spirit as the sending of "another" comforter (παράκλητος, John 14:26); Luke reflects this tradition when he ascribes "comfort" to the holy Spirit (Acts 9:31, παράκλησις).

5) The role of the forerunner is to "turn the people to the Lord their God" (Luke 1:16, ἐπιστρέφω); this was the pre-eminent work of Elijah on Mt. Carmel—to turn the people away from Baal to Yahweh (1 Kgs 18:37.

---

[23] We can therefore apply Wenk's analysis of the Baptist's mission to that of the apostles. Wenk notes the accent of ethical renewal implied in turning the people to the "wisdom of the just", *Community-Forming Power*, 155-156.
[24] Thus for example, B. J. Malina and J. H. Neyrey argue for an *halakhic* background to the symbol in "First Century Personality: Dyadic, not Individualistic" in *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (ed., J. H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 92.
[25] The evidence in Luke indicates that ὁδός was used and understood by *opponents* to identify believers and in this way it acts as a boundary marker.

סבב/στρέφω).[26] The same purpose is prominent in Acts (Acts 3:19: 11:21. ἐπιστρέφω), but results ultimately in partial failure (Acts 28:27). Peter asserts were the people to turn unto God, "times of refreshing" *would come* from the "face of the Lord" (Acts 3:20, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου).[27]

We conclude therefore that the use of the motif of the "spirit and power of Elijah" brings a broad view of the work of a prophet to Luke's story. Even though Luke does not attribute miracles to John the Baptist, this does not diminish his participation in this Elijianic latter day bestowal. In the case of the apostles, the broader functions of the Elijianic traditions are reflected in stories of teaching, confrontation and miracles.

3. Jesus' Anointing

In this section, we consider Jesus' reception of the Spirit in his Jordan experience and Luke's scriptural validation of that anointing in Jesus' Nazareth address.

3.1 Empowerment

The principal interpretation of Jesus' baptismal anointing with the Spirit is provided by the quotation of Isa 61:1-2a, which supplies a teleological framework. The terms suggest an empowering[28] for various tasks. Luke uses the gloss of empowerment in the expression, ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος in Luke 4:14, and the mention of δύναμις in Luke 4:36 in relation to the healing of the Synagogue Man. This perspective is confirmed in Luke's composition of Peter's speech,

> Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει (Acts 10:38).

In addition to Isa 61:1-2a, Turner argues that Luke would have understood the baptismal tradition about Jesus, and the assertion, ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ

---

[26] Pao notes an anti-idol polemic in Acts, *New Exodus*, ch. 6.
[27] Dunn, *Baptism*, 90. We discuss this text further below in Chapter Five.
[28] Menzies, *Development*, 146-154.

εὐδόκησα, as a "relatively free rendering of Isa 42:1b" and equally relevant to an understanding of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit.[29] Turner suggests that Luke 3:21-22 is a "free rendering" of Isa 42:1b because of the lack of lexical links:

ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν/נתתי רוחי עליו Isa 42:1b

Nevertheless, it is likely that Luke expects his readers to include Isa 42:1 in their understanding of Jesus' anointing with the Spirit because it is one of the intertexts of Isa 61:1.[30]

A citation of Isa 61:1-2a cannot be taken on its own; the intertexts of that text are brought to bear upon the interpretation of Luke's narrative. This principle is suggested by Luke's own manipulation of Isaianic texts: he combines Isa 61:1-2a with Isa 58:6d.[31] Thus, a connection between the Servant passages in Isaiah and the anonymous voice of Isa 61:1 seems a desideratum for the implied reader of Luke.[32]

The first-person assertion that the "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ/רוח אדני יהוה עלי, Isa 61:1) is a natural counterpoint to the third-person claim, "I have put my Spirit upon him" (ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου

---

[29] *Power*, 197. Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 194, makes the same connection. See also Asher Finkel, "Jesus' Preaching in the Synagogue on the Sabbath (Luke 4:16-28)" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 325-341 (336).

[30] Marshall, *Luke*, 183, notes that in 11QMelch II, 6-9, 15; Isa 52:7 and 61:1 are linked exegetically in a description of the Melchizedek deliverer, and this linkage is with material that is contiguous with the Servant Song of Isa 52:13-53:14. This is an illustration of how other Servant material like Isa 42:1-4 was linked with Isaiah 61; see C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1969), 365.

[31] For an overview of Luke's use of Isaiah, see Bart J. Koet, "Isaiah in Luke-Acts", in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 79-100, and Pao, *New Exodus*, 29-36. For a full length study see P. Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008).

[32] Pao, *New Exodus*, 76-77.

ἐπ' αὐτόν/נתתי רוחי עליו, Isa 42:1), or the second person assertion. "my Spirit which is upon you" (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμόν ὅ ἐστιν ἐπὶ σοί/רוחי אשר עליך. Isa 59:21). or again, the third-person assertion, "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him" (ונחה עליו רוח יהוה/καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. Isa 11:2).

This kind of linkage is suggested by the way in which these Isaianic texts were handled in Luke's day. Luke alludes to Isa 42:1 (בחיר/ὁ ἐκλεκτός) in the christological statements of Luke 9:35; 23:35 through the lexical items, ἐκλέγω and ἐκλεκτός,[33] and Matthew includes an extended citation (Matt 12:18-21).[34] Luke also associates Isa 52:13-53:12 with Jesus in the conversation of the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts 8:30-35).

Paul applies Isa 59:20-21 to Jesus in Rom 11:26-27, referring to a future "coming" of "the deliverer" to Zion, and he positions such a return after the τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθη, a phrase that resonates with the Lucan scheme implied by the phrase πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (Luke 21:24).[35] In the Petrine letters, there is a quotation of Isa 11:2, ונחה עליו רוח יהוה/καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ but varied to apply to the Petrine community, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται (1 Pet 4:14).[36]

This collocation of Isaianic texts in early Christian writings illustrates a choice that associates eschatological hopes with an individual; Qumran exegesis has the same pattern. D. D. Hannah notes that Isa 42:1 and 10:33-11:10 are among the "most widespread" texts used in Second Temple

---

[33] *Power*, 197.
[34] R. Beaton, "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 63-78 (71-72).
[35] It is beyond the scope of this study to consider the interpretation of this Pauline text; for an introduction see J. R. Wagner, "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 117-132 (126-127).
[36] See S. Moyise, "Isaiah in 1 Peter" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 175-188 (185-186).

Judaism.[37] To select just two examples of the kind of intertextual exegesis being practised with Isa 61:1-2: 4Q521 2 II, 6 exegetes Isa 61:1-2 with Gen 1:2, רוחו תרחף, and 11QMelch II, 6-8, 15-16 exegetes Isa 52:7 with Isa 61:1-2.

An alignment of Isa 61:1-2 with Isa 59:20-21 is plausible on several counts. First, the motif of inspired speech is shared between the two oracles in the emphasis upon "words" (דבר/ῥῆμα, Isa 59:21) and "good tidings" (בשר/εὐαγγελίζομαι, Isa 61:1). Secondly, there is a ministry to those in Zion (לציון/Σιων, Isa 59:20; 61:3). Thirdly, those in Zion are given something—words in Isa 59:21—praise in Isa 61:3. And fourthly, the individual of both prophecies "comes" or is "sent" (שלח, בוא/ἀποστέλλω, ἥκω, Isa 59:20; 61:1).

Luke may well have aligned the two prophecies because the message of Isa 59:20-21 is entirely jejune to his presentation of Jesus, John the Baptist and the apostles. First, the motif of a "Coming One" is important for Luke (ἔρχομαι, Luke 3:16; 4:34; 5:32; 7:19-20, 34; Acts 13:25) and this reflects the coming of a redeemer in Isa 59:20. Second, as H. Schürmann notes, „Gedacht ist grundlegend wohl an den „Starken"...der gesablt ist mit dem „Geist der Stärke"...",[38] which echoes Isa 11:2. Thirdly, the aspect of "the turning" of the people (ἀποστρέφω, Isa 59:20) from transgression is a feature of the Lucan Baptist mission (ἐπιστρέφω, Luke 1:16-17). Fourthly, Luke utilizes the concept of a redeemer or deliverer in his own prophetic anticipation of Jesus (גאל/ῥυόμενος, Isa 59:20, ῥύομαι, Luke 1:68, 74). Finally, the prophetic word that is given to the redeemer is also given to his "children" (σπέρμα/זרע, Isa 59:21) and "children's children" (MT only). Luke places this refrain in Peter's mouth in respect of the promise of the holy Spirit (Acts 2:39).

---

[37] D. D. Hannah, "Isaiah within Second Temple Judaism" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 7-33 (8).

[38] "The basic thought is probably of the 'Stronger One'...who is anointed with the 'Spirit of strength'...", *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:172.

We conclude therefore that empowerment is clearly an aspect of the Isaianic bestowal texts (Isa 11:2; 42:1; 59:21; 61:1), and it is likely that Luke read them in broadly "messianic" terms,[39] even if as Schürmann notes Luke's source may have understood the anointing as prophetic.[40]

3.1.1 Davidic Messiah

If the principal intention behind Luke's use of Isa 61:1-2a is to legitimate Jesus' empowerment by the Spirit and place him in an Isaianic framework of interpretation, a second intention is seen in his use of Psalm 2 in the account of Jesus' baptism.

Luke quotes[41] Ps 2:7 (LXX) in the words, υἱός μου εἶ σύ (Luke 3:22) and this brings to the table of interpretation the Davidic associations of the Psalm. Luke uses the full text of Ps 2:7b (LXX) in Acts 13:33 (υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε) in connection with the resurrection, but the aspect of begetting is absent in Luke 3.[42] Luke's interpretation of the Psalm would appear to be that its "begetting" is a "begetting from the dead" (an interpretation also attested in Heb 1:5), but its "sonship" has its basis in Jesus' birth through Mary. Luke establishes the sonship of Jesus in Luke 1:35,[43] and records an awareness of sonship on the part of Jesus in Luke

---

[39] It is beyond the scope of our study to enter into the debate over whether Jesus' anointment is just prophetic, or for that matter, just priestly; for a review of scholarship see Schreck, "Nazareth Pericope", 439-443. Our argument is that the Luke saw the anointment as, in the first instance, messianic. Since David was a prophet (2 Sam 23:1-2) and related to the Melchizedek priesthood (Ps 110:4), other dimensions to Jesus' anointment are not ruled out. For a working definition of "messianic" and a method for identifying messianic texts and their data, see G. S. Oegema, *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), ch. 1.

[40] „Die luk Komposition scheint die „Salbung" V 18 „messianisch" zu verstehen...der Text in der vorluk Perikope aber an eine Prophetensalbung zu denken." ("The Lucan composition seems to understand the 'anointment' as 'messianic'...but the pre-Lucan text seems to think of a prophetic-anointment."), *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:234.

[41] Turner, *Power*, 197, Menzies, *Development*, 151.

[42] Here we follow Turner, *Power*, 197, in rejecting the Western text, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, as an addition influenced by Ps 2:7.

[43] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 162-171.

2:49. Luke further applies Ps 2:1 to the events of Jesus' trial and crucifixion (Acts 4:27), calling Jesus God's "holy child" who was "anointed". Accordingly, we conclude that Jesus' anointing with the Spirit at Jordan is not about adoption of sonship; rather it is about *declaring* Jesus to be the Davidic Messiah, in the same way as on the mount of transfiguration (Luke 9:35).[44]

The conjunction of the servant/herald anointing of Isaianic oracles with the Davidic promise of Psalm 2 is consistent with Davidic tradition of the אל רוח יהוה/πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπὶ Δαυιδ (1 Sam 16:13). However, the varied application of Ps 2:7 creates a problem of interpretation. Luke applies the text both to Jesus' baptism and his resurrection-ascension.

Psalms 2 and 110 have been regarded as "enthronement" psalms by most OT scholars.[45] Does Luke view Jesus' baptism as an enthronement? Turner notes that David's anointing took place several years before David assumed the kingship,[46] and this opens up the possibility that Luke sees Ps 2:7 in terms of such an anointing rather than an enthronement. This would explain his use of the psalm in conjunction with Isaiah 61, which uses the notion of anointing. Further, the language of "sitting" as a metaphor of enthronement is absent from the baptismal account, but it is used by Luke in Acts 2 in his quotation of Psalm 110. Therefore it seems unlikely that Luke wants his reader to see a Davidic enthronement in the baptism account but rather a Davidic anointing. It is more plausible to construe Jesus' resurrection-ascension as an enthronement. Hence, Turner asserts that Jesus "becomes the Davidic king, exercising royal functions, through

---

[44] Again, here we follow Turner's argument, *Power*, 198-201, and agree with Menzies' conclusion, *Development*, 152, and oppose Dunn's view that Jesus' reception of the Spirit signifies his "adoption as Son", *Jesus and the Spirit*, 62-67 (65), *Baptism*, 28.

[45] This consensus is noted in N. Whybray *Reading the Psalms as a Book* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 94, and J. Day, *Psalms* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 92.

[46] *Power*, 201.

resurrection ascension".[47] Luke's use of Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:33 in connection with the resurrection would support this reading.

However, Luke's use of Psalms 2 and 110 is not without dissonance.[48] Psalm 2 declares that "I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill" (v. 6), and Psalm 110 declares that the Davidic king will rule out of Zion (v. 2). The Davidic throne was in Jerusalem, but Jesus had been exalted to heaven. The dissonance creates the possibility that Luke holds out the prospect of a "return" of Jesus to Jerusalem (Acts 1:11; 3:21) and a future enthronement Luke 1:32-33).

3.2 The Isaianic Story-Line

What are the implications of Luke's use of Isaiah 61 for the implied reader? Turner asserts that the empowerment of Jesus commences "the promised cleansing/restoration of Zion".[49] Fuller argues that with Jesus' Isaianic declaration (Isa 61:1-2b), "Luke's revision of Israel's restoration hopes begins to take on more specificity".[50] These are important proposals which require discussion. If Isaiah 61 is a restoration oracle, how does it fit into Luke's narrative story, given that this story "anticipates" a rejection of the Jewish Messiah, a destruction of Jerusalem and its temple, and a new scattering of the Jews? We will structure this discussion by considering first

---

[47] *Power*, 200, 275, 295; Fuller, *Restoration*, 204, follows Turner.

[48] The messianic interpretation of Psalm 110 has also been extensively discussed. For example, see D. Juel, *Messianic Exegesis* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1992), 135-150. Juel bases his discussion on D. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973). He notes that "Hay's survey of post-biblical literature suggests there is no single interpretative tradition that can be regarded as normative", 139. He follows the same line of interpretation as Turner and Fuller in seeing Luke's use of Psalm 110 as signalling Jesus' accession to the Davidic throne, 144. For a discussion of the possible historical catalysts of Psalm 110 see W. Van der Meer, "Psalm 110: A Psalm of Rehabilitation?" in *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (eds. J. C. de Moor and W. Van der Meer; JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 207-234.

[49] *Power*, 201.

[50] *Restoration*, 237.

the story-line[51] of Isaiah 61, and then by examining Luke's application. Our proposal will be that the Isaianic oracle is qualified by Luke's story so that the stress of the Isaianic quotation is seen to rest upon the aspect of a proclamation of deliverance.

3.2.1 Immediate Contextualization

Luke's quotation of Isa 61:1-2 is a selection from a longer oracle which has a theme of transformation.[52] The presupposition of the oracle is that it is *possible* to "bring good tidings to the poor" (לבשר ענוים/εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς), "to bind up the brokenhearted" (לחבש לנשברי לב/ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδία), "to proclaim liberty to the captives" (לקרא לשבוים דרור/κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν) and "the opening of the eyes (τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν/פקח קוח[53]) to those who are bound"; that is, there are these needs to be met. The language of the oracle evokes images of the Levitical Jubilee.[54] It is further presupposed that there are "mourners of Zion" (אבלי ציון/πενθοῦσιν Σιων, v. 3) and that they are dressed in sackcloth and "ashes" (אפר/σποδός, v. 3), and there is a need for a project of reconstruction to begin (v. 4). This project will

---

[51] The application of the notion of a "story-line" to Isaianic oracles is illustrated in the scholarly reconstruction of their originating contexts. J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 462, explicitly uses the notion in relation to the "book" of Isaiah 56-66.

[52] The question of the length of the parent oracle and the identification of any discrete units lies outside our remit. Isa 61:1-3 seems to be a basic unit, as argued by Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 365-367, but the pronominal suffix of v.4 is tied to the "mourners of Zion" in v. 3, and intratextual links in Isa 61:1-11 would no doubt stretch the "oracle" for Luke's implied reader, see Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 499-503 for a discussion linking v. 4 to vv. 1-3.

[53] The MT קוח is hapax, and the idiom פקח קוח is unclear; Luke however, follows the LXX.

[54] For example, B. S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: WJK Press, 2001), 505. The allusions that carry the Levitical figure include "proclaiming liberty" (v. 1, Lev 25:10), and the "year" of "double" harvest (v. 7, Lev 25:22). This allusion is noted by NT scholars, for example, Turner, *Power*, 224. G. J. Brooke, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 2005), 82-86, offers a recent discussion of the use of Isaiah 61 and Leviticus 25 in 11QMelch.

repair "the desolations of many generations" (v. 4, דרות עולמים/ἐξηρημωμένας εἰς γενεάς[55]).

The context for the oracle is an aftermath—a situation after war and destruction. This is indicated by the concept of "good tidings" (בשר/εὐαγγελίζομαι), which is used in contexts of military and political messages (2 Sam 1:20; 4:10; 1 Kgs 1:42), rather than prophetic proclamations of doom or hope and their attendant themes. Similarly, the proclamation of liberty to captives and a day of vengeance (קרא יום/ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως, cf. Isa 34:8; 63:4) fit a situation in which a victor reclaims prisoners and slaves taken in war and takes revenge on the remnants of the opposing forces.

The other terminology in the oracle has politico-military precedents. Thus the work of "binding" echoes the post-war work of Yahweh in Isa 30:26, "in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people". The broken-hearted state of the people echoes the trauma of war (Psa 147:3), as does the state of mourning (Lam 1:4). The oracle therefore presupposes that deliverance from the enemy has taken place.[56] If we extend the oracle up to v. 11, the story also includes elements that involve the nations (vv. 6, 9); the nations would make tribute to Israel, and their seed would be known among the nations.

---

[55] The LXX reads "desolate *for* many generations".

[56] This is a different construction of the oracle to that presented by W. A. M. Beuken, "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55" in *The Book of Isaiah* (ed., J. Vermeylen; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 411-42, (419-421), who interprets the Jubilee allusion to signal an end to "economic slavery" (419), the figure of "opening the eyes" to a relief of oppression (420), and as a consequence, interprets the "day of vengeance" to be "authoritative and strong action" (421). His approach fails to recognise the metaphorical use of the notion of "Jubilee", and it fails to give sufficient weight to the military usage of קרא. The oracle may reflect the pre-exilic historical tradition of the Jubilee year immediately after the Assyrian invasion (Isa 37:30-31; 2 Kgs 19:29-30). This year saw a release of captives, vengeance, a rebuilding of desolate cities, and a re-planting of the fields.

The point of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the anointed individual of this oracle is to facilitate the work that he executes.[57] This work pertains to the psyche of individuals identified as "the poor", the "broken-hearted", the "captives" (v. 1), and the "mourners" (vv. 2-3). These classes of individuals may be distinct or overlap, but as a result of the work of the anointed one, they *then* undertake restoration work (v. 4).

3.2.2 Extended Contextualization

The story-line in the oracle units of Isaiah 61 does not intimate an exilic setting. In their hypothetical reconstructions, scholars have proposed a *post-exilic* origin for the oracle. G. Emmerson comments that "the nature of the blessings promised in chs. 60-62 implies that the country was still impoverished as the result of devastation (62:4). There are memories of forced labour, of an enemy pillaging and looting (60:17-18). The general impression given is of a time soon after the return from exile when the community, depleted and demoralized, was endeavouring to reestablish itself and reaffirm its identity; but it is difficult to be entirely certain of this".[58] Thus, for example, the release of captives is likely to refer to local circumstances in Judea rather than the situation of any "exiles".[59]

Scholars are uncertain of the historical catalysts[60] behind Isaiah 56-66, but insofar as the range of proposals is broadly post-exilic, this reflects the story

---

[57] Marshall, *Luke*, 183. Marshall discusses whether the individual of Isaiah 61 is "messianic" or a "prophet", but stresses that Luke's point in using Isaiah 61 is to associate Jesus with the functions of the Isaianic individual.
[58] G. Emmerson, *Isaiah 56-66* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 59. See also R, N Whybray, *The Second Isaiah* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 5, for a recognition that the situation of Isaiah 56-66 is different to that of Isaiah 40-55.
[59] Westermann states, *Isaiah 40-66*, 366, "The liberation of the captives does not mean the exiles, but, as in 58:6, people put in prison for debt and the like".
[60] For a review of proposals, see M. E. Tate, "The Book of Isaiah in Recent Study" in *Forming Prophetic Literature* (eds., J. W. Watts and P. R. House: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 38-43, and B. Schramm, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 16-19. Schramm

elements in the oracles.[61] These elements are Judean rather than exilic: restoration is about the land and those in the land. The counterpoint to the need for restoration is not a community in exile, but a community in the land. The *land-focus* of the oracles in Isaiah 60-62 is confirmed by the use of the Jubilee language in Isaiah 61—this metaphor trades on the legislation about the return of land, the cancellation of debts and the release of indentured servants.

While scholars may be uncertain of the historical catalyst for Isaiah 61 (as well as Isaiah 56-66), there is wider agreement about the coherence of Isaiah 60-62 as a core of oracles.[62] This raises the question of the reading context for Luke's implied reader and the effect of such coherence upon their perceptions. If we respect this coherence and extend the reading context to include surrounding oracles, a broader picture of the state of the land and the work of restoration can be drawn as the context in which the herald/servant of Isa 61:1 announces his commission. Thus, while we do need to ascribe to Luke's implied reader a land-focused reading for Isaiah 61, we do not need to assume on his part any actual post-exilic catalyst.[63]

3.2.3 The Lucan Application

Our consideration of Luke's application of Isa 61:1-2a in his narrative revolves around Luke's understanding of the restoration of Israel as a reality. In presenting this discussion, we will engage with three recent treatments of this topic which offer a "new exodus" and an "exilic" nuance to Luke's perceptions. Then we will offer a "Jubilee" nuance as an *alternative* perspective.

---

tabulates the differing historical proposals of Elliger, Volz, Fohrer, Soggin, Westermann, Pauritsch and Hanson.

[61] Scholars allow the possibility that there is pre-exilic material in the oracles of Isaiah 56-66; see Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 301-302.

[62] Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 296.

[63] Schramm notes that "The material is notorious for its lack of any sort of concrete historical reference", *Opponents*, 15.

3.2.3.1 Textual Questions

Scholars have noted four differences between Luke's citation and Isaiah 61 (LXX) which raises the question of Luke's source. Menzies notes that source-critical and redaction-critical questions about this text are "numerous and exceedingly complex";[64] accordingly the issue has been extensively discussed.[65] It is outside the scope of our study to move forward the source critical questions raised by Luke's text and we will confine our discussion to a review of the possibilities that have been put forward.

Taking the existing critical LXX text of Isa 61:1-2a, we may note that Luke's text does not have ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ; it includes Isa 58:6d, ἀπόστελε (ἀποστεῖλαι) τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει: it has καλέσαι for κηρύξαι: and it stops the citation before καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως.

There is mss. support for and against ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ as part of Luke's text. Marshall avers that it is easier to explain its inclusion as assimilation to the LXX and that it is not original to the original text.[66] Schürmann holds that it was originally in Luke,[67] and if so it would give a basis for the later reference to "healing" (Luke 4:23). However, Turner observes that if the clause was present, then no adequate

---

[64] *Development*, 163.

[65] Menzies, Bock, Turner and Pao offer recent discussion of the issues. *Development*, 162-174, *Power*, 215-220, *New Exodus*, 72-74, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 105-111, and the various options have been explored in articles, for example, B. D. Chilton, "Announcement in Nazara: An Analysis of Luke 4:16-21" in *Gospel Perspectives* (eds., R. T. France, D. Wenham and Craig Blomberg; 6 vols; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980-1986), 2:147-172; J. A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds., C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 46-69, and S. E. Porter "Scripture Justifies Mission: The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts" in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed., S. E. Porter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 104-126; as well as commentaries, for example, Marshall, *Luke*, 177-180 and Bock, *Luke* 1:404-405.

[66] *Luke*, 182,

[67] *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:229.

explanation has been forthcoming of why the textual tradition subsequently omitted the line.[68]

Chilton accepts the absence of ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ in Luke's text and argues that his source is tradition because he "would never have missed out the healing phrase when vv. 23f. deal precisely with this topic" if quoting directly from the Old Greek.[69] Turner concurs with Chilton and argues, with Chilton, that several features of the Nazareth pericope betray a pre-Lucan source.[70]

Marshall notes that ἀπόστελε (ἀποστεῖλαι) τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει is thought to be "due to Christian exegetical activity" rather than Jesus' original synagogue address.[71] Chilton argues that this insertion was also in Luke's tradition because ἐν with ἄφεσις is unusual for Luke,[72] but he argues that the tradition goes back to Jesus' midrashic exposition.[73] Turner follows Chilton although not as far as postulating Jesus' own exposition.[74]

These observations about the citation are supported by a wider case for a source or sources behind the Nazareth pericope. Thus Schürmann makes a series of observations about vv. 17, 20 and concludes that they are „...trotz aller luk Redaktionsspuren schwerlich luk Bildung, und darum ist das Zitat VV 18f kaum luk Einfügung".[75] For our purposes we may take the case presented by Chilton, Turner and Schürmann as well established.

---

[68] *Power*, 221.
[69] "Announcement", 164.
[70] *Power*, 216-217.
[71] *Luke*, 182.
[72] "Announcement", 164.
[73] Chilton's argument cites the Old Syriac versions as support that "unless Jesus expressed himself in this way, it is difficult to see why any version of the New Testament would have altered the citation from the Old Testament", "Announcement", 164.
[74] *Power*, 220, 222.
[75] "...despite all traces of Lucan redaction only barely recognisable as Lucan composition, and therefore vv. 18f can hardly be a Lucan addition", *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:233. Schürmann adds that the source may be the same as that underlying Luke 7:22.

The competing hypotheses are that the changes are due to Luke's hand or to a different Old Greek text than that preserved in the LXX. However, the argument in favour of Luke himself making the redactional changes to the Old Greek is undecideable. Even were it to be shown that the differences in Luke's quotation are entirely jejune to his theology, this would not show that they were due to his hand rather than tradition. His tradition may be such precisely because it is consonant with his own point of view.

Nevertheless, if Luke has to hand both Hebrew and Greek scriptures, as well as sources of tradition, the question still remains as to why his "citation" of Isa 61:1-2a is different to scriptural texts; adverting to a possible tradition is only one level of explanation. Our interest is in the possibilities of authorial theme as a level of explanation.

3.2.3.2 Authorial Themes

Source-critical possibilities do not preclude a consideration of the *final form* of Luke's text and the impact of his included[76] changes for the implied reader.

1) The terms of the Isaianic citation have to do with proclamation and they are re-used by Luke in his narrative (εὐαγγελίζομαι, Luke 7:22; 8:1; 16:16; Acts 8:12; κηρύσσω, Luke 8:1; 9:2; 24:47; Acts 28:31). In this respect, Luke includes the verb κηρύσσω for καλέω in "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord", which is one of his preferred terms for preaching.

2) Turner recognizes the strength of this observation when he argues that Isa 58:6d (ἀπόστελε (ἀποστεῖλαι) τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει) is included in Luke's citation "in order to stress the theme of Jesus as prophet-liberator, and possibly to clarify that he [Jesus] does not merely announce messianic

---

[76] We use the notion of "inclusion" here to allow for the possibilities that have been canvassed in our source-critical review: Luke may be including changes from a source *or* making changes himself and thereby including them.

liberty (as the use of Isa 61:1-2 alone might suggest) but also *effects* [my emphasis] it".[77]

The embedding of Isa 58:6d inside the citation of Isa 61:1-2 has presumably resulted from perceptions of common theme. There are common lexical[78] links (ἄφεσις, δεκτός), which suggest that the proclamation of liberty to captives (שבה/αἰχμάλωτος) and sending away the oppressed (רצץ/θραύω) are two aspects of the same Jubilee-like event (Isa 61:1; Lev 25:10).[79] These are fundamentally ethical actions, and Isa 58:6-7 recounts a series of ethical choices which God is said to prefer rather than the fasting of the Day of Atonement. However, the prophetic advocacy of an ethical life before God (cf. Hos 6:6), rather than rituals of atonement, does not of itself fully explain Luke's inclusion or retention of Isa 58:6d in his citation of Isa 61:1-2a.[80]

The ethical demands of Isa 58:6-7 are reflected in Synoptic motifs and this makes a citation from Isa 58:6d appropriate. Thus Luke includes motifs of "hunger" (Luke 1:53; 6:21), and the "poor" (Luke 6:20; 7:22; 14:13, 21) in Jesus' ministry. He partly epitomizes John the Baptist's ministry in terms of sharing clothing and food which reflects the ethics of the Isaianic text (Luke 3:11). Finally, the proclamation to the poor announced in Isa 61:1 further dovetails the two oracles.[81]

---

[77] *Power*, 224.

[78] These are noted by scholars, for example, Kimball, *Exposition*, 106-107, and Pao, *New Exodus*, 73. J. B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 210, correctly observes that the inclusion of Isa 58:6d draws "special attention to the word "release" as a characteristic activity of Jesus' ministry".

[79] The intertextuality between Leviticus 25 and Isaiah 58 is established with the lexical links ענה and נפש (Isa 58:3; Lev 16:29, 31), the sounding of the trumpet (Isa 58:1; Lev 25:9) on the day of atonement that begins the Jubilee, and the release of slaves (Isa 58:6d; Lev 25:10).

[80] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 208 n. 47, usefully observes the interchanging use חפשׁ and דרור in Jeremiah 34 in its development of a Jubilee theme. He notes that this "further supports the cohesion between Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2".

[81] Matthew's judgment pericope (Matt 25:34-46) particularly resonates with Isa 58:6-7 in summarizing the kind of life that inherits the kingdom of God.

3) Luke does not include ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ and Menzies has argued that this is because Luke has a *prophetic* understanding of the Spirit and wished to disassociate Jesus' ministry of healing from the terms of the Isaianic text.[82] However, this is an argument from silence, and it is just as possible to assert the contrary: Luke omitted this phrase because its metaphorical intent[83] obscured a connection that he wanted to make between prophetic ministry and literal healing in the example of Elisha (Luke 4:27), which then functions as a paradigm for Jesus' ministry in his narrative.[84]

4) Luke's citation does not include the reference to "the day of vengeance" (יום נקם/ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως). While "the ministry of Jesus was never conceived in such a fashion",[85] nevertheless, as S. E. Porter observes,[86] the theme of vengeance is included in Luke 18:7-8 (ἐκδίκησις[87]) in connection with the coming of the Son of Man. It is also included in Luke 21:22 (ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως) in connection with a wrath (ὀργή, Luke 21:23, cf. 3:7) upon the people and the coming of the Son of Man (Luke 21:27). We cannot be certain therefore that Luke is directing a reader to exclude the motif of vengeance in his understanding Jesus' quotation.

The above points, (1)–(4), describe thematic points of contact between Luke's gospel and his programmatic quotation. The broader theme represented by the quotation is one of restoration.

---

[82] *Development*, 166-171.
[83] This metaphorical intent is accepted by Menzies, *Development*, 167, and used by Turner, *Power*, 224-225, to argue our point.
[84] Green, *Luke*, 210, offers no source-critical discussion and says that the reasons for the omission of ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ are "unclear".
[85] Turner, *Power*, 222.
[86] "Scripture Justifies Mission", 111.
[87] This is not the term used in Isa 61:2a (LXX) but it is the term chiefly used in the LXX for נקם; G. A. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1937), 137.

3.2.3.3 New Exodus Restoration

Turner argues that Luke's use of Isaiah 61 is part of an understanding of the Spirit,

> ...as the power of God through which Jesus proclaimed Israel's new exodus release from captivity to Belial, and effected it. especially (though not exclusively) in works of deliverance from sickness and demonic affliction.[88]

Accordingly, Turner thinks that Jesus' ministry is "the period in which the promises of Israel's restoration in Luke 1-2 begin to be realized".[89] Pao also considers Luke's programmatic use of certain Isaianic texts. including Isa 61:1-2a, which he characterizes as conveying a new exodus story.[90] Wenk argues that Pentecost is also "part of Jesus' liberating ministry as announced in Lk. 4.16-30; it is the continuation of 'all that Jesus began to do and teach' and as such part of the New Exodus".[91] While not denying the Isaianic background for Luke, and many of the observations of these scholars, our question is whether a "new exodus" characterization is justified for Isaiah 58 and 61.

Turner argues that new exodus themes in Luke-Acts require or presuppose an *engine of delivery* and this is the Spirit.[92] He says that,

---

[88] *Power*, 214; Turner discusses Luke 4:16-30 from a redactional perspective. and argues that Luke's purpose behind his citation of Isa 61:1-2a is to incorporate an Isaianic "New Exodus" understanding of Israel's restoration into his narrative, 213-266. Pao, *New Exodus*, 71-84, follows the same approach.

[89] *Power*, 214; see also Pao, *New Exodus*, 95.

[90] Isa 6:9-10; 49:6; 58:6d; 61:1-2a, as used in Luke 4:16-30; 24:44-49, Acts 1:8; 13:46-47; and 28:25-28.

[91] *Community-Forming Power*, 258.

[92] The observation of this requirement is correct, and the episodes in Acts illustrate the role of the Spirit in Turner's sense of deliverance. A discussion of these episodes is beyond our scope, but we can note here an issue for further research: Pao, *New Exodus*, 147-180, proposes that the Word of God is the *agent* of the new exodus; this proposal raises the question of how the Spirit and/or the Word should be placed as an *agent* in this typological framework.

...at the centre of gravity of Luke's multifaceted view of 'salvation' is God's invasive dynamic presence in strength (kingdom of God), powerfully transforming Israel into a community of radical filial obedience (sonship), joyful worship, and witness. More specifically, the 'salvation' Luke is talking about is now widely becoming recognised as a Christocentric version of Isaianic New Exodus hopes for Israel's restoration, based largely (but not exclusively) on Isaiah 40-55.[93]

It is beyond the scope of our study to evaluate whether and to what extent[94] Luke encodes new exodus typology in his *whole narrative*; neither can we discuss fully the question of whether Luke saw in the ministry of Jesus *as a whole* the beginning of the restoration of Israel. Our concern is with a critical piece of evidence in these proposals, viz. Luke's use of Isaiah in Luke 4:16-30. Does Luke's programmatic use of Isaiah 58 and 61 contribute to such theologies? Is his usage a signal to the reader that Jesus' reception of the Spirit "is an empowering by which to inaugurate Israel's New Exodus liberation"?[95] If Luke's use of Isaiah in this programmatic text is not supportive of a new exodus typology of restoration, then this will cast doubt on this proposal and signal the need for further work in this area.

The presence of exodus typology in Isaiah 40-66 is well known as is the rubric, "the New Exodus".[96] This rubric can be narrowly or broadly defined

---

[93] "Spirit and Salvation", 107, cf. *Power*, 246-249. For a recent statement of Luke's New Exodus restoration, see R. B. Hays, "The Liberation of Israel in Luke-Acts: Intertextual Narration as Countercultural Practice" (Unpublished paper presented at *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellelektüre*, Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main, November 2004).

[94] The principal correspondence between Isaiah 40-55 and Luke-Acts lies in the motif of a "light for the Gentiles".

[95] *Power*, 266.

[96] For example, B. W. Anderson, "Exodus Typology in Second Isaiah" in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (eds., B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson; London: SCM Press, 1962) 177-195; M. Fishbane, *Text and Texture* (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), 121-140; E. W. Conrad, *Reading Isaiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 148; and Caird, *Language*, 214.

and this critically affects its value in an analysis of Luke's pneumatology. Mánek defines the "new exodus" as "the leaving of the sepulchre"[97] for Jesus; his suffering death and resurrection are an "exodus"—a descent into the waters of the Red Sea.[98] Exodus typology is associated with Jesus' death and resurrection at Jerusalem (Luke 9:31, ἔξοδος), a typology that is particularly evident in the poignant symbolism of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. Mánek's focus is upon Jesus' life and death rather than upon Jesus' ministry to Israel.

Although C. F. Evans does not use the rubric "new exodus", his paper, "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel", illustrates another approach to exodus typology. He sets out parallels between Luke 9:51-18:14 and Deuteronomy and concludes that "Luke has cast that section of his Gospel which is made up of non-Marcan material into the form of a journey to the borders of the Promised Land, a journey which follows that of Deuteronomy by way of correspondence and contrast".[99]

Again, Jesus' Jordan experience and his subsequent temptation in the wilderness could be seen as an exodus typological sequence, an enacted entry upon a wilderness journey that leads to a kingdom.[100] Examples of socio-political public behaviour from the first century illustrate that those involved often acted symbolically using Israelite traditions as a model for their action. This historical pattern makes it likely that Jesus' own words and actions would have been construed symbolically. Thus Jesus' public

---

[97] "New Exodus", 12.
[98] "New Exodus", 15.
[99] "Central Section", 51. For a discussion, see C. A. Evans, "Luke 16:1-18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds., C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 121-139, and "The Pharisee and the Publican: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner: JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 342-355.
[100] For a review of the socio-political prophets see Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements", 124-148. Horsley describes the imitating actions of such prophets as "historical-eschatological typology", 131.

baptism in the Jordan, departure into the wilderness and subsequent return from the wilderness resonate with Old Testament traditions.

Eschewing the use of the label as a term for general Mosaic typology and claims that Luke has patterned his travel narrative on Deuteronomy, Turner uses the expression "as a description of a post-Exilic constellation of hopes developed from Isaiah 40-55".[101] This definition is quite sweeping in its embrace and requires discussion.

The "exodus" could be narrowly defined to include just the deliverance of Israel from Egypt up to and including the crossing of the Red Sea; it could be more broadly defined to include the two-year journey to the land or the whole of the wilderness wandering period; and it could include the crossing of Jordan and arrival in the land. Turner includes all these elements as they have been reconfigured in Isaiah 40-55, and he also adds the element that the "new exodus" embraces the goal of a "restored Zion/Jerusalem".[102]

Pao has a similar comprehensive understanding of the motif of the "new exodus". Concluding a discussion of Isa 40:1-11, and noting the military language of vv. 10-11, he states that "This language evokes the Exodus paradigm in which God delivers and restores his people".[103] The question can be asked, however, as to whether "restoration" is an *exodus* paradigm. Certainly deliverance and journey is involved, but Israel was not the "people of the land" before the exodus; a small family went down into Egypt and a nation came out of Egypt. The nation, as such, was not *restored* to the land in the traditions of Genesis-Exodus; it might be better therefore to describe Isaianic typology in terms of a "new exodus deliverance" (e.g. Isa 48:20-21: 51:9-10).

While it can be agreed that Isaiah 40-55 includes Exodus-Numbers allusions and therefore an exodus typology, these centre around notions of

---

101 *Power*, 246.
102 *Power*, 247.
103 *New Exodus*, 51.

deliverance at the Red Sea through a defeat of Rahab (Isa 43:1-3: 51:9-10. 15),[104] of a way across a wilderness (Isa 40:3-5; 43:19-20; 49:11: 63:13),[105] and the leading of the people (Isa 40:10-11; 52:12). However, it is not clear that *all* references to a wilderness are part of an exodus typology. Thus, as we shall argue more fully below in our discussion of Fuller, the replenishing of the wilderness (Isa 41:18-19; 51:3; 64:9) is a metaphor for the restoration of land that belongs to Zion. Those oracles that describe what takes place *in the land* are not obviously part of an exodus typology, given that the exodus story is essentially about *deliverance* and *journey*.

The argument here is conceptual and typological. In his discussion of the "Way" texts in Isaiah (which we will discuss below in connection with Fuller), Pao affirms that they form "the central core of the Isaianic New Exodus in which the people of God are called to come out and return as the reconstituted nation of Israel", and avers that "This emphasis on the ingathering of the exiles is naturally connected with the centrality of the concern for the Land".[106] The typological point for dispute is whether "gathering" or "ingathering" is *exodus-like*; while the exodus allusions in Isaiah pertain to journey and deliverance, a "gathering" is not what the *old* exodus is about—we can therefore question the scope of the "new exodus" rubric as it is applied to Isaiah by scholars.

It is not clear therefore that the oracle that includes Isa 61:1-2a has exodus allusions and thereby draws its images into a broader new exodus typology. The emphases appear to centre on those in Zion (Isa 61:3), the restoration of the land belonging to Zion (Isa 61:4), the subduing of the surrounding nations (Isa 61:5), and the renewal of the priesthood (Isa 61:6). The proclamation of good tidings and the location of the spirit-anointed individual would appear to be *from* Jerusalem (Isa 40:9; 41:27; 52:7). It is from this location that liberty is proclaimed to the captives, but as we will argue, the typology here is that of a *Jubilee* proclamation of liberty, rather

---

[104] Pao, *New Exodus*, 56.
[105] Pao, *New Exodus*, 59-68.
[106] *New Exodus*, 114.

than any exodus-like proclamation. Pao's argument that "the significance of the Isaianic quotation in Luke 4:16-30 lies in the introduction of the Isaianic New Exodus"[107] can therefore be challenged. The Isaianic oracle has instead a Jubilee focus on the *land* and is ostensibly post-exilic.

Insofar as Isaiah 61 addresses a post-exilic situation, and Luke reads the oracle against some post-exilic history or other, the Jubilee metaphor is about the *land* and not about "the coming redemption from exile and captivity".[108] The typological value for Luke would be clearly seen in the phrase "you shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land" (Lev 25:10),[109] which would aptly prefigure the ministry of Jesus. This typology is appropriate to a community settled in the land rather than a community experiencing a new exodus journey. It is not safe therefore to assert, with Turner, that "the Jubilee language of ἄφεσις/release immediately focuses the theme of 'liberation' within the broader context of Jewish eschatological Jubilee *and* [my emphasis] New Exodus hopes".[110] Turner has not shown that Isaiah 61 and its release is a "release from the oppressive slavery of 'exile' into which she [Israel] had sold herself by her disobedience".[111] He is correct to emphasize the Jubilee aspect of Isaiah 61, but incorrect to combine this aspect with a new exodus emphasis.

Wenk follows Turner in combining the typologies of the new exodus and the Jubilee. He says, "The New Exodus/jubilean soteriology of Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2 reflects itself in the ethics of the renewed, liberated community".[112] His interest lies in drawing out the ethical implications of Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2 rather than in arguing for the applicability of the new exodus motif which he regards as established by Turner. In this regard Wenk adds the argument that,

---

[107] *New Exodus*, 77.
[108] Green, *Luke*, 212.
[109] Brooke, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 84.
[110] *Power*, 226.
[111] *Power*, 226.
[112] *Community-Forming Power*, 209, cf. 192, 204.

> One way to guarantee the egalitarian community as introduced in the Exodus was the sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee (Lev 25:1-54). It is, therefore, not surprising that the writings of the prophets and of Jewish protest groups reflect the merging of the New Exodus motif and Jubileean themes and describe the renewal of the covenant as a renewed social order.[113]

Wenk is right to emphasize the link between God's redemption of Israel from Egypt and the basis of his ethical requirements for the people (Lev 25:38 makes the explicit connection). However, this does not warrant applying a new exodus rubric to the ethics of Isa 58:6 and Isa 61:1-2. The Jubilee legislation underpinning these texts remains the same and is not new; further, its basis remains the same, and this is the exodus. As we have argued above, the focus of Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2 is the land, for which a Jubilee metaphor is entirely appropriate. There is no *new* exodus in these texts, but rather, it is the *old* exodus which continues to underpin the ethical requirements of the Jubilee legislation.

Our proposal can therefore be set in contrast with Pao. He argues that "Israel's restoration forms the foundation of the Lukan New Exodus program".[114] We can agree that there are important restoration types in Luke-Acts centred upon the reconstitution (around the twelve) and reunification of Israel (with Samaria); there is gathering of Diaspora Jews typified in the Pentecost account; and the early Christians are a community of the Spirit (Isaiah 32) under a Davidic king.[115] However, the "new exodus" characterization is too sweeping in its embrace because these motifs are not derived from the story of the *old* exodus. Luke signals his preferred "restoration" typology in terms of the "Jubilee" type of Isaiah 58 and 61.

---

[113] *Community-Forming Power*, 204-205.
[114] *New Exodus*, 122.
[115] *New Exodus*, ch. 4.

3.2.3.4 Exilic Restoration

Fuller offers a nuanced reading of Luke's restoration theology as an "exilic model of restoration".[116] Against the background of an examination of the exilic tradition of restoration in early Jewish literature,[117] Fuller argues that for Luke, exile is the "predicament from which restoration is needed",[118] and he avers that "Luke's description of Israel's restoration depends upon the pattern of exile and return, the dominant meta-narrative of Jewish history".[119] Pao expresses a similar point when he says that "The discussion of restoration presupposes an exilic situation in which the people of Israel are scattered throughout the neighbouring lands".[120]

Fuller claims that Luke's "most important"[121] means of describing Israel's continual exile is the motif of the "wilderness", and in this descriptive project he regards Isa 40:3-5 as having "programmatic value".[122] In respect of the Nazareth pericope, he asserts that "In Jesus' initial speech to Israel at Nazareth (Luke 4:14-30), he introduces himself *inter alia* as the messiah who has come to "release" the "captives" (αἰχμάλωτος) from their exile (4:18)".[123] Is Fuller correct to construe Isa 40:3-5 in this way? With the Lucan Jesus predicting a captivity of the Jews (Luke 21:24), the question for Fuller's thesis is how liberation from exile coheres with a forthcoming "exile".

---

116 *Restoration*, 239.

117 *Restoration*, chs. 1-2. Pao, *New Exodus*, 30, offers the summary that use of Isaiah in Second Temple Judaism was for establishing the coming salvation from "exile", the role of God's agent in making this happen, and the judgment of the nations. In respect of the theme of the exile in Isaiah and the use of that theme in Second Temple writings, see J. Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), ch. 7.

118 *Restoration*, 198.

119 *Restoration*, 199-200.

120 *New Exodus*, 118.

121 *Restoration*, 211.

122 *Restoration*, 228. Pao, *New Exodus*, 245, also regards Isa 40:3-5 as the "hermeneutic key through which the rest of the Lukan narrative is to be understood".

123 *Restoration*, 210.

Fuller asserts that, "In the original literary setting of Isaiah (40:3). the wilderness functions as a metaphor for Israel's exile. and the place where God will appear in restoring the Jewish people to the Land".[124] This reading is a common scholarly approach to Isa 40:3-5. For example, Westermann asserts that "the highway which is to be made through the desert is the way on which Yahweh now gives proof of himself, in a new and quite unlooked-for historical act: the way for leading his people home".[125] This reading interprets the wilderness motif as a metaphor for exile and the "way" as a metaphor of salvation for the community in Babylon.[126] Pao also follows this line of interpretation citing Second Temple texts in support, for example, he observes that Bar 5:7 quotes Isa 40:4 in the context of an expression of the return of the exiles.[127]

However, this common approach has been questioned by recent scholarship. This acutely raises the methodological question of what Luke's reading *might have been* if scholars propose a variety of readings. Fuller's own approach is to cite examples of the use of Isa 40:3-5 in Second Temple literature as a guide to Luke's own understanding.[128] The problem with this method is that the understanding of Isa 40:3-5 in other texts cannot

---

[124] *Restoration*, 212-213.

[125] Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 39; see also Childs, *Isaiah*, 299; J. L. McKenzie, *Second Isaiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1968), 18-19; and Blenkinsopp, *Opening the Sealed Book*, 244.

[126] See also J. Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40-55* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 17-19; and Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 300.

[127] *New Exodus*, 41-45; he also cites *Pss. Sol.* 11:4-6 as an exilic return modelled on Isa 40:4 along with texts that bespeak an eschatological return modelled on Isa 40:4 such as *T. Mos.* 10:1-4, *1 En.* 1:6.

[128] *Restoration*, 213-219. There appears to be a suppressed premise in Fuller's analysis of some texts. For example, 4Q176 does not use terms such as "Babylon" or "exile", nevertheless, because Fuller regards the Babylonian Exile as the original literary setting for Isa 40:3-5, he takes this as the literary backdrop for 4Q176. Similarly, in 1QS VIII, 12, there is a use of Isa 40:3 and the notions of a "way" and the "wilderness" in respect of the Qumran community, but the text itself does not use a term for "exile", and so Fuller's reference to the "group's wilderness-exile" (218) is not established.

determine Luke's own understanding, and they in turn may not exegete Isa 40:3-5 in line with an "original literary setting".[129]

An initial doubt about an exilic construal of the "wilderness" might be prompted by the difficulty that the wilderness is that space *between* the Promised Land and the exiles. In the historical traditions of the people. Egypt was a place of "bondage"[130] and they journeyed through the wilderness to get to the Promised Land. The use of the motif of the "wilderness" for the place of exile or the state of exile is therefore not an unequivocal choice in reading. A clear example of this journeying concept of the wilderness is Isa 48:20-21,[131]

> Go forth from Babylon, flee from Chaldea, declare this with a shout of joy, proclaim it, send it forth to the end of the earth; say, "The Lord has redeemed his servant Jacob!" They thirsted not when he led them through the deserts (חרבה); he made water flow for them from the rock; he cleft the rock and the water gushed out. Isa 48:20-21

This historical allusion to the Exodus-Numbers wilderness journey is a clear precedent for the journey from Babylon. However, this is not the dominant notion of the "wilderness" in the oracles of Isaiah 40-66, and it is important to recognize the variety of notions in the text given that Luke is evidently very familiar with Isaiah and adept at deploying composite quotations.

H. Barstad has offered another proposal about Isa 40:3.[132] He acknowledges that the desert motif in Isaiah is commonly taken to be part of the

---

[129] *Restoration*, 212.
[130] Here we eschew equating Egypt with a place of "exile" since at this stage in their historical traditions, Israel was not a people that had been in the Land and who had then been exiled in Egypt.
[131] This is recognised by Goldingay who says, "In due course the idea of Israel's own journey through the wilderness will be more prominent, but here [Isaiah 40] more significance attaches to the idea of Yhwh's having left Jerusalem for the east and thus for the wilderness/steppe", *Message*, 18.
[132] Hans Barstad, *A Way in the Wilderness* (*JSS* Monographs 12: Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989).

expression of the return of the exiles through the desert from Babylon:[133] this return is taken to be a "new exodus". However, Barstad analyses some of the typical "new exodus" texts in Isaiah 40-55 and argues that they do not betray this story. His case is that Second Isaiah is not a Babylonian prophet, but one domiciled in Jerusalem.[134] He details evidence for this and interprets some occurrences of the wilderness metaphor in terms of the *land* of Judah. His conclusion in respect of Isa 40:3-5 is stated in this way:

> The language of Is 40:3-4 is through and through metaphorical. As so many of the metaphorical passages in Second Isaiah dealing with the wilderness and desert, also 40:3-4 should be regarded as poetical allusions to Yahweh's encroachment upon the course of history, resulting in a new and blossoming future for the Judean nation.[135]

Without drawing in a specific historical thesis about the date and provenance of Isaiah 40, our case against Fuller is that the story elements of

---

[133] Barstad, *Wilderness*, 5. For a review of scholarship relating to "new exodus" themes including that of Barstad, see Øystein Lund, *Way Metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55* (FAT 2.28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 4-19. Of those scholars that have been critical of the older "new exodus" reading, Lund comments, "all the scholars have noted that the earlier exegesis of the so-called 'Exodus passages' builds upon a concept of Exodus, desert wandering and homecoming that cannot be explicitly drawn out of the passages themselves", (20).

[134] A Syro-Judean domicile for Second Isaiah has been argued in recent research. For example see P. R. Davies, "God of Cyrus, God of Israel: Some Religio-Historical Reflections on Isaiah 40-55" in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed* (eds., J. Davies, G. Harvey and W. G. E. Watson; JSOTSup 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 207-225 (213-215); R. J. Coggins, "Do we still need Deutero-Isaiah?" *JSOT* 80 (1998): 77-92 (85); C. Seitz, *Zion's Final Destiny: the Development of the Book of Isaiah: a Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 205-207. In older scholarship, a non-Babylonian domicile was argued by C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928), 20-37 and J. D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 20-23. Barstad has detailed his case in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: 'Exilic' Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55* (Oslo: Novus Forlag, 1997), 23-33.

[135] Barstad, *Wilderness*, 20.

Isa 40:1-11 support Barstad's interpretation of a *Judean focus*. In development of this case, we can make the following arguments:

1) The oracle units of Isaiah 40:1-11 address Jerusalem and the cities of Judah (vv. 2, 9). Thus, the injunction of v. 2, "Speak" (דברו) implies that there is a requirement for an active speaking ministry *in* Jerusalem to preach a message of comfort. This ministry is complemented by the injunction to Zion herself to preach from a high mountain to the cities of Judah (v. 9).

The pattern in the historical and prophetic traditions is for the prophet who is called to be part of the society he addresses.[136] An ongoing ministry to Jerusalem and the cities of Judah implies therefore the presence of the prophet who authored these oracles in Judah.

In subsequent oracles, the ministry to Jerusalem and to the cities of Judah is associated with a "servant" and "messengers" (e.g. Isa 41:9; 42:6; 43:10; and 44:26). The message is one of restoration: Jerusalem is to be inhabited and the cities of Judah are to be rebuilt, but it is also a message that salvation has *already* occurred.[137]

2) Comfort is offered to Jerusalem, but there is evidently a work of restoration to be done in the land. It is in this connection that the motif of a "wilderness" is introduced and the natural suggestion therefore is that *the land* is pictured as a wilderness.

There are lexical links between Isa 40:9 and Isa 52:7-9 consisting of the "bringing of good news" (בשר), a mention of "Zion" (ציון), "Jerusalem" (ירושלם), "mountains" (הר), and "voices" (קול). Further, there are contextual links

---

[136] The classic statement of this principle is S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913), 237.
[137] Goldingay offers a typical response to this argument. He says, "The passage introduces us to a characteristic feature of the chapters: that they may outwardly speak to Jerusalem, to the nations, to Babylon in particular, or to Cyrus, but the actual recipient of each of the prophecies is the people in exile whose destiny is bound up with these...", *Message*, 14.

between Isa 52:7-9 and Isa 40:1-11 in the mention of "comfort" (נחם. Isa 40:1, 2), in the common theme of a declaration about God (Isa 40:9; 52:7. "Behold your God", "Your God reigneth") and in the presence of a number of speakers (Isa 40:1, 52:8—"watchmen").

With this common material between the oracles of Isa 52:7-9 and 40:1-11, it can be suggested that "the waste places of Jerusalem" of Isa 52:9 (חרבות ירושלם) is the "wilderness" (מדבר) of Isaiah 40. BDB defines[138] ציה as "dry ground" and it is associated with מדבר in texts such as Isa 51:3, "For the Lord shall comfort Zion: he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden...". The LXX also points to this association in that it uses ἔρημος for both words in Isa 40:3, 51:3 and 52:9.

Contrary to Fuller and Westermann, an intertextual reading of the literary context of Isa 40:3-5 suggests that the wilderness here is not the place or the fact of exile, nor the region through which the exiles would journey; rather, it is the land of Judah.

3) Other oracle units consistently support this reading. Thus Isa 41:17-20 asserts that rivers, springs and trees will flourish in the wilderness. Barstad asserts that "the description concerns the general restoration of the Judean people",[139] but turning the "desert" into a fertile land is also an apt figure of promise for agricultural and economic renewal (cf. Ps 107:33-35).

Isaiah 49:19 affirms,

> Surely your waste and your desolate places (חרבה/ἔρημος) and your devastated land — surely now you will be too narrow for your inhabitants, and those who swallowed you up will be far away. Isa 49:19

---

[138] BDB, 351; see also Goldingay's discussion, *Message*, 18.
[139] Barstad, *Wilderness*, 26.

This follows the promise that Yahweh would cause his people to inherit the "desolate heritages" (שמם/ἔρημος, Isa 49:8). The same term "desolate" (שמם/ἔρημος) is used of Jerusalem in the expression "children of the desolate" in Isa 54:1 (cf. Isa 62:4).

Isaiah 44:26 states,

> ...who confirms the word of his servant, and performs the counsel of his messengers; who says of Jerusalem, 'She shall be inhabited,' and of the cities of Judah, 'They shall be built, and I will raise up their ruins (חרבה/ἔρημος)'... Isa 44:26

These "ruins" (חרבה/ἔρημος) are again mentioned in Isa 58:12, which promises that the people will rebuild their ruins. Isaiah 64:10 states,

> Your holy cities have become a wilderness (מדבר/ἔρημος), Zion has become a wilderness, Jerusalem a desolation. Isa 64:10

Within the oracle units of Isaiah 61 (v. 4), there is a mention of the "waste places" (חרבה), which suggests that the focus of Luke's source (Isa 61:1-2a) is *the land* rather than exile. As we have noted, the story elements of Isa 61:1-2 reflect the aftermath of war and the need to release prisoners of war. The oracle addresses a local Judean situation rather than the geopolitics of a Babylonian exile.

We suggest therefore that the purpose of these "wilderness" oracles is to paint a picture of the restoration of the people and the land.[140]

4) The return of those in Babylon does not feature in the oracle of Isa 40:3-5. Moreover, as Barstad asserts, within the context of national restoration, the

---

[140] There is yet a further notion of "wilderness" in Isaiah 40-66—the wilderness of Kedar, a region south and east of Palestine (Isa 42:11: Ezek 27:21).

oracles of Isaiah 40-55 do not just describe the return of exiles from Babylon, "but from the whole Diaspora".[141] Barstad's point may be anachronistic in that the concept of a "Diaspora" may not be applicable to the oracles of Isaiah 40-66. However, this does not detract from the observation that these oracles presuppose a return from all points of the compass rather than one place (Isa 43:5; 49:12).[142]

The injunction in Isa 40:3 is arguably for the people to prepare a way for God so that *he* might come;[143] it is not a way for the people themselves to come from any exile. The "way" that they prepare might be one of reformation and renewal of faith towards God (cf. 1QS IX, 16-21). The injunction to "prepare" is reinforced in vv. 10-11, where it is said that the Lord God will come *against* the strong and feed and herd his flock. The picture is of a God who will come to the hills of Judah and who will herd the sheep upon the hills and defend them against the surrounding nations. This picture of God coming to the land is the image for Luke's Baptist to announce the coming of Jesus to the people. This contextualizes the "wilderness" to the hills of Judah and a "way" that the people are to prepare in that land. As such, it is a different "way" to that which Yahweh makes in another wilderness (מדבר/ἔρημος) for his people to return (Isa 42:16; 43:19-20).[144]

---

[141] Barstad, *Wilderness*, 19.

[142] This argument raises the methodological point as to whether an "exile" is from one land or from all points of the compass. Fuller, *Restoration*, 210. cites Luke 13:24-28 "the east and west, from the north and south" as if it is unexceptionable that a Diaspora is an exile. Pao, *New Exodus*, 42-43, cites *Pss. Sol.* 11:4-6 in support of an exilic reading as it quotes Isa 40:4, but here again the motif is of an east, west and north Diaspora rather than an exile; similarly, Bar 5:7 describes a return from east and west to Jerusalem, which is hardly evocative of just a Babylonian exile.

[143] Compare *1 En.* 1:4-6 in which God comes to Sinai with mountains and hills made low on the way; see Pao, *New Exodus*, 43.

[144] *Contra* Pao, *New Exodus*, 53 who equates the way of Isa 40:3 with Isa 43:16-19. The expression "the Way" can allude to the wilderness way, and this is different to the way in the Red Sea (Isa 51:10), and different again to the way that Yahweh comes upon to the cities of Judah in Isaiah. Pao's insights into the "new exodus" typology implicit in Isa 40:3 can be reconfigured to relate to a people *in the land*, and in this way his thesis that

We conclude therefore that insofar as Luke takes Isa 40:3-5 and Isa 61:1-2a into his story, and that story concerns *the land*, the "wilderness" in which John the Baptist delivers his message is the "wilderness" of the people in their land. This means that, contrary to Fuller, there is no "exilic-wilderness"[145] in John the Baptist's location—just a wilderness. There is no "exit from Israel into the wilderness"[146] when people go to John the Baptist: he is baptizing *in Judea*. There is no need to "enter the wilderness of John", rather Luke only deploys a motif of "entry" in relation to the kingdom (Luke 18:17, 24-25).

3.2.3.5 Jubilee Restoration

We have noted above that Isaiah 61 presents a picture of Israel's restoration in Jubilee terms, and our argument is that this motif, rather than a "new exodus" or "exilic" motif, is characteristic of Isaiah 61 and therefore Luke 4. The inclusion of Isa 58:6d with Isa 61:1-2a with the consequent repetition of ἄφεσις/release signals the Jubilee emphasis of Luke. Accordingly, we cannot agree with Fuller when he avers that Luke "gives priority to Isaiah 61 (and other OT passages) in envisioning Israel's release from exile and her apocalyptic restoration".[147] Isaiah 61 does not warrant the claim that the Lucan Jesus proclaims the "end of Israel's exile at Nazareth".[148]

The observation of a Jubilee motif in Isaiah is uncontroversial. The focus of the motif is upon the land and the people in the land and, as such, it is a typological pattern for Luke that stands independently of any new exodus or exilic typology that he may use elsewhere in his narrative. We will discuss Luke's Jubilee typology for restoration, a) in respect of its notion of

---

"the Way" functions as a polemical term of identity for the nascent Christian community is better served if exilic associations are excluded, see *New Exodus*, 37-69 (65).

[145] *Restoration*, 225; see also 228, 229, 236, 268. Here it is worth noting that much of what Fuller has to say about the wilderness *qua* wilderness is correct; our disagreement with him is the *exilic overtone* of his treatment.

[146] *Restoration*, 225.

[147] *Restoration*, 238.

[148] *Restoration*, 240.

"release"; b) with regard to the mention of the "opening of the eyes": and c) in relation to the "poor and the downtrodden".

3.2.3.5.1 Jubilee Release

The Jubilee legislation was concerned with social justice in respect of land ownership and inheritance, and in respect of slavery and possessions (Lev 25:10-55). The justification for the law was the exodus and redemption of the people from Egypt and the gift to them of the land of Canaan (Lev 25:38, 42, 55).[149] The two emphases of the legislation are the release of indentured servants and a restoration of the land to the family.

The Jubilee legislation is used metaphorically in Isaiah 61, and the principal aspect chosen is "release" (דרור/ἄφεσις, Lev 25:10; Isa 61:1). The restoration of land *to* the family is not overtly picked up in Isaiah 61, although it is important to note that a different notion of restoration is used in Isa 61:4, "they shall build up the ancient ruins, they shall raise up the former devastations". The restoration of property *to* a family inherent in the Jubilee legislation concerns rights of ownership; the restoration *of* an infrastructure is concerned with cities, towns, villages, roads, boundaries, *and so on*;[150] Leviticus is concerned with possession of the land.

Nevertheless, there may be an echo of the Jubilee motif of *giving the land back* in the presupposition that an enemy has been removed from the land and it has been returned to the people (v. 7). The oracle units in Isaiah 61 continue the Jubilee theme in that the provision of "food" is promised in the commitment, "you shall eat the wealth of the nations" (v. 6, cf. Lev 25:12): a key aspect of the Jubilee legislation was the provision of abundant food to allow the land to lie fallow for three years. This increase may also be reflected in the promise of "double" (משנה, v. 7) in the land, however, the LXX interprets this as οὕτως ἐκ δευτέρας κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν.

---

149 M. Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 241-244. For an overview see C. J. H. Wright, "Year of Jubilee", *ABD*, 3:1025-1030.

150 The two notions are respectively "restoration *to* *x*" and "restoration *of* *x*".

The metaphorical use of the Jubilee motif in Isaiah is secured by the collocation of שבה/αἰχμάλωτος with דרור/ἄφεσις.[151] The distinctive Jubilee word דרור is used with שבה, but this latter word is not a word for indentured servants but rather "captives" or "prisoners of war". We might define דרור/ἄφεσις as "release from oppressive conditions",[152] but the usage of the term with שבה/αἰχμάλωτος narrows the choice to the release of "captives",[153] especially when we take into account the other indicators of the aftermath of military conflict in the context of Isaiah 61. The focus of the oracle is therefore not the literal release of debts as required by the Jubilee legislation.[154]

There is some dissonance between Isaiah 61 and Luke's account of Jesus' ministry. G. J. Brooke asks, "if Isaiah 61:1-2 is designed to be programmatic for Jesus' ministry as depicted in Luke, then one can justifiably ask at what point Jesus may be considered to release prisoners";[155] his question is rhetorical. The dissonance exists because of the contrast with Isaiah's post-conflict context for the liberation of prisoners and Luke's account.

The interpretive issue involves metaphor. As A. Gibson notes, "Metaphor is (roughly) the transference of an expression from one semantic domain to another, which involves the preservation of words but a change in their value(s)".[156] While the semantic domain of ἄφεσις in Isaiah and the LXX may imply that the word collocated with αἰχμαλώτοις "could only mean the sort of 'freedom' or 'liberty' one grants to prisoners",[157] when the word is

---

[151] Another indication of the metaphorical application of the Jubilee legislation is the reference to "eating the wealth of nations".
[152] *Power*, 223; BDB, 204.
[153] BDB, 985. See Num 21:29; Esth 2:6; Job 12:17, 19; Amos 6:7; 7:11, 17; Nah 3:10; Isa 5:13; 14:2; 46:2; Ezek 12:4; 30:18.
[154] *Contra* Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66*, 367.
[155] *Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 84.
[156] *Biblical Semantic Logic*, 27; see also Caird, *Language*, ch. 8, and Turner and Cotterell, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 299-302, for general discussion.
[157] Turner, *Power*, 223.

transferred to Luke-Acts, the question of semantic value needs to addressed afresh.

Asher Finkel goes behind the Jubilee metaphor in Isaiah 61 to the Jubilee legislation of Leviticus 25 in order to argue that Jesus' synagogue address "announced a Sabbatical time with its Pentateuchal demands to convert the feudal society to a community sharing with the poor",[158] and that therefore "Luke presents teaching of Jesus on the kingdom with reference to selling properties, sharing with the poor, renewal and release of both men and women from *mammon* and abhorrence of arrogance".[159] This interprets Jesus' Isaianic release in metaphorical terms. In a similar vein, J. B. Green suggests that the release of prisoners in Luke's story might refer to indebted prisoners.[160] Finkel's proposal handles the dissonance with Isaiah 61 by bringing its Jubilee metaphor back into the literal domain for Luke by describing the social and economic aspects of Jesus' appeal to the people.

In this connection, a metaphorical alternative needs to be canvassed. It is possible that Luke saw in the Isaianic text a typology about forgiveness.[161] The release of captives (Isa 61:1), or the release of slaves (Isa 58:6), could translate as figures of corporate forgiveness in Luke's presentation of Jesus' preaching. Luke's use of ἄφεσις elsewhere in Luke-Acts is always with ἁμαρτία (Luke 1:77; 3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18). Collocated with αἰχμάλωτος in Isaiah 61, the sense of ἄφεσις is "release from oppressive conditions", as Turner notes,[162] but this does not exclude a reader seeing a typology in that eschatological act, one that is suggested

---

[158] "Jesus' Preaching to the Synagogue", 337.

[159] "Jesus' Preaching to the Synagogue", 338.

[160] Green, *Luke*, 212; see also J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (2nd ed.; AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 532.

[161] For example, see Menzies, *Development*, 168; Marshall, *Luke*, 184; Green, *Luke*, 211-212; and C. H. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1982), 55. Turner, *Power*, 222, notes that this is a common proposal.

[162] *Power*, 223. Turner's definition is a little abstract; the usage of the term in the LXX suggests "captives" in Isa 61:1 when we take into account the other indicators of the aftermath of military conflict.

through association of ἄφεσις with ἁμαρτία.[163] In this respect, we can ask whether "it is unlikely a native Greek speaker would perceive any direct connection between the sort of 'release' envisaged in the Isaianic oracles and 'forgiveness of sins'—at least not on the basis of the common word ἄφεσις".[164]

The evaluation of this question depends on the effect that Luke-Acts *itself* has upon the reader's perceptions about ἄφεσις. Turner observes, "We need not doubt that a New Testament writer might use the whole clause ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει ('to set the oppressed at liberty') metaphorically as a referring expression for forgiveness—if he viewed sin as an oppressive power from which humans needed release...".[165] It is because Turner thinks Luke does not regard sin as an enslaving power that he is not using ἄφεσις from Isaiah 58 and 61 to connote forgiveness.

However, Turner's argument is not enough to secure his conclusion. The claim that ἄφεσις from Isaiah 58 and 61 is part of a metaphorical use of the Isaianic oracle for forgiveness requires that the source semantics be respected. However, even if we suppose that there is an absence of material in Luke-Acts regarding "sin" as an enslaving power, this is not the only way in which Luke might indicate a metaphorical development of ἄφεσις from Isaiah 58 and 61.

Luke has already trailed ἄφεσις in relation to corporate Israel in Luke 1:77 and 3:3. The forgiveness of sins is offered within the Mosaic typology of God "visiting" the people (Luke 1:68, 78, ἐπισκέπτομαι; Exod 3:16, פקד/ἐπισκοπῇ). This visitation was to release them from bondage in Egypt.[166] This corporate notion of forgiveness can direct a reader towards a metaphorical

---

[163] Menzies, *Development*, 171-173, also follows our emphasis, and here we oppose Turner, *Power*, 223-224. The figure of "bondage" and a corresponding "freedom" is common in early church writing, e.g. Rom 8:15; Gal 4:3; Heb 2:15; 2 Pet 2:19.

[164] Turner, *Power*, 223.

[165] *Power*, 223, n. 27.

[166] Marshall, *Luke*, 90.

understanding of ἄφεσις in terms of forgiveness of sins if there is dissonance with more literal readings.[167]

M. Weinfield has offered a further argument. He states that "The freedom proclaimed on the Day of Atonement (Lev 25:10) underwent a process of spiritual metamorphosis during the second temple period".[168] His argument is that the symbology of the Day of Atonement *influenced* symbolic interpretation of the Jubilee legislation:

1) Philo in *Congr.* 107-108, referring to the Day of Atonement upon which Jubilee commences he says, "This is remission (ἄφεσις) and deliverance, this is complete freedom of the soul" and hence the soul "rises up to return to the lot which it formerly received". Philo thus typically regards the number 10 (the tenth of Tishrei) to be symbolic of "the remission of debts, and the return to the ancient allotments of property at the end of every fifty years" (*Congr.* 89). He also imputes symbolic significance to the number 50 (the Jubilee year) by saying it "proclaims remission (ἄφεσις) of offenses and perfect liberty and a return to their ancient possessions" (*Det.* 63).

Philo associates the notion of release and forgiveness implicit in the Day of Atonement with the Jubilee and its "release" of indentured servants to return to their ancient possessions.

2) In 11QMelch 2, 6 a symbolic significance is given to the eschatological Jubilee release: "And liberty (דרור) will be proclaimed for them, to free them from [the debt of] all their iniquities". 11QMelch interweaves texts from Leviticus 25, Deuteronomy 15 and Isaiah 61 to describe the end-time which comes during the tenth Jubilee.[169] Sekki notes that 11QMelch is the only

---

[167] *Contra* Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us*, 136-137, who interprets the "release of captives" to refer to the ingathering of exiles in Acts; Luke's Mosaic typology of "visitation" supports a metaphorical construal of "captives"; see Bock, *Luke*, 1:409.

[168] M. Weinfield, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 227-231 (227).

[169] See also 4Q521 Frags. 2, II, 12.

sectarian text to associate משח with רוח in denoting a future deliverer.[170] Weinfield's conclusion is that "Such an exegesis of Isa. 61:1-3 must have lain in the background of Lk. 4:16-19, in which Jesus sees himself as bearing to the reader news of freedom and grace from the Lord".[171]

3.2.3.5.2 Opening the Eyes

The MT has the difficult expression לאסורים פקח קוח, which the LXX has interpreted as τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. The Qal participle of אסר is straightforward giving the sense of "prisoners",[172] but the idiom פקח קוח is unclear. The verb פקח means "open"[173] and is often used with the common Hebrew for "eyes" (עין, e.g. Isa 42:7), but קוח is hapax. Childs notes[174] that there might be a textual error due to dittography which is possible because of the two shared consonants. Otherwise, he notes that the text is a rare verbal form. Motyer offers[175] the suggestion that is a reduplicated noun meaning "wide-opening" but with no comparative linguistics. Westermann offers no comment and represents the *hapax* with a lacuna in his translation.[176]

The Hebrew for "prisoners" is unrepresented in the LXX unless it has been taken as a figure of speech for "the blind". In any event, the LXX seems to follow the lead of the verb פקח and supplied τυφλοῖς as its natural complement.[177] Luke follows the LXX, and the question is whether he takes his Isaiah text to be metaphorical or literal.

The pneumatological intertexts of Isa 61:1-2a (Isa 11:2; 42:1; 59:21) include the notion of power (Isa 11:2), but this pertains to the powers exercised in messianic leadership rather than the power implicit in healing. However,

---

[170] *Ruah*, 82.
[171] *Normative and Sectarian Judaism*, 229.
[172] BDB, 63.
[173] BDB, 824.
[174] *Isaiah*, 501.
[175] *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 500.
[176] *Isaiah 40-66*, 364.
[177] R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint* (2 vols: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), 1:369, notes that אסר and פקח occur in consecutive clauses in Ps 146:7-8.

the restoration intertexts of Isa 61:1-2a include an implication of healing that coheres with the mention of τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. Thus, Luke's summary of Jesus' healing ministry in his response to John the Baptist (Luke 7:22) includes restoration motifs of "seeing and hearing" (Isa 29:18; 32:3), "the blind" (Isa 35:5; 42:7; 61:1), "the lame" (Isa 35:6), "the deaf" (Isa 29:18; 35:5), and the "poor" (Isa 29:19; 58:7; 61:1). Furthermore, Luke describes the reaction of the people to Jesus' raising the dead as acknowledging that a great prophet had risen among them (Luke 7:16). On this basis it is possible that Luke's conjunction of δύναμις and πνεῦμα is epexegetical[178] (Luke 4:14; Acts 10:38),[179] and the citation of τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν is designed to validate in a programmatic way Jesus' ministry of healing.

In this connection, Turner cites 4Q521 and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (e.g. *T. Zeb.* 8.8) as evidence of contemporary Jewish understanding that the messianic liberation of Israel involved healing and exorcism; however, he concedes that the texts do not attribute exorcism "specifically to *the Spirit* upon the messiah".[180] Turner notes the evidence of Isa 29:17-21 and 35:1-10 in connecting the messiah and healing[181] and states that the paucity of textual evidence in Luke's literary co-text for a direct link between possession of the Spirit and healing miracles "should not be over-pressed".[182] This leaves early Christian writings as evidence that a direct connection between the Spirit and healing was being made (e.g. Matt 12:28; 1 Cor 12:9-10), but such evidence does not settle Luke's perspective.

The Nazareth pericope goes on to record Jesus' citation of Elijah and Elisha and their respective nature and healing miracles for foreigners. This is set up as Jesus' response to the audience's jibe of "Physician, heal thyself"

---

[178] For a discussion of the epexegetical or adverbial καί, see J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (4 vols; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963), 3:335-336.

[179] It is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the nature of the "miracles" of healing and exorcism. For an introduction, see J. M. Hull. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1974).

[180] *Power*, 252.

[181] *Power*, 251.

[182] *Power*, 251.

(ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν, Luke 4:23), which suggests their understanding of Jesus' role as a healer. Jesus' mention of Elijah and Elisha is aimed at bolstering his claim to be a prophet (Luke 4:24), but such a role is announced by him in his opening assertion that the Spirit of the Lord was upon him "to preach the gospel" (Luke 4:18). In this associative detail, Luke gives ample grounds for connecting Jesus' healing ministry to his possession of the Spirit.

This association is strengthened by Luke's allusion to Isa 32:15 in Luke 24:49, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν, where he has used δύναμις for πνεῦμα. The association is also supported by the speech that Luke records for Peter in Acts 10:35-38. Turner shows that this speech alludes to Luke 4:16-30 and that ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει interprets Jesus' anointing as empowerment.[183]

The only countervailing text to this line of argument is Luke 11:20 where Luke chooses the expression, εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια rather than an alternative such as the Matthean, εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια. Scholars such as Schweizer and Menzies have argued that this choice shows that Luke disassociated "the Spirit" from exorcism, preferring instead to structure his narrative with the notion of δύναμις. Turner's response[184] to this argument is to assert that Luke's choice may be made in order to reflect a mosaic christology based on the allusion inherent in δακτύλῳ θεοῦ (Exod 8:15).

Turner's argument neutralizes the position of Schweizer and Menzies and makes the issue of interpretation undecideable. It is possible however to strengthen his argument with a proposal that Luke is deploying a Davidic typology in the parabolic sayings around Luke 11:20. Turner offers the common suggestion that δακτύλῳ θεοῦ is a Mosaic allusion, but the allusion is isolated in its context. A stronger case against Schweizer and Menzies could

---

183 *Power*, 262.
184 *Power*, 259.

be made if it could be shown that Luke's choice of δακτύλῳ θεοῦ was part of a typology involving the parabolic sayings in the context.

Jesus' sayings follow the sequence: divided kingdom, divided house, and a divided Satan (Luke 11:17-18). In the Matthean version, Satan casts out Satan and is divided against himself (Matt 12:26), and in the Markan version Satan "rises up" against Satan (Mark 3:26). This language is the language of thrones, accession and coups. Jewish historical traditions include a record of the division of the nation.

The kingdom was divided or "rent apart" (1 Kgs 11:31), the house of Jacob was divided into the "house of Joseph" and "house of Judah" (1 Kgs 11:28; 12:21). This happened because Jeroboam "rose up" against Rehoboam (ἀνίστημι, 2 Chron 13:6; Mark 3:26). Jesus could well be applying his sayings obliquely to the Jewish authorities that were arraigned against him. The remedy for a divided kingdom was a Davidic king and a restoration of the undivided kingdom of Israel, and Luke has advertised this future for Jesus (Luke 1:33). In this typological context, Jesus' mention of a "gathering" to him (Luke 12:23) reflects the gathering of the two tribal groups to Jeroboam and Rehoboam (2 Chron 11:1; 13:7). Those who were not with Jesus "scattered" the people, and these were the false shepherds that scattered the sheep (Luke 12:23; Jer 21:1-2; Ezek 34:6, 12).

In choosing these comparisons, Jesus has focused his opponents' attention on *their* history, and in this way he is making them into owners of a divided kingdom and in need of the king from David. They had inherited the spirit of Jeroboam's apostasy in wanting to be divided from the Davidic Messiah. Their leadership was like the false priesthood of Jeroboam and the associated idols. This state of affairs was being confronted by Jesus in the casting out of demons by the finger of God.

Jesus' ministry of healing is therefore likely anticipated in τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν. Luke's use of Isaiah therefore does not warrant the conclusion that Jesus'

empowerment was *only* related to preaching.[185] However, this literal aspect does not exclude a metaphorical sense being inferred from τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν.[186] This sense is motivated by the metaphor of "forgiveness" implicit in the "release of captives" which we have argued, but it is also suggested in Paul's speech before Agrippa (Acts 26:18). Here Luke's Paul quotes the Isaianic motif of "opening of the eyes" from Isa 42:7 in connection with the "forgiveness of sins". Luke affirms that those whose eyes are opened are delivered from "darkness" and this picks up on the detail in Isa 42:7 about prisoners sitting in darkness. Luke's application of Isa 42:7 to the Gentiles therefore suggests a metaphorical use of "opening of the eyes" and the "release of prisoners" in his reading of Isaiah. As Green notes, recovery of sight in Luke's narrative is a metaphor for "receiving revelation and experiencing salvation and inclusion in God's family".[187]

3.2.3.5.3 The Poor and the Downtrodden

The audience for Jesus' preaching consists of the "poor" (πτωχός, עני, Isa 61:1) and the "downtrodden" (θραύω, רצץ, Isa 58:6d). Wenk notes that scholars have interpreted the "poor" and "downtrodden" in both metaphorical and literal terms.[188]

The semantic range of רצץ embraces social and economic oppression (Amos 4:1), and the context of Isa 58:6 would indicate this application.[189] However, θραύω carries a broader semantic range that includes the "breaking" and

---

[185] As argued by Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:407, and Menzies, *Development*, 125-126, 160.

[186] Marshall, *Luke*, 184, refers to this as an "undertone"; see also Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us*, 135.

[187] Green, *Luke*, 211. L. T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5: Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 437, states, "The language of transference from darkness to light fits the context of religious conversion". Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 211, cites *Jos. Asen.* 8:9 as another example of the motif.

[188] *Community-Forming Power*, 211-214. For an overview of the theme of "poor" and "rich" in Luke-Acts, see R. J. Karris, "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben" in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed., C. H. Talbert; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978), 112-125.

[189] BDB, 954, includes "crush", "break" within its semantic range.

"striking"[190] of enemies (e.g. Isa 2:10; 2 Macc 15:16) as well as contributing to the metaphor of a "broken spirit" (e.g. Ezek 21:12. 20; 2 Macc 9:11). The semantic range of עני embraces notions of humility as well as those in poverty (e.g. Num 12:3, Amos 8:4),[191] and πτωχός is indicative of poverty and destitution.[192]

The presence of συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ in Luke's quotation would indicate a socio-economically disadvantaged group who are broken in spirit. Luke's use of πτωχός elsewhere in his gospel indicates that those suffering poverty are a focus of Jesus' concern (Luke 6:20; 14:13, 21; 16:20; 19:8; 21:3), but this does not exclude the possibility that "the poor" in the Nazareth address are "the people" as a whole or that the "the poor" is also a symbolic designation in some sense.[193] Luke's programmatic address offers a *message* to the poor rather than social and economic action and this is borne out in his narrative.[194]

Wenk observes, "Any attempt to restrict the 'poor' to any of the above categories falls short of Luke's wide-ranging portrayal of the recipients of the good news".[195] Accordingly, he identifies the poor by extension in the narrative episodes between Luke 4:16-30 and 7:22, and on this basis he takes the term to embrace all levels of society. Wenk's analysis can be accepted, and for our purposes we can note one aspect of Wenk's elaboration of Jesus' ministry, viz. his deliverance of those who were in bondage to demonic affliction.[196] The association of demonic affliction with a metaphor

---

[190] LS, 369.
[191] BDB, 776.
[192] L&N, 57.53; LS, 709.
[193] Bock, *Luke*, 1:408 centres the symbolic and spiritual sense of "the poor" in Luke 6:23. Green, *Luke*, 210-211, adds to the literal and symbolic meanings of "the poor", taking the term to embrace social and economic conditions as well as the situation of those who outside the boundaries of God's people.
[194] Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us*, 134.
[195] *Community-Forming Power*, 214.
[196] *Community-Forming Power*, 214, 216; cf. Turner, *Power*, 214.

of deliverance complements the over-arching deliverance from the wrath to come announced in John the Baptist's mission.[197]

3.2.4 Dissonance

While Isaiah 61 is a comprehensive restoration oracle with an application in the aftermath of military conflict, Luke's application has no such setting. We have already noted that there is a measure of dissonance with the oracle and this raises the question of the nature of Luke's "revisionary" usage. The dissonance is broader once the larger reading context of Isaiah 61 is taken into account, since that context bespeaks a national restoration.

There are several theoretical models which could handle this dissonance. One model would be that Luke has no contextual agenda; his selected text from Isaiah 61 is a bestowal prophecy which fits his purpose of validating Jesus' empowerment. This "proof-text" model does not cohere with Luke's own use of national restoration motifs in Luke 1 and 2 and we will not discuss it further.

Another model would be to interpret Luke's understanding of Israel's restoration solely in non-material and non-national terms. This model would offer a characterization of restoration in societal and individual terms in relation to the Christian movement. Such a model would still be political insofar as it recognized that the early church sought to engage wider society and came into conflict with the authorities.

---

[197] The two notions of deliverance are partly brought together in the political and symbolic analysis of demonic affliction by scholars such as P. W. Hollenbach, "Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities: A Socio-Historical Study" *JAAR* 49 (1981): 567-588; J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: Harper Collins, 1992), 313-20; and R. A. Horsley, *Jesus and Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 99-103, However, cautionary notes about this kind of analysis have been sounded by S. L. Davis, *Jesus the Healer* (London: SCM Press, 1995), ch. 6, and S. Guijarro, "The Politics of Exorcism" in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds., W. Stegemann, B. J. Malina and G. Theissen; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 117-133.

A third model would retain a national and material perspective for Luke but argue that his story in the gospel shows that such restoration hopes were unrealized. Instead, he saw *elements* of the restoration demonstrated in Jesus' ministry and in the development of the early church. However, any national aspirations are related by him to the time "for establishing (ἀποκατάστασις) all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Acts 3:21). It is this third model that we will defend.

Luke delimits the national and material scope of the Isaianic oracle in several ways:

1) The restoration motifs of the prophecy (Isa 61:4, בנה, קום/οἰκοδομέω, καινίζω) suggest a messianic age. If there is a place in Luke's scheme of salvation-history for this *national kind* of reconstruction it is *after* the return of Jesus, when it will be time for the ἀποκατάστασις of all things spoken by prophets (Acts 3:21).[198] This principle implies that Luke is aware of prophetic material that is *irrelevant* to his story. Hence, in respect of Isaiah 61, Luke applies the proclamation motifs of the oracle to Jesus' ministry, but he does not include the expression καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως (Isa 61:2; 58:18), which would import a note of vengeance into Jesus' ministry.[199]

Accordingly, Luke includes several pointers in his narrative that restricts the reader's expectations vis-à-vis the restoration of Israel. For example, the disciples express continuing *hope* for the restoration of Israel (Luke 24:21, cf. 2:25), and Luke excludes immediate restoration from the expectation of the reader (Acts 1:6-7) just after reiterating the baptismal promise of the Spirit.[200] Further, he retains many unfulfilled predictions relating to the coming of the Son of Man which pertain to restoration (e.g. Luke 9:26; 21:27).

---

198 We discuss this text more fully in the next chapter.

199 Another example of selective use that excludes national restoration motifs is Isa 49:6. Luke uses the theme of "light to the Gentiles" (Luke 2:32; Acts 13:47; 26:23) rather than the theme of "raising up the tribes of Jacob" or "restoring the kept [i.e. the survivors] of Israel".

200 Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 133.

2) Scholars make the point that the Nazareth pericope is a paradigmatic illustration of the rejection of Jesus.[201] Jesus' own reported speech is that "no prophet is accepted in his own country" (Luke 4:24). This detail is consistent with a prophetic reading of the Isaianic bestowal as a commission of proclamation, but incongruous if Luke is advertising the commencement of a programme of national restoration vis-à-vis Israel.

Luke includes a prominent theme of rejection of the Spirit-led witness to the Gospel on the part of many Jews, and this is said to lead to a desolation of the nation. This theme of rejection (ἀντιλέγω) and desolation (πτῶσις) is programmatically announced by Simeon (Luke 2:34, cf. Matt 7:27), and reflected in a number of pericopae throughout Luke-Acts (e.g. rejection: Acts 13:45; 28:19; desolation: Luke 3:33-35; 19:28-39; 19:42-44; 20:17-28). This division[202] of Israel suggests that Luke does not utilize material "restoration" motifs from Isaiah.

3) In terms of the structure of the narrative plot, Luke interposes several devices before any prospect of national restoration, including proclamation of deliverance, the death and resurrection of Jesus, a forthcoming calamity, and a coming again of the Son of Man.

i) Luke includes several pointers to a *forthcoming* deliverance. For example, he ascribes an expectation of "deliverance in Jerusalem" to Hannah (Luke 2:38). He gives expression to national hopes of "liberation" through Zechariah (Luke 1:68-71). He presents the Baptist's message as one of "escape" and the good news as one of "deliverance" from such wrath (Luke 3:3-9; cf. 5:32; 7:50; 9:24, 56; 19:9-10). This deliverance is predicated upon the acceptance of a message, a baptism of repentance (Luke 3:3, 8). And the message of salvation/deliverance is continued in Acts, through Stephen's Mosaic typology (Acts 7:24-25), and through preaching (Acts 4:12; 13:26, 47;

---

201 Marshall, *Luke*, 279.

202 See J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press. 1972), 44-49.

16:17). In short, the continuing story-line of a message of salvation implies a "sequel" of an actual deliverance.

ii) The forthcoming calamity that Luke specifies is the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (Luke 13:35; 19:43-44; 21:24), and Luke ties this happening to the coming of the Son of Man with power and great glory (Luke 21:24-27). Exactly *what* the Son of Man will do to bring about "power and great glory" is not specified by Luke.

iii) The predicted sequence in Luke is that the Son of Man is rejected first (Luke 17:25; 18:31-33), and then there follows a catastrophe comparable to the Flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Luke 17:26-30). The coming again of the Son of Man "in glory" follows this calamity and is associated with the coming of the kingdom of God (Luke 9:26), with rule assigned to his "servants" (Luke 12:43-44; 22:16; 29-30); this coming also involves "vengeance" (Luke 18:7-8; 20:16; 21:22).

4) We noted above that Isaiah 61 *presupposes* deliverance and an aftermath of war as the framework for its restoration message; it also includes a note of vengeance. J. A. Sanders has shown how the motif of vengeance in Isa 61:2a is important in the Qumran materials.[203] Luke's story has these ingredients in prospect, and this suggests that Luke would have used Isa 61:1-2a to legitimate Jesus' proclamation of a forthcoming deliverance. The deliverance of Zion presupposed[204] in Isaiah 61 therefore becomes an *anticipated* deliverance of Zion by the Son of Man. It is unlikely therefore that he uses Isaiah 61 to signal an *initiation* of a national restoration commencing with Jesus' ministry.

---

[203] Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4", 54-57.

[204] The notion here is not one that has to do with an historical event of deliverance. Rather, the "actual" deliverance and aftermath of war is a story-construct of the oracle.

3.2.4.1 Elements of Restoration

The nature of Luke's revisionary usage of Isaiah 61 is to select elements that apply to the ministry of Jesus. Motyer aptly observes that "what Isaiah sees as a double-faceted ministry the Lord Jesus apportions respectively to his first and second comings, the work of the Servant and of the Anointed Conqueror".[205] Motyer's conservative outlook can be translated into a statement of Lucan theology: Luke is apportioning elements of the Isaianic restoration respectively to Jesus' ministry, the apostolic preaching, and the return of Jesus.

A selection of elements and reconfiguration is shown at the start of Luke's gospel in his description of the work of John the Baptist. He evokes Mal 4:6 and the "turning" (ἀποκαθιστάνω) work of Elijah in Luke 1:16-17. However, while the LXX uses ἀποκαθιστάνω to describe this work, Luke uses ἐπιστρέφω and reserves ἀποκαθιστάνω for the disciples' question about the restoration of Israel (Acts 1:6).[206] In this way restoration (ἀποκαθιστάνω) is narrowed in Luke to a turning (ἐπιστρέφω) of the heart.[207]

The programmatic use of Isa 61:1-2a introduces the element of liberation[208] and the proclamation of that freedom. As the prophetic material continues the story, a work of national and material restoration is predicted to follow the release (Isa 61:4, בנו/οἰκοδομήσουσιν), but Luke does not take on board this aspect in his narrative, postponing it to beyond the time of the apostles (Acts 1:6).

---

[205] *Prophecy of Isaiah*, 500.

[206] R. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKKNT 5; 2 vols; Zurich: Benziger, 1986), 1:156, notes this connection between the expectation of Elijah and the restoration of Israel in relation to Acts 1:6 and 3:21, a connection we consider further in the next chapter.

[207] The distinction is illustrated in Jer 15:19, "If you return (ἐπιστρέφω), I will restore (ἀποκαθιστάνω) you".

[208] It is worth noting an irony here: when Jesus proclaims liberation in Nazareth, John the Baptist is in prison (Luke 3:20), and he is still in prison when Jesus sends his Isaianic message of liberation to John about his ministry (Luke 7:19-23; 9:7-9).

Luke's selection of elements extends to the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles[209] (Isa 42:6; 49:6; 61:9, 11; Luke 2:32; Acts 13:47; 26:23), but this element is an *integral* part of Isaiah's restoration oracles in which the nations are i) subdued (Isa 41:2; 60:12; 64:2); ii) judged and called to account (Isa 42:1; 43:9); iii) offer obeisance (Isa 49:7); iv) make a pilgrimage to Zion (Isa 49:22; 55:5; 60:3; 66:18); v) supply economic wealth (Isa 60:6, 16; 61:6; 66:20); and vi) offer military help to Judah (Isa 60:5, 11). These other elements do not overtly feature on Luke's account and his narrative therefore shows a selection of restoration motifs. Luke is selectively applying the multi-faceted restoration of Isaiah to his story.

In the Prophets, "restoration" oracles are the counterpoint to the Assyrian and Babylonian destructions and consequent deportation and exile. They may range over several elements and include i) the temple (Isa 60:7, 13; 61:6; 66:21, 23; Jer 27:27); ii) the Davidic monarchy (Isa 55:4; 61:1-3; Jer 23:5-6; 33:15-17, 21-22); iii) reunification (Isa 49:6; Jer 50:19); iv) the conditions of economic and social well-being (Isa 51:3; 55:13; 61:4-5; 65:10, 21; Jer 30:17; 32:15, 41; 33:12-13); v) social order and justice (Isa 60:18; 61:8; 62:1; 65:22-23; Jer 30:19-20); vi) the proclamation of the Law and righteousness from Zion (Isa 62:1; Jer 30:19; 33:11); and vii) the rebuilding of Jerusalem (Isa 60:14; 62:7, 12; 65:17-18; 66:10-13; Jer 30:18; 31:38-40; 32:37; 33:16). Restoration on all these levels leads to restoration of the body of the nation, and it is associated with the repentance of the people (Isa 55:7; Jer 15:19).[210]

---

[209] We discuss this aspect in the next chapter in relation to Pentecost; here we should ask why the Lucan Jesus does not extend his preaching to Gentiles during his ministry given its evident legitimacy in Isaianic restoration oracles and its adumbration in Luke 2:32.

[210] For an introduction to restoration material in the Prophets see Konrad Schmid and Odil Hannes Steck, "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition" in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed., J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), 41-81. Schmid and Steck offer both a synchronic and diachronic overview, and for our purposes it is sufficient to note their synchronic reading. They summarise the leading themes of restoration prophecies under the phrases, *limited time for judgment, the breaking of the power of the nations, the inclusion of the nations in salvation, the establishment of the people in the*

The question raised by this kind of complexity and Luke's selection of elements from Isaiah 58 and 61 is whether the *inauguration*[211] of the "restoration of Israel" has commenced in the ministry of John the Baptist and Jesus. This requires an historical judgment and the factors to weigh in favour of and against such a judgment are, on the one hand. the bestowal of the Spirit, the universal proclamation of the gospel, and the healing ministry, and on the other hand, the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem and scattering of the people.

Our proposal is that Luke's Jesus does not inaugurate the restoration of Israel, so much as proclaims and demonstrates its character;[212] he effects the deliverance of those who respond to his message, and this deliverance is the precondition for the work of restoration, but the full restoration lies beyond the apostolic preaching.

4. Conclusion

An old debate lies in the background of our discussion: is Luke's scheme of salvation a realized or futurist eschatology, and is the future aspect imminent or delayed?[213] Such a debate is complex and extensive; it ranges over Luke's entire gospel. In respect of our one text, Isaiah 61, we have argued that Jesus' reception of the Spirit is part of the same eschatological bestowal prophesied by Joel. In the case of Luke's use of Isaiah, his story

---

land, the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple, the restoration of institutions, the restoration of the monarchy, agricultural renewal and self-sufficiency, the separation of the wicked in Israel from the faithful. and *the proximity of the realisation of restoration.*

[211] Turner affirms that Jesus' preaching and teaching "challenged Israel to participate in the restoration God's reign was inaugurating", *Power*, 230: Pao states that Acts 1:8 "confirms the beginning of the process of the restoration of Israel", *New Exodus*, 95-96.

[212] Cf. Fuller, *Restoration*, 248.

[213] For a review of this debate see B. D. Chilton, "Introduction", in *The Kingdom of God* (ed., B. D. Chilton; London: SPCK, 1984), 1-26. D. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 93-98, has a recent discussion relating specifically to Luke-Acts. For a position close to our own, see R. H. Fuller, *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1954), ch. 2.

narrative does not incorporate all the restoration elements of Isaiah 61. Thus, an essentially coherent and contiguous oracle relating to the spirit-driven eschatological restoration of Israel is *fractured* in Luke's story by the death and resurrection of the anointed deliverer and the forthcoming destruction of the nation. However, Luke's story-material relating to the return of Jesus holds the promise of the fulfillment of Israel's national aspirations.

CHAPTER FIVE
The Bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost

1. Introduction

Scholars have argued that the account of Pentecost is foundational for an understanding of Acts. First, Luke trails Pentecost extensively from John the Baptist's prophecy (Luke 3:16), by way of narrative promises (Luke 11:13; 24:49), up until the ascension (Acts 1:5, 8). Secondly, he echoes the language of Pentecost in subsequent manifestations of the Spirit throughout Acts (Acts 4:31; 8:14-17; 10:44-47; 11:15-17; 19:1-6).[1] And finally, themes enunciated in the description of the event and in Peter's speech reverberate throughout the book.

In this chapter we consider Luke's use of typology in relation to the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost; again, our focus is intertextual rather than source-critical[2] or redactional.[3] We first examine the intertextuality of the theophanic detail (Acts 2:1-4) and the character of the speech acts (Acts 2:5-13). In this connection we will discuss whether this detail illustrates a Sinai typology and argue that it presents a typology based upon Isaiah's Call Narrative (Isaiah 6).

We will then consider how the anticipations of the Spirit in the Gospel (Luke 3:16; 24:49) prepare the reader for the understanding of Pentecost. In particular, our concern is to show how Luke's use of Jewish scripture brings a prophetic-typological framework to his Pentecost account. With this

---

[1] For a discussion of this pattern see E. Richard, "Pentecost as a Recurrent Theme in Luke-Acts" in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed., E. Richard; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 133-149.

[2] For discussion of source-critical proposals see Haenchen, *Acts*, 172-173. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 99-100, points to various discordant features relating to the question of whether the tongues were glossolalia and xenolalia and observes that these illustrate layers in the text.

[3] Haenchen argues that Luke's account is largely due to his literary requirements, *Acts*, 173-175. For an opposite view see, I. H. Marshall, "The Significance of Pentecost" *SJT* 30 (1977): 347-369.

background, we look lastly at Luke's use of Joel in Peter's speech and the interpretative template it places upon Pentecost.

Pentecost has been analysed from many perspectives. Our restricted objective is to show that the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost is directed towards the *two* requirements of delivering a people from a forthcoming catastrophe and reforming the people in readiness for the advent of their messiah. Our approach will situate Pentecost within a prophetic scheme characterized as the "last days" of a Jewish commonwealth.

2. The Pentecost Theophany

Many scholars have compared the theophanic details of Pentecost to Sinai.[4] Several socio-literary arguments have been put forward to show that Luke's readership would have made a connection between Pentecost and Sinai. The contribution of the literary co-text is threefold:[5] first, covenant renewal is joined to the celebrations of the Festival of Weeks; secondly, there are lexical and typological points of contact between the Pentecost account and the scriptural descriptions of Sinai; and thirdly, various Second Temple texts embellish the scriptural Sinai narrative with details that are reminiscent of Luke's descriptive detail in Acts 2. The principal evidence for a Sinai typology in Acts 2 is therefore calendrical and intertextual.

---

[4] For example, Goppelt, *Typos*, 117; R. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 138; Turner, *Power*, 279-290; Dunn, *Baptism*, 48-49; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 246-251; J. H. E. Hull. *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Lutterworth, 1967), 53-55; G. W. H. Lampe, *God as Spirit* (London: SCM, 1976), 68; Keener. *Gospels and Acts*, 193; Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:410-11; Haenchen, *Acts*, 174; A. Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Oekumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 5; 2 vols; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981). 1:83-84; J. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 132-133; G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission* (NSBT 17; Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 201-208; and Litwak, *Echoes*, 165-166.

[5] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 246.

J. C. Vanderkam[6] and L. O'Reilly[7] particularly emphasize rabbinical texts (2c. and later). Vanderkam also stresses the associations between Sinai and the Festival of Weeks that are indicated in *Jubilees* and Qumran texts.[8] Turner's case is largely based on Philo's account of Sinai, and his conclusion is that,

> there is a relatively secure case that Acts 2 deliberately evokes the fundamental Jewish story of Moses' ascent to God to receive the Torah which he then gives to Israel (and beyond) with theophanic accompaniment.[9]

After his review of primary texts, Vanderkam concludes that, "the *Jubilees*-Qumran tradition shows that already in the second century B.C.E. the Festival of Weeks was closely tied to the events at Mount Sinai".[10] Correspondingly, he observes[11] that there is little in Acts 2 that reminds a reader of what the Old Testament says about this festival, and this is a significant qualification. Discussion of the question is therefore warranted.

2.1 Calendrical Evidence

The following points constitute the principal calendrical evidence for a Sinai connection with Pentecost:

1) The Law was given in the third month (Exod 19:1)[12] and celebration of covenant and its renewal would naturally have taken place in the third month. Weinfeld suggests[13] that such a celebration is described in Psalm 81,

---

[6] J. C. Vanderkam, "The Festival of Weeks and the Story of Pentecost" in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed., C. A. Evans; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 185-205 (198-200).
[7] Leo O'Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1987), 18-21.
[8] "Festival", 188-193.
[9] *Power*, 289. Weiser also notes Philo's account, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:84.
[10] "Festival", 203-4.
[11] "Festival", 203.
[12] *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Neof.* follow the MT but *Tg. Ps.-J.* adds that it was the first day of the month.
[13] *Judaism*, 271.

and positioned in the third month by 2 Chron 15:10-12.[14] His argument rests on the shared detail of the *Shofar*, which he speculates was used at the Festival of Weeks.

2) Covenant renewal or covenant making is associated more generally with this feast in *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 1:1). First, in respect of the making of the Noachic covenant (*Jub.* 6:17), which is then said to have been renewed in the Sinai covenant (*Jub.* 6:19);[15] and secondly, in respect of the making of the Abrahamic covenants of Genesis 15 and 17 (*Jub.* 14:1, 10, 20; 15:1). Vanderkam comments that this celebration of covenant is the "primary association" for the festival rather than the "act of giving the Siniatic Torah".[16]

3) The Jubilees calendar was of importance to Qumran,[17] and while initiation into and renewal of commitment to the community is not positioned in the annual calendar, the date may be implied in 4Q266 11, II, 17-19, which records a disciplinary ceremony in the third month for members of the community who depart from the Law.[18]

2.1.1 Evaluation

The calendrical evidence is tendentious. Philo and Josephus do not record an association between Pentecost and the celebration of the Law, and it is not known how widespread such an association was in the first century. Thus, as Weinfeld observes, the older view of scholarship was that such an association was only regularly made in Rabbinic Judaism.[19] However, even if such an association was known, for example in Qumran circles, or in

---

[14] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 248.
[15] Vanderkam, "Festival", 190.
[16] "Festival", 192.
[17] J. C. Vanderkam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 47-48, 111.
[18] Turner, *Power*, 281; Vanderkam, "Festival", 193; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 248.
[19] Weinfeld, *Judaism*, 268, cites E. Lohse, "πεντηκοστή", *TDNT* 6:48-50, but the point appears in commentaries such as Barrett, *Acts*, 1:111 and Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 132.

groups influenced by *Jubilees*,[20] this does not establish the reason for Luke's Pentecost allusion. The Festival of Weeks had its obvious harvest connotations, and it is arguable that it is *these* associations that motivate Luke's calendrical observation.

Luke's note of timing—Pentecost—may not be designed to connect with the giving of the Spirit. It could equally provide a context for understanding the success of the disciples' initial preaching. Firstfruits was celebrated at the beginning of harvest (Exod 23:16, θερισμός), and the festival of "ingathering" at the end of the harvest. Luke has previously used a harvest figure to describe the mission of the seventy (Luke 10:1-2, θερισμός). This suggests that Luke would have conceived of the disciples at Pentecost as "labourers" in the field and the result of their preaching on this occasion (3000 converts, Acts 2:41) to be the Firstfruits of a future fuller harvest. Such a typology is consistent with Luke's view of "the preaching of the word" as a sowing of seed (Luke 8:11). This proposal locates the point of Luke's calendrical observation in Jewish scriptural traditions about Firstfruits, rather than any contemporary association with Sinai.[21]

2.2 Scriptural Intertextual Evidence

Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures implies that he constructs typology with multiple echoes to his scriptural source materials. Thus any Sinai typology in Acts 2 should consist in a series of echoes and allusions.

Lexical links between Sinai and Pentecost include, i) a "gathering" with "one accord" (ὁμοθυμαδόν,[22] Acts 2:46, יחדו/ὁμοθυμαδόν, Exod 19:8); ii) some standing "afar off"(μακράν, Acts 2:39, רחוק/μακρόθεν, Exod 20:18); iii) the same timing in the third month after leaving Egypt (Exod 19:1); iv) the same time of day—morning (Exod 24:4; Acts 2:15); v) "sound (קול/φωνή, ἠχέω, Exod 19:16, 19:

---

[20] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 248.

[21] Dunn, *Acts*, 23, notes a shared firstfruits figure for the Spirit in Rom 8:23.

[22] This word occurs in Byzantine texts of Acts 2:2. However, this manuscript tradition may be influenced by a perceived typological correspondence. see Barrett, *Acts*, 1:112.

20:18; Deut 4:12;[23] φωνή, ἦχος, Acts 2:2, 6); and vi) "fire" (πῦρ/אֵשׁ. Exod 19:18; Deut 4:11; Acts 2:3).[24]

In addition to these links, typological correspondences have been suggested. Vanderkam states that Luke's account of the ascension would cause the reader of Luke-Acts "to have Moses and Mount Sinai in mind as he turned his attention to the Pentecost story".[25] The correspondences he proposes are i) Jesus/Moses' ascension on a mountain (Exod 24:18; Acts 1:12); ii) the period of forty days that marks Jesus' ascension and Moses' Sinai ascents (Exod 24:18; Acts 1:3); and iii) the presence of a cloud that hides both Moses and Jesus (Exod 24:18; Acts 1:9). These details set the scene for Pentecost and invite the comparison that just as Moses gave the Law, so too Jesus gave the Spirit.

In addition to these observations, Turner offers some broader points of comparison with the exodus story. He asserts that the quotation of Joel 3 provides a fulfilment to Num 11:29, which expresses the hope for a more general bestowal of the Spirit of prophecy; he affirms that Luke sets Jesus and Moses as parallel figures; and he compares the two "crooked generations" of Moses and the apostles.[26]

2.2.1 Evaluation

These lexical links and typological correspondences are a slender basis upon which to affirm that an implied reader would have drawn a comparison between Sinai and Pentecost. Several narrative critical arguments tell against the proposal that Luke has encoded a Sinai typology in his Pentecost account. Considerations of plot, other episode details, and the

---

[23] The Deuteronomic Sinai tradition has a repeated emphasis on the fire and the voice (Deut 4:33; 5:4-5, 22-26; 8:10, 15; 10:4); otherwise, its account does not have the complexity for a narrative typology.

[24] J. A. Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998). 238; Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:102; Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 133.

[25] "Festival", 196.

[26] *Power*, 284-5; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 247.

roles of Jesus and the disciples, militate against reading Pentecost as an anti-type to Sinai:

1) Sinai represents a covenant agreement; there is sacrifice, declaration of intent, and a giving of the Law. The accounts detail an extended *transaction* between the people and Yahweh. The Sinai covenant incorporates the Israelites as a nation before God and it sets up complex laws for governing the nation covering all aspects of the body politic. This kind of *action* does not have counterparts in Acts 2 or obvious typical analogues. The apparatus of institution is absent from Acts; instead, the Spirit is associated with proclamation and witness.

2) The *spatial relationship*s of the Sinai and Pentecost accounts do not correspond. There are multiple ascents and multiple theophanies at Sinai; no one ascent or theophany serves as a type for Pentecost.[27] A comparison can be made with the first theophany at Sinai (Exod 19:16) in terms of the "voice" and the "fire" but, crucially, Moses has not ascended to the top of Sinai prior to this theophany, and only communicates with God from the base of the mountain (Exod 19:20); law-giving is implied by the editorial conjunction of legal material that follows (Exod 20:1-17), but there is no explicit mention of "the giving of the law" or of any transaction to do with the making of a covenant.

Following an ascent/descent (Exod 19:20-21), the next theophany (Exod 20:18) duplicates the detail of the first theophany without the mention of "fire" but, again, Moses is with the people, "afar off" rather than up the mountain, and there is no mention of anything being given, although it is implied (again via editorial collocation) that the ten commandments were given before Moses had to return suddenly to the people.

---

[27] Jewish writings re-tell Sinai and variously note multiple ascents (*1 En.* 89:29-32), avoid the language of ascent and descent (*Pseudo-Philo* 11:1-15), or collapse several ascents into one (Josephus, *Ant.* 3. 75-93). Luke is not re-telling Sinai, and if he is alluding to Sinai, we cannot infer from his allusive language that he thinks of Sinai as a single ascent.

The next theophany ("fire"—Exod 24:17) sees Moses up the mountain to receive the Law (v. 12), but it *follows* the covenant transaction, which takes place some way down the mountain, and at which both Moses and the elders of Israel are present. Furthermore, only tabernacle plans follow this theophany, rather than what might be considered "the Law".

If Luke intends his readers to pick up on Sinai in his Pentecost account, he does not point them to any one episode. The right spatial relationship in which both Jesus and Moses are "up" and "give" something to the "people" does not coincide with the occurrence of the theophanic detail to which Luke is said to make an allusion (Exod 19:16).

Against our position, Turner offers an argument based on Acts 2:33-34: "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear". He asserts that Luke visualises a single *composite* ascent based on Ps 68:18, "You are gone up on high, you have led captivity captive, you have received gifts for man" (LXX, Ps 67:19).[28] His proposal is that this text "affirms a New Moses fulfilment of Ps 68:18, re-contextualized in the light of Joel and the Pentecost events".[29] Corresponding to the gift of the Law that Moses received,[30] Jesus has received the gift of the Spirit and passed on gifts to men in the event of Pentecost.[31]

---

[28] Commentators note that the allusion to Sinai in Ps 68:18 is set within the context of a celebration of Yahweh in his holy temple (vv. 16, 29). See A. Weiser, *Psalms* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1962), 482; J. Clinton McCann Jr., *Psalms* (NIB 4; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 946.

[29] *Power*, 287. Turner positions his treatment as a response to the negative appraisal of this connection in R. F. O'Toole, "Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost" *JBL* 102 (1983): 245-58. O'Toole's trenchant view is that Luke's "account of Pentecost does not contain a single verifiable reference to the Sinai covenant" (246).

[30] Later rabbinic interpretation interpreted Ps 67:18 as a reference to Moses receiving the Law.

[31] While not citing Ps 68:18 and making an argument based on that text, Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 139, references Eph 4:7 for evidence that a linkage was being made between the giving of the Law and the giving of the

There are several problems with this proposal: i) Turner himself states that it is "difficult to prove (or to disprove)",[32] and this is because of the absence of corresponding lexical material (only λαμβάνω); ii) Psalm 67 interposes the phrase "led captivity captive" (שבית שבי/ᾐχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν, cf. Deut 21:10), which refers to the exodus from Egypt, between the "ascent" and the giving of gifts, which suggests that Ps 67:19 *itemises* achievements rather delineates a sequence of ascending on high and receiving gifts for men; iii) if Ps 67:19 is sequential, the "ascent" of the Psalm is the *burning bush* ascent, and this may be indicated by the use of בקדש/ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ in Ps 67:19, which picks up on אדמת קדש/γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν from Exod 3:5; there is no comparable use of ἅγιος in Moses' later Sinai ascents; and iv) the mention of the receiving of gifts suggests that the "gifts" (as opposed to "gift") alludes to the bestowal of the Spirit upon the seventy elders (Num 11:24-27).[33]

3) In terms of the narrative *plot of Luke-Acts*, rather than preparing an implied reader to see Sinai echoes at Pentecost, Luke may actually require an opposite reading: Sinai is a *microcosm* of Jesus' earthly ministry including the ascension period.

A typology is suggested[34] in Jesus' cryptic remark to Herod, "Behold, I cast out demons, and I do cures today and tomorrow (σήμερον καὶ αὔριον), and the

---

Spirit, "a tradition with roots in Palestinian Jewish Christianity" („eine Tradition mit Wurzeln im palästinischen Judenchristentum"). He is cautious however in noting that "Whether this tradition was connected to Pentecost is unclear" („Ob diese Tradition mit Pfingsten verbunden war, ist unsicher"), 139.

[32] *Power*, 288. Barnabas Lindars' comment on this connection (which he nevertheless supports) is that "the evidence is slighter, and the results less certain" than a connection with Psalm 110, *New Testament Apologetic*. (London: SCM Press, 1973), 51.

[33] While not discussing Psalm 68, Beale draws a comparison between Num 11:24f and Pentecost, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 210-211.

[34] This allusion is suggested by W. Grimm,"Eschatologischer Saul wider eschatologischen David. Eine Deutung von Lc xiii 31ff" *NovT* 15 (1973): 114-133.

third day (τῇ τρίτῃ) I shall be perfected" (Luke 13:32). This remark[35] describes a two-day time-period for his ministry, and then a "third day". The same lexical fragments pick out identical time periods in the Sinai account. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them today and tomorrow (היום ומחר/σήμερον καὶ αὔριον), and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day (ליום השלישי/τὴν τρίτην)" (Exod 19:10-11). This allusion may indicate Luke's perspective on Jesus' exorcisms, viz., that they were an anti-type to Moses' sanctifying of the people, prior to ascending the mountain to God on the third day.

The fragments, σήμερον καὶ αὔριον and τῇ τρίτῃ, if they allude to the Exodus text, identify the "third day" upon which Moses ascended Sinai as being analogous to the period after the resurrection, which took place on the "third day" (Luke 24:7, τῇ τρίτῃ). Luke identifies an evidently symbolic period of forty days for this time in which Jesus was "teaching" the apostles (Acts 1:3), and this likely alludes to the forty-day periods during which Moses received tabernacle instructions and commandments from God (Exod 24:18; 34:28). Luke's account distinguishes two and possibly three ascensions[36] of Jesus (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9), as well as mysterious appearances and disappearances (Luke 24:31, 36). Luke's readers may therefore have seen a comparison with Moses' *multiple* ascents of Sinai and the immediate post-resurrection period.[37]

---

[35] Marshall reviews redaction-critical scholarship on this text, but concludes that Luke is likely to be using a source, *Luke*, 569-570. If the saying is derived from a source, it has still been chosen by Luke and given a location in his narrative, and this is sufficient to make the saying indicative of a Lucan perspective.

[36] J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost" in his collected essays *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 265-294 (275), suggests that "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" (Luke 24:46) may imply ascension prior to the Bethany ascension, and with the Olivet ascension, this indicates a pattern of multiple ascensions during the forty days prior to Pentecost.

[37] Wenk *Community-Forming Power*, 166, notes a Sinai allusion in the use of ἐπισκιάζω in Exod 40:35 and Luke 1:35.

Accordingly, rather than equate Pentecost and Sinai. Luke's allusions suggest a comparison between Sinai and the period *prior* to Pentecost. Sinai has a narrative focus on Moses ascending and descending and bringing the commands and instructions to the people; this is Luke's record about the post-resurrection period. Such a comparison would be part of Luke's general presentation of Jesus as an anti-type to Moses.[38]

However, the post-resurrection period is the concluding part of Jesus' ministry in relation to the disciples. Rather than comparing Pentecost to Sinai, Luke's implied readers are more likely to have compared Jesus' teaching throughout his ministry to the giving of a "law".[39] This is indicated in the following allusion,

> אלה הדברים אשר דבר משה אל כל ישראל
> οἱ λόγοι οὓς ἐλάλησεν Μωυσῆς παντὶ Ισραηλ
> (Deut 1:1)
>
> Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς
> (Luke 24:44)

This closing Lucan epitaph sets Jesus' words as the anti-type to the Law given through Moses, and therefore it is unlikely that Luke's readers would have seen the "gift of the Spirit" as the anti-type to the gift of "the Law".

5) In terms of the *plot of the Pentateuch*, the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost is more likely to evoke recollections of the bestowal of the Spirit upon Joshua through the laying on of hands, in readiness for his work after Moses' departure (Deut 34:9). A typology based on this incident retains a Moses-like character role for Jesus (as in the conventional Sinai reading of Acts 2); it adds an element of "succession" (the disciples have the character-role of a "successor"[40]), which is absent from the conventional Sinai typology; it offers a scriptural precedent for the "laying on of hands" motif in

---

[38] For discussion of this theme see R. F. O'Toole, "The Parallels between Jesus and Moses" *BTB* 20 (1990): 22-29.
[39] See Woods' conclusions on Luke's travel section, *Finger of God*, 245-246.
[40] Although it has not won widespread support, Talbert's thesis of successor biography in *Literary Patterns*, 125-136, has shown that there is an "element" of succession in Acts.

Acts; and it supplies a reason for the mention of "signs and wonders" in Acts 2:22 in connection with Jesus—such a mention of "signs and wonders" in connection with Moses immediately follows the bestowal of the Spirit upon Joshua (Deut 34:10-12).

6) Finally, Sinai and Pentecost do not assign a structurally comparable role to the *character* of the recipients of the Law/Spirit. At Sinai, the people need cleansing (Exod 19:10), there is a danger of perishing (Exod 19:21), they are afraid (Exod 20:18), and finally there is the sin of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32). At Pentecost there is an outburst or praise and witness on the part of the disciples, and a sustained programme of preaching is initiated.

2.3 Second Temple Evidence

The literary co-text for the Pentecost account variously describes the Law being offered to the nations in, i) different languages; ii) in thundering voices; and iii) in a theophany involving flames of fire.[41] Israel is then chosen because of its response to the offer made by Yahweh. It is argued that Luke's readers would have seen the bestowal of the Spirit as an analogous and comparable foundational[42] event involving fames of fire, a thunderous sound, and tongues. The relevant evidence is as follows:

1) Philo's midrashim on Sinai (*Dec.* 33, 44, 46, *Spec. Leg.* 2.189) use several expressions that resonate with Pentecost: "sound" (ἦχος); "fire" (πῦρ); "breath" (πνεῦμα); "voice" (φωνή); "from heaven" (ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ); "rush" (φορά); and "language" (διάλεκτος); "ends of the habitable world" (ἐσχατιαῖς κατοικοῦντας); "great things" (μεγάλα μεγάλων); and "signs" (σημεῖα).

---

[41] The primary texts are conveniently listed in Weinfeld, *Normative and Sectarian Judaism*, 274-275. For typical applications of this material to Acts 2, see Johnson, *Acts*, 45-47; Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:84; and Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:102.

[42] Thus Turner, *Power*, 267, affirms that Jesus is "a greater Moses who ascends to God in order to grant a foundational gift to Israel". See also Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 249.

Philo describes the Sinai theophany in terms of an invisible sound which fashioned the air and changed it into a flaming fire. sounding forth like an articulate voice like breath passing through a trumpet; the fire rushed as it were from heaven and became articulate speech reaching as far as the ends of the earth. Turner's argument is that Luke's account would have reminded a reader of such Sinai traditions.[43] Commenting on the collocation of fire, sound and language in *Dec.* 33, A. Weiser comments, „Es sind die Elemente, die auch im luk Pfingstbericht auftreten".[44] G. Hovenden agrees but adds that "it needs to be said that the parallels are to Philo's elaboration of the Sinai event rather than to the Old Testament account".[45]

2) Josephus describes the initial Sinai ascent and the people's expectation that Moses would return μετὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν ἀγαθῶν (*Ant.* 3.77) and that God would receive Moses in order δοῦναι δωρεάν ὑφ' ἧς εὖ βιώσονται (*Ant.* 3.78). Turner's argument[46] is that Luke's language of τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός and τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33, 39) would have reminded a reader of traditional readings of Moses' ascent to receive the Law.

3) The Dead Sea fragment 1Q34 Frag. 3, II, 6, states, "You established them, isolating them for yourself in order to make them holy among all nations. And you renewed your covenant with them in the vision of glory, and in the words of your holy [spirit], by the works of your hand. Your right hand has written to let them know the regulations of glory and the everlasting deeds." This identifies the Spirit as the inspiration behind the revelation of the Law.[47]

---

[43] *Power*, 285.
[44] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:84, ("These are the elements which also appear in the Lucan Pentecost account"). Pesch also principally uses Josephus and Philo to make the case for a parallelism, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:102.
[45] Hovenden, *Speaking in Tongues*, 82.
[46] *Power*, 286.
[47] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 104-105.

4) Certain rabbinic texts refer to tongues of fire and languages in connection with Sinai and can be compared to Philo. As with Philo, these texts interpret the plurality of voices of Exod 19:16 as voices related to God's speech. This voice was "seen" (Exod 20:18) and became visible as fire or flames of fire (*Mekilta Bahodesh* 4.3-4, cf. Ps 29:7). In some texts, the voices become the languages of the nations (*Exodus Rabbah* 28.6; *b. Sabb.* 88b; *Midrash Psalms* 92:3). The Targums also reflect this association of voice and fire in *Ps.-J. Exod* 20:2: "The first word, when it came forth from the mouth of the Holy One...like flames of fire". Vanderkam's argument is that "it is reasonable to conclude that Luke in Acts 2 chose the symbols of fiery tongues, which enabled the apostles to speak the diverse languages of their international audience, in conscious dependence on Jewish understandings of Sinai".[48]

Without quoting a specific text, Weiser asserts that this rabbinical interpretation of Sinai, „Auch diese Auslegung steht dem Sprachenwunder des luk Pfingstberichts nahe".[49] He is accordingly more cautious and avers that, „Die atl. Und jüdischen Texte lassen nicht darauf schließen, daß der luk Bericht direct von ihnen abhängig ist".[50]

2.3.1 Evaluation

Several qualifications limit the value of such parallels:

1) Philo's account of Sinai uses shared vocabulary with Acts 2 for a different purpose. Thus, for Philo, the sound at Sinai is compared to πνεῦμα blown through a trumpet; Luke's use of πνεῦμα pertains to the divine spirit. Philo's describes the heavenly fire as in a φορά, whereas Luke ascribes this aspect to the wind (φέρω). Philo describes the sound being changed and fashioned

---

48 "Festival", 201; see also Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:103.

49 "...is quite close to the miracle of languages of the Lucan Pentecost account", *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:84; see also Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:102.

50 "The Old Testament and Jewish texts do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that Luke's account is directly dependent on them". *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:84.

into fire, whereas Luke describes the phenomena of sound and fire in separate terms.

2) The dissemination of the Torah in diverse languages (seventy, *b. Shab. 88b*; four, *Sifre Deuteronomy* 33.2) echoes the account of Babel and division of the seventy nations. It may therefore be that Luke echoes the aftermath of Babel[51] in the detail of the "tongues of fire" being divided or distributed (Gen 10:5). On this hypothesis, Luke *shares* the same concern evidenced in proto-rabbinic Sinai traditions, and this accounts for his feature of a "distributed tongue".

Luke's verb for the distribution of tongues is διαμερίζω, and this may be an allusion to the division (Gen 10:25, פלג/διαμερίζω) of the earth in the days of Peleg, or it may be an echo with Deut 32:8 and the division of the nations (נחל/διαμερίζω). Such an allusion would be a scriptural form of expression for the reality of multilingualism.[52]

Luke describes "tongues distributed as fire" (διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρός). This simile is not the same as those used in Jewish Sinai traditions, for example, Philo has "flaming fire" (πῦρ φλογοειδές, *Dec.* 33), and "flame" (φλόξ, *Dec.* 46); Luke's description is *anthropomorphic*, and the closest parallel is Enoch's vision of heaven where he uses the expression "tongues of fire" (γλῶσσαι πυρός, *1 En.* 14:9-10) in a temple context.[53] Rather than assert a parallel with Jewish Sinai traditions, Luke may be constructing a figure

---

[51] Menzies sees the gift of the Spirit as a supplementary gift for mission and is sympathetic to a comparison with Babel, *Development*, 229-44. However, Barrett, *Acts*, 1:119, and Witherington, *Acts*, 136, think that any allusion is slight. In our presentation, Pentecost is *not* a reversal of Babel but recognition of the reality of Babel.

[52] Although Vanderkam supports a Sinai application, he usefully notes that the midrashic retellings of this story have the Lord offering the Law to the nations, whereas Luke has Peter offer the Spirit to the Jews, "Festival", 205.

[53] Beale discusses this text and stresses the heavenly sanctuary location of these tongues and their position as a construct of the temple, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 206.

from the separate elements of "tongues" and "fire"[54] which were available in the Jewish scriptures and making a connection with the idea of the temple.

3) The theophanic detail in the Pentecost account does not point to a comparison with Sinai. Menzies argues that Pentecost merely shows an author who is "familiar with the language of Jewish theophany".[55] Barrett expresses a similar opinion when he says that "Luke is accumulating features characteristic of theophanies".[56] Conzelmann states that any comparison is "debateable".[57]

Luke's theophanic prologue is to be noted for its theological possibilities, but a comparison with Isaiah's call narrative has been overlooked.[58] Luke is deliberately evoking Isaiah's call narrative (Isa 6:1-13). Isaiah saw "the lord sitting (κάθημαι/ישב) upon a throne" and "the house" (οἶκος/היכל) "full (πλήρης/מלא) of his glory" (Isa 6:1, LXX[59]). In the accompanying theophany smoke fills (πίμπλημι/מלא, cf. Ezek 10:4) the temple, and there is a voice or sound (φωνή/קול) of praise (Isa 6:3-4), which shakes (ἐπαίρω/נוע) the doorposts of the temple. Isaiah has his "lips" (Isa 6:9) purged as a symbol of his appropriateness as a mouthpiece of the Deity.[60]

---

[54] We explore this possibility below in our discussion of Luke's use of Malachi.

[55] *Development*, 241.

[56] *Acts*, 1:113.

[57] Conzelmann, *Acts*, 16. Other scholars who have doubted whether Sinai is significant for Pentecost include Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 182-183; Marshall, "Pentecost", 365-366; G. Krodel, "The Functions of the Spirit in the Old Testament, the Synoptic Tradition, and the Book of Acts" in *The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church* (ed., P. D. Opsahl: Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1978), 10-46, (30); and Lohse, *TDNT* 6:49.

[58] An allusion to this call narrative is noted (but not developed) by F. S. Spencer, *Journeying through Acts: A Literary Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 42. Luke has already recorded several conventional prophetic possessions of the Spirit (Luke 1 and 2, *passim*) lacking theophanic overtones.

[59] This LXX interpretation of the Hebrew is confirmed in Johannine tradition and applied to Jesus (John 12:41).

[60] Beale, *The Temple and The Church's Mission*, 211, notes features of temple theophanies such as "filling" the house (1 Kgs 8:10) and fire coming

Luke's Pentecost account has corresponding detail: Luke has the disciples in "the house" (οἶκος), when the house is filled (πληρόω) with a rushing mighty wind (Acts 2:2); the disciples are then filled (πίμπλημι, Acts 2:4) with the holy Spirit, and their voice (φωνή, Acts 2:6) is a voice of praise, and they are empowered to speak on behalf of God; finally, this event takes place after Jesus has ascended and been exalted to a position as "the lord" sitting upon a throne (κάθημαι, Acts 2:33, 34).

A typological comparison between Pentecost and Isaiah's Call Narrative contributes to the question of where the theophanic phenomena were experienced. Scholars have mainly supposed a setting in a house or more specifically a room in a house.[61] Luke certainly uses οἶκος of "houses" and in contrast to the temple (Acts 5:42). Barrett argues that Luke's use of κάθημαι elsewhere in Acts means "sit" and therefore in Acts 2 the disciples are sitting in a room and that οἶκος should be understood as "room".[62] He allows the possibility that οἶκος may indicate a chamber of the temple rather than a room in a private house, and he cites Josephus' usage of οἶκος for the temple chambers (*Ant.* 8.65).

The possibility that it was a room in the temple compound is supported by the silent transition in the narrative to a public space where there is a crowd. Barrett notes that any transfer of location is formally absent from the text.[63] Since, the multitude that subsequently clusters around the disciples (Acts 2:6) would not be facilitated in the room of a private house, some transition to a public space is needed, and one that can attract and

---

down from heaven (2 Chron 7:1), and these support our temple focused reading.

[61] For example, Haenchen, *Acts*, 168, 175; Menzies, *Development*, 208-9 n. 5: Spencer, *Journeying*, 42; and Barrett, *Acts*, 1:113-114. Haenchen cites the contrary opinion of scholars who have argued for a location in the temple. Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:103, avers that the gathering was in the house „dessen »Obergemach« in 1,13 als Versammlungsraum genannt war" ("whose 'Upper Room' in 1:13 was named as a meeting-place").

[62] Acts 1:114; LS, 546, notes "room" for οἶκος.

[63] *Acts*, 1:117.

embrace three thousand converts. Luke adds that the disciples were daily in the temple (Acts 2:46, cf. Luke 24:53; Acts 5:25), and this would seem the natural location for them on the day of Pentecost.

However, another possibility is that οἶκος refers to the temple as a whole rather than a chamber,[64] and that the disciples are sitting in an open area at the time the sound and rushing wind engulfed them. While Luke uses ἱερόν in Acts for the temple (22 times), rather than οἶκος,[65] this word is used by him (Acts 7:47, 49; cf. Luke 13:35; 19:46), when he is directly using Jewish scriptural material about the temple.[66] Luke could therefore be using οἶκος as part of his set of allusions to Isaiah 6 and as part of his theophanic description. A setting in the temple makes it more likely that the Spirit would have inspired praise amongst other speech acts.

In addition to these correspondences, there is a broad thematic "fit" with Acts insofar as Isaiah's call narrative is about calling and commission. The crux in the text is about who will be "sent" and who will tell the people (Isa 6:8-9, שלח/ἀποστέλλω). This corresponds to the commission of the disciples to be "apostles" (ἀπόστολος, Luke 6:13; Acts 1:8). Isaiah's commission was ultimately to be unsuccessful insofar as the people would hear "but not understand", and see "but not perceive" (Isa 6:9). This is the quotation upon which Luke concludes his view of the Jews (Acts 28:25-26), which thereby shows his Isaianic view of the preaching of the disciples throughout Acts.[67]

4) In a similar way, the detail of the "rushing mighty wind" may point to a different scriptural text. A mighty wind (Exod 14:21; Acts 2:2, עז/βίαιος)

---

[64] LS, 546, notes "temple" for οἶκος, and Haenchen cites Josephus using οἶκος for Solomon's temple (*Ant.* 8.65).
[65] Haenchen, *Acts*, 168.
[66] It should also be noted, given Luke's subsequent use of Joel 3:1-5, that Joel's preferred term for the temple is בית, and Luke's choice here is to secure the same pattern of use as Joel (1:9, 13f, 16; 4:18).
[67] Thus the distribution of the Spirit to each of the recipients can be compared to the giving of the Spirit to the elders in the wilderness (Num 11:17).

divided the Red Sea and signalled an act of deliverance. Such an echo would be consistent with Luke's deliverance pneumatology, and impart to the bestowal of the Spirit a comparable significance: God was acting to deliver his people in this bestowal of the Spirit.

In this connection, we should distinguish the role given to the Spirit in the Qumran community to the making of the covenant. 1Q34 Frag. 2, II, 6, relates the holy Spirit to the "words" of the covenant. The Spirit lies behind the Law of the covenant at Sinai but it is not specifically "given" at Sinai. Similarly, in Luke's typology, the Spirit lies behind the witness of the church.

While Pentecost is a "beginning" for the disciples (Luke 1:2; 24:47; Acts 11:15), it is not a beginning for Jesus (Acts 1:2). Sinai was not a beginning for Israel, rather the departure from Egypt and the crossing of the Red Sea were the "beginning", as indicated by the institution of the calendar (Exod 12:2). Instead of a Sinai typology, the outburst of praise at Pentecost could have been seen as analogous to the praise delivered by the Red Sea.[68]

5) Finally, there is the question of what can be ascribed to the *implied* reader. Some of Luke's *real* readers may have known traditions preserved in Philo and made the sort of linkage suggested by Turner. Rabbinic midrash about Sinai may reflect synagogue elaborations and be part of common culture. However, these possibilities do not warrant the conclusion that Luke's *own text* encodes a Sinai typology in virtue of its shared vocabulary and motifs with the Jewish scriptures or the wider literary co-text.

Wenk acknowledges that there are bound to be lexical differences and similarities between the Pentecost account and re-tellings of Sinai, but affirms that there is a structural similarity between the disputed narratives. He claims that in both cases i) the people of God are assembled:

---

[68] Both outbursts of praise take place in the morning (Acts 2:15; Exod 14:27).

ii) there is a theophany; iii) there is a critical redemptive event; iv) there is a miraculous sound and something like fire; and v) the theophany leads to miraculous speech.[69] Wenk's analysis illustrates a methodological problem with typological discussion in that the description of the commentator can be configured to make the typology more plausible than that allowed by the underlying textual data. Thus, in Wenk's case, we could reply that "the people" are present at Sinai, but not in the same way at Pentecost—there is no assembly at Pentecost. We could also argue that the critical redemptive event in Exodus is the crossing of the Red Sea rather than Sinai. Furthermore, the generality of Wenk's structural comparison would equally apply in a comparison between Isaiah's Call Narrative and Pentecost: the people of God were assembled (Isa 6:9); the event was critical and redemptive in initiating Isaiah's mission (Isa 6:9-12); there is sound and fire (Isa 6:3, 6); there are theophanic visionary details (Isa 6:1-2); and the event leads to speech (Isa 6:7).

2.4 Conclusion

Our conclusion therefore is that Luke is not deploying any extensive Sinai typology. The elements of his account echo different scriptural episodes, Babel, the crossing of the Red Sea, and the call theophany of Isaiah. If Luke intends a link with proto-rabbinic traditions about Sinai, then this is likely to reside in the common requirement that the Torah and the Gospel needed to be taken to the ends of the earth in all languages. This single point of contact, however, does not yield a Sinai typology in the Pentecost account; rather it is recognition of the language barrier facing the proclamation of the word of God. This is not a sufficient basis upon which to compare Pentecost to Sinai as a foundational event. Contrary to Turner's view that there is a "secure case"[70] for comparing Pentecost and Sinai, there are significant typological arguments to be heard against this view. These question whether the comparisons of scenic detail that Turner and other

---

[69] *Community-Forming Power*, 249.

[70] *Power*, 289. Cf. Fuller, *Restoration*, 261 n. 256 for a different reason for rejecting Turner.

scholars assert are sufficient to make Pentecost theologically comparable as a foundational event.

3. Speech Acts

Scholars have primarily asked whether the tongues mentioned in the account of Pentecost should be seen as *glossolalia*, *akolalia*, or *xenolalia*.[71] This is a debate about whether the phenomenon is a miracle of hearing or speaking and whether the speaking is intelligible foreign languages or unintelligible speech. A discussion of these issues lies outside the scope of our study, and we assume that the case for a miracle of speaking in foreign tongues is proven.[72] Our concern is with *the nature of the speech acts* that are implied in Luke's account.

We noted in Chapter Three examples of Jewish texts that associate the holy Spirit and singing (e.g. the Targumic association of the Spirit with singing at the Red Sea); these texts establish the possibility that Luke's readers read Pentecost as an event of charismatic praise. Given the example of singing at the Exodus crossing of the Red Sea, and the use of exodus typology by Luke, charismatic praise at Pentecost is apposite. Luke has already advertised his typological understanding of Jesus' death and resurrection as an ἔξοδος (Luke 9:31),[73] and considerations of plot would suggest that *this deliverance* required a response of praise.

---

[71] For discussion see Hovenden, *Speaking in Tongues*, 59-77; Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:85; Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 133-134; and Barrett, *Acts*, 1:115-117. We agree with Hovenden's conclusion that a multi-lingual element is present in Luke's complete account Pentecost.

[72] Weiser hypothesizes that Luke has altered a source that carried the implication of glossolalia so that the miracle is one of xenolalia, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:86; Haenchen, *Acts*, 172, 186; and Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:99-100, also take this line of interpretation. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 137-138 notes that other scholars take the traditional element to be xenolalia which Luke has altered to glossolalia. He disagrees with both viewpoints and suggests "...for Luke both glossolalia and miraculous languages belong to tradition" („...für Lukas sowohl Glossolalie als auch Sprachenwunder zur Tradition gehören"), 138.

[73] E. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; London: Nelson, 1966), 11, 142; J. B. Green, *Luke*, 382; Marshall, *Luke*, 384.

Luke uses ἀποφθέγγομαι[74] in Acts 2:4 ("utterance") to describe the speech act.[75] LXX usage (9x) also indicates a cultic context and oracles delivered in association with idol worship (Ps 58:8; Mic 5:11; Zech 10:2; Ezek 13:9. 19). The verb occurs in 1 Chron 25:1 translating נבא, "Moreover David and the captains of the host separated to the service of the sons of Asaph...who should prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals": and the related noun occurs in the Song of Moses (Deut 32:2, cf. *Odes* 2:2), "My doctrine (ἀπόφθεγμα) shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass". Furthermore, in Ps 58:8 where the verb is used to describe the lying of the enemies of Israel, the Psalmist contrasts this with *his* singing (v. 17).

By using ἀποφθέγγομαι, Luke is therefore invoking a liturgical framework for understanding the speech acts engendered by the Spirit at Pentecost: these involve praise, but not necessarily ecstatic praise. Luke's use of Joel's prophecy supports such a choice of language. The prophesying (נבא) referenced by Peter (Joel 3:1) could just as well refer to liturgical prophesying as to any "market-place" proclamation, and this may be what Luke sees in Joel.

The subject matter of the tongues is denoted by τὰ μεγαλεῖα (v. 11) and this noun is used with verbs of proclamation in the LXX (e.g. Sir 18:4; 36:8; 2 Macc 3:34) including the praise of God's mighty acts (e.g. Sir 17:10; Ps

---

[74] LS, 110, give the sense as "to speak one's opinion plainly"; Haenchen, *Acts*, 168, n. 3, gives "to speak in a solemn or inspired way"; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:116-117, notes Plutarch's use of the word in connection with Pythian oracles (*De Pyth Orac*. 23), and affirms that Luke means "inspired" speech. Johnson, *Acts*, 42, notes that Luke has the Spirit giving each person individually their speech and proposes "declaim".

[75] Barrett notes that the verb and its cognate (ἀπόφθεγμα) that Luke uses are associated with the cultic delivery of brief oracles in Hellenistic literature, *Acts*, 1:116-117. The Hellenistic parallels have been set out by P. W. van der Horst, "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2:1-47)" *JSNT* 25 (1985): 49-60.

70:19).[76] The expression is used in Deut 11:2-3 to describe the acts of God in Egypt (rather than at Sinai).[77]

The Gentile "Pentecost", modelled on the account in Acts 2, uses the verb μεγαλύνω ("to magnify") to characterize the tongues, where speaking with tongues is juxtaposed with the description, καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν (Acts 10:46). For Luke, the archetypical magnification of the Deity is delivered by Mary (Luke 1:46, μεγαλύνω).[78] The use of τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεου therefore makes it likely that Luke saw praise in this manifestation of the Spirit.

However, speech acts appropriate to the witness of the "market-place" are also manifested at Pentecost. Luke repeats ἀποφθέγγεσθαι in Acts 2:14, and this makes Peter's declaration an *example* of the kind of speech act to which the Spirit was giving utterance.[79]

Peter's speech is missiological and directed towards devout Jews of the Diaspora resident in Jerusalem, but there is no suggestion that this speech act had a multi-lingual character. Similarly, there is no evidence that the speech acts of praise initially initiated by the Spirit (v. 4) were directed towards any person or group. Their multi-lingual character allowed Diaspora Jews to understand something of what was being uttered, but this does not imply that the speech acts were delivered *in their direction* (the Jews appear later on in the scene). Only Peter's speech is specifically directed towards any person or group.

---

[76] The corresponding Hebrew, גדל, is used for the "greatness" of God and is also used in praise (Deut 32:3; Ps 150:2).

[77] Hence, we would argue, *contra* Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 250, the signs and wonders motif in Acts 2 does not add to a Sinai typology, but rather a deliverance from Egypt typology.

[78] There may be a narrative symmetry between the incidence of praise in the opening chapters of Luke and Acts.

[79] See C. H. Giblin, "Complementarity of Symbolic Event and Discourse in Acts 2:1-40", *Studia Evangelica* 6 (1973): 186-96, and Menzies. *Development*, 210. Weiser notes that Peter is now speaking in one language, „sicher seiner eigenen aramäischen", ("certainly his own Aramaic"), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:91. However, Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 134, takes ἀποφθέγγεσθαι in Acts 2:4 and 14 to suggest Peter spoke in tongues.

The praise may not have been missiological proclamation as such, but it had missiological value.[80] Turner is right to emphasize against Menzies that the initial speech acts are praise and not missiological proclamation.[81] However, their illocutionary status does not exclude their perlocutionary effect from having a missiological character.[82] Our conclusion, therefore, is that the speech acts of praise engendered by the Spirit at Pentecost are primarily missiological. However, this is not because of any *linguistic* gift;[83] rather, they are missiological because of their *content and effect*.

4. Anticipations of the Spirit

Luke alludes to three principal scriptural texts to validate his account of Pentecost; two (Mal 3:1 and Isa 32:15) are embedded in predictions of Pentecost and one (Joel 3:1-5) is part of a commentary upon Pentecost. The implication of such usage is that Luke believes such texts and their contexts have something to contribute to an understanding of Pentecost. Luke's use of these three texts implies a Jewish eschatological framework for the bestowal of the Spirit, and this is supported by his use of ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις from Isa 2:2 as a byline for his quotation of Joel (Acts 2:17). Within this framework, we will show that Luke positions such bestowal in relation to a need for deliverance and reformation. Our proposal is that rather than

---

[80] Menzies regards tongues as part of the "endowment of power for mission", *Development*, 207, and states that "Luke's account highlights the missiological significance of the Pentecostal gift", *Development*, 211.

[81] Turner makes this argument and adds that had Luke intended the *glossolalia* to have been read as purely missiological, he would have used a more specific verb like ἀναγγέλλω, εὐαγγελίζω, διαγγέλλω, or κηρύσσω, *Power*, 272. The literary co-text shows that τὰ μεγαλεῖα may be the subject of proclamation (Tob 11:15; Sir 18:4), prayer (Sir 36:7), as well as praise. Turner argues that the tongues were "invasive charismatic praise", and regards Menzies' missiological interpretation to be flawed, *Power*, 271-2. Turner has the better argument: the speech acts inspired by the Spirit were partly liturgical and partly missiological. Weiser also sees the miracle as one of praise, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:86.

[82] Hence, Luke can describe Peter's speech using ἀποφθέγγεσθαι; see Lohse, *TDNT* 6:50 n. 43.

[83] Language "ability" does not appear in Acts in any open context of preaching; rather, tongues appear elsewhere solely in *response behaviours* (Acts 10:46; 19:6).

seeing Pentecost as a new Sinai, Luke derives his typology from his reading of Malachi, Isaiah and Joel.

4.1 Using Malachi

The prediction and contrast of the Baptist—αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί (Luke 3:16d)—is clearly pivotal for Luke, as it is partially repeated twice (Acts 1:5; 11:16). Significantly, the reference to "fire" is dropped from the two fulfilment texts in Acts that link John's prediction to Pentecost, although "fire" is mentioned in the description of the theophany at Pentecost and in the accompanying Joel citation. Thus, while the use of a single preposition[84] to govern πνεύματι ἁγίῳ and πυρί suggests that the singular baptismal work of the messiah[85] has two characteristics, and Luke provides the reader with an interpretation of the Baptist's prediction in the Pentecost account,[86] it is unclear as to whether Luke intends his implied audience to regard the "tongues of fire" as the fulfilment of the "fire" aspect of the prediction or whether he implies an eschatological fulfilment more in keeping with the Joel citation.

The eschatological aspects of the Joel citation (Acts 2:20) allow for a (destructive) judgmental reading of John's prediction, and this is supported by Luke's eschatological expansion of the Coming One's preaching (Luke 3:17), the flavour of which is also that of destructive judgment. Further, as Schürmann notes, „Die Feuertaufe läßt an das Gericht denken, wie der Kontext (VV. 9. 17b) und das traditionelle Bild belehren".[87] However, this language does not fit well with a baptism that *also* involves the Spirit and

---

[84] Dunn, *Baptism*, 11; Turner, *Power*, 178 n. 28, and *contra* R. L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 289-95.

[85] That Luke is presenting a description of the work of the *messiah* is indicated by the narrative clue in the previous verse: the people wondered whether John was "the Christ". Luke explicitly advertises his Davidic understanding of Χριστός in Luke 2:11, 20, and 20:41.

[86] Marshall, *Luke*, 146.

[87] "The baptism of fire prompts us to think of judgment as the context (VV 9.17b) and the traditional image teach", *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:174. For a discussion of the of the "traditional image" in relation to Qumran and the Baptist logion see C. H. H. Scobie, "John the Baptist" in *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed., M. Black; London: SPCK, 1969), 58-69 (59).

the application given to the work of the Spirit after Pentecost, which has positive overtones.[88] Consequently, Dunn observes that many scholars have thought that John originally either spoke of just a baptism of fire[89] or just a baptism of wind and fire,[90] which eliminates the perceived difficulty. Schürmann, however, correctly observes that the Baptist' message was directed to salvation and a logion about a „Sturmwind-Taufe" alone would be implausible: „Ein Fehlen der Heilsvorstellung ergäbe zudem eine analogielose und absurd Eschatologie: Eine Messiaserwartung, die nur den Richter, nicht primär den Retter gesehen hat, hat es in Israel nie gegeben".[91] Accordingly, Dunn argues[92] for the historical likelihood of a reference to the holy Spirit in the Baptist's original preaching (represented by Q), and argues that the,

> ...most probable interpretation is that Spirit-and-fire together describe the one purgative act of messianic judgment which both repentant and unrepentant would experience, the former as a blessing, the latter as a destruction.[93]

---

[88] As Schürmann notes, Pentecost is not the only fulfilment of the logion; the receipt of the Spirit through the laying on of hands as well as the Cornelius episode are embraced by the prediction, *Lukasevangelium*, 1:174.

[89] For example, see R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963), 246.

[90] For example, see C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947), 126. Hence, Barrett believes that the form of the Baptist's logion in Mark and Q are "due to the influence of Christian experience"; Bultmann is in agreement, *Synoptic Tradition*, 246; see also E. Best "Spirit-Baptism", *NovT* 4 (1960): 236-43 (240).

[91] "The lack of a notion of salvation would lead to an absurd eschatology without any analogy: an expectation of the Messiah, which only viewed him as a redeemer, has never existed in Israel", *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:176.

[92] *Baptism*, 9-10. Dunn's reasons are twofold: i) the synoptic traditions show that John's preaching has a salvific as well as a judgmental aspect and this is the basis of the two baptismal characteristics for Jesus' baptism; ii) Qumran teaching on the cleansing power of the holy Spirit forms a parallel to John's preaching, with which John may have been familiar, and so there is no need to eliminate the Spirit from a putative original.

[93] *Baptism*, 11. See also his essay, "The Birth of a Metaphor—Baptized in Spirit" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 103-117 (105). Dunn is followed by Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 153, and Turner, *Power*, 173. Schürmann. *Das*

However, it is not clear that Dunn is able to explain satisfactorily how a metaphorical idea of *destructive* fire can co-exist with the non-metaphorical idea of "the Spirit" in a joint characterization of messianic baptism that takes Pentecost as a paradigm. His proposal requires there to be two groups in the narrative fulfilment—the repentant and unrepentant. and it is not clear that there are two such groups.[94]

Dunn's evidence consists of several Old Testament and Second Temple texts involving "fire", but he does not invoke the Pentecost account as a control on his interpretation, because he is arguing a historico-critical case regarding the *original form* of the Baptist's logion. Further, along with other scholars,[95] citing similar texts, Dunn does not privilege Luke's use of Mal 3:1 in his interpretation of the logion. Crucially, for our approach, the context of Malachi utilizes a metaphor of fire in relation to purification of the Levites, but it does so only in relation to the one group, and does not portray a second group that might function as a typical analogue to Dunn's "unrepentant" people.[96]

If we can show that Luke intends his readers to associate an idea of *non-destructive purification*[97] with the "fire" of the Baptist's logion, Dunn's

---

Lukasevangelium, 1:171 adds to the judgmental reading that the „die Feuertaufe ist nur der Hintergrund" ("the baptism of fire is only the background") and that „Heil and Rettung aus dem Feuerbrand" ("salvation and redemption from the fire") is the point of the logion.

[94] The same criticism applies to Turner, *Power*, 185 and Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:176.

[95] Marshall, *Luke*, 147-148; Best, "Spirit-Baptism", 240; Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 153.

[96] Wenk notes Mal 3:1-3 as a cleansing text in connection with Luke 3:16-17. *Community-Forming Power*, 187 n. 41, but interprets the logion in relation to two groups—repentant and unrepentant, associating the fire of v. 16 with the fire of v. 17 (187-188).

[97] Dunn notes that this approach, stemming from Chrysostom, has "been generally abandoned" by scholars, "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 93-102 (93); our aim is to explore how far it can be

historical case for the original form of the Baptist's logion will be strengthened, but in a way that Dunn excludes: his claim is that "the fire of the baptism logion, coming as it does between and closely linked to the other references [to fire], can hardly be so different as to lack the same element of punitive destruction".[98] Our counter-claim is that the "fire" of the purging metaphor is indeed different to the "fire" of ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, i.e. purging is not the same action or activity as baptizing.[99] This "spirit-and-fire" relates to a single group, rather than two groups, and it involves the notion of beneficial purification.[100] If "fire" is beneficial, then Schürmann is wrong to assert that "the baptism of fire is not a salvation-good".[101]

Given our methodological concern with the implied reader and how s/he might have interpreted the Baptist's prediction,[102] our question is how the characteristics of "fire" and "holy Spirit" *might* jointly characterize

---

rehabilitated. Green, *Luke*, 181, canvasses this reading, along with the "destructive" reading.

[98] "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism", 95.

[99] See A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901), 95. More recently, Turner has observed that "the wording of 3:17 implies that John viewed himself as having in large measure effected the eschatological sifting of Israel" because the Coming One has a spade to clean the threshing floor rather than a winnowing fork, *Power*, 171. This further distinguishes the action of baptism in v. 16 from the eschatological cleansing of v. 17. The evidence of Palestinian agricultural practices supports this approach and this is set out by R. L. Webb, "The Activity of John the Baptist's Expected Figure at the Threshing Floor (Matthew 3:12=Luke 3:17)" *JSNT* 43 (1991): 103-111. Webb usefully notes that if winnowing is not the activity of Luke 3:17, it is unlikely that πνεῦμα denotes "wind" in Luke 3:16, "Activity", 110. Exactly what the eschatological cleansing is in v. 17 is unclear, but the metaphor of destruction suggests that the work of the Coming One is not one of immediate restoration.

[100] A link between the holy Spirit and purification was made by the Qumran sect, see 1QS 3.7-9, 4.21, 1QH 16.12. M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961), 135, suggests that there may be an allusion in 1QS 4.21 to Mal 3:3 insofar as it uses the metaphor of refining (יברר); however, the verb is different to that in Malachi (צרף).

[101] „Die Feuertaufe ist kein Heilsgut", *Das Lukasevangelium*, 1:174.

[102] Accordingly, it is not satisfactory to assert, with Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 153, that "the fulfilment is not necessarily as the expectation"; Nolland is forced to make this statement because he sees no direct fulfilment for the fire aspect of the baptism, and this is because he interprets the fire of Luke 3:16 to be the same as that in Luke 3:17.

Pentecost as a "baptism" in the light of Luke's use of Malachi.[103] It is possible (from a redaction-critical point of view) that Luke has "fire" in the logion in contradistinction to Mark in order to forge a link with Malachi.

Luke has John address "the people" (λαός, ὑμᾶς, Luke 3:15-16), and it is this corporate entity of which Jesus' baptizing work is predicated (rather than just a group of disciples). Luke sets up multiple contrasts between John and the one who is coming: strength (ἰσχυρότερος); status (ἱκανός); instrument of baptism (πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί); and ownership (ἄλων, ἀποθήκη). The critical intertextual allusion that Luke makes for his readers in Luke 3:16 is the idea of *one who is coming* (ἔρχομαι). This allusion draws in Mal 3:1[104] to the process of understanding the meaning of the baptismal prediction:

> Behold, I send my messenger, to prepare the way before me, and the lord (אדון/κύριος), whom you seek, will suddenly come (בוא/ἔρχομαι) to his temple; and (ו/καί) the messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight, behold, he is coming (בוא/ἔρχομαι), says the Lord of hosts.

The interpretation of this text is disputed by scholars. The critical question for modern scholars is whether the text refers to one or two individuals. Our question is the same, but we ask it on behalf of Luke: how did he read this text? Luke has already flagged his view of John as Elijah (Luke 1:16-17), and this understanding is derived from Mal 4:5. This text is an evident interpretation of the earlier prediction of Mal 3:1, supplying an

---

[103] Accordingly, we reject the diplomatic pluralism of Brawley, *Text to Text*, 77, who argues of three scholarly readings of Luke 3:16 that "intertextuality allows for all three voices to sound out of the cultural repertoire at the same time". The cultural repertoire does offer various intertextual links and readings, but this does not mean that Luke does not expect his reader to discriminate between these possible linkages.

[104] D. Daube, *The Sudden in the Scriptures* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), 22, n.2, describes this link as "absolutely necessary"; Turner, *Power*, 183, describes it as "probable".

identification of the one who would be sent.[105] It reuses common semantic and lexical elements to identify Elijah as the one who will be sent (יהוה, שנה, ל, שלח, אנכי, הנה). This coincidence of elements, (מלאך and אליה are both the subject of שלח), which are carried forward into the LXX, makes it probable that Luke read the messenger of Mal 3:1 as a reference to Elijah and that he therefore discerned two individuals in the text, with only the second individual being characterized as someone who was "coming". Significantly, Luke uses ὁ ἐρχόμενος of Jesus (Luke 7:19-20; 13:35; 19:38) thereby evoking Ps 118:26.[106]

That Luke sees two individuals in Mal 3:1 is suggested by his later use of this text in Luke 7:27.[107] The Malachi source is changed to create a distinction between Jesus and John,

> This is the one about whom it has been written: 'Look, I am sending my messenger ahead of you, who will prepare your path in front of you'.[108]

The change to a second-person pronoun from the first-person in the MT/LXX texts in Jesus' reported speech establishes that Jesus is to be placed into the role of Yahweh and John the Baptist into the role of the messenger.[109]

---

[105] So O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. Ackroyd; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 442.

[106] J. A. T. Robinson suggests that John saw "the Coming One" as Elijah—see his "Elijah, John and Jesus" in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1962), 29-30, 33. He distinguishes John the Baptist's view from the later view of Luke, who took John the Baptist to be "Elijah". Accordingly, Robinson reads John the Baptist's allusion to Mal 3:1 in terms of one individual—Elijah; Luke, however, read Malachi as referring to two coming individuals: Elijah is "sent" before the "coming" (ἔρχομαι) day of the Lord (Mal 4:5), and this day is associated with the "lord" who comes (ἔρχομαι) "suddenly" to his temple (Mal 3:1).

[107] See Markus Öhler, "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God" *JBL* 118 (1999): 461-476 (467-468).

[108] J. S. Kloppenborg, J. M. Robinson, and P. Hoffmann, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 134.

[109] Luke's contrast between John and someone coming who was stronger (ὁ ἰσχυρότερος) is supported by his citational use of Isa 40:3-5, which has a

The change of pronouns in Luke 7:27 conforms the citation of Mal 3:1 closer to Exod 23:20 (LXX), upon which the Malachi text is dependent.[110] The angel which went before Israel led them in the way and brought them to the land. This is the point upon which Malachi bases his prediction: in the same way that an angel led Israel in the way to the land, so too Yahweh was coming to the land and an angel (messenger) would prepare *his* way. The presupposition of this reworking of Exod 23:20 by Malachi is that Yahweh is absent from the land. This is consistent with post-exilic dissatisfaction with the temple and the absence of the Shekinah-Glory (Hag 2:3, 7). One of the continuing causes for this absence is the condition of the priesthood as described by Malachi (Mal 2:8). This reading is supported by (and supports) the most likely scenario for dating Malachi, viz. that his oracles are to be dated after the re-building of the temple.

However, while preparation for the coming of Yahweh is required, Malachi does not make Levitical purification a condition for the return of Yahweh to the temple, and neither does he formally equate Yahweh with the "lord" who comes suddenly to the temple; Yahweh speaks of this "lord" in the third-person. However, this does not exclude the possibility that Yahweh would come to the land *in the person* of the "lord" whom the people sought. The probability that Luke read Malachi 3 in this way is suggested by his use of Isaiah 40. The words פנה,[111] דרך/ὁδός, and יהוה/κύριος are shared between Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3. Luke applies Isaiah 40 and its use of יהוה/κύριος to Jesus, and Luke also applies אדון/κύριος from Malachi 3 to Jesus.

Luke is therefore doing two things with Mal 3:1: first, in Luke 7:27 he sets up a typological comparison between John the Baptist and the angel of the

---

corresponding *emphasis* on someone coming "with might" (Isa 40:10, חזק/ἰσχύς) in addition to the messenger.

[110] Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 131.

[111] Isa 40:3 (LXX) has ἑτοιμάζω for this verb whereas Mal 3:1 (LXX) has ἐπιβλέπω.

Lord, and between Yahweh and Jesus; and secondly. in Luke 3:16 he sets up an eschatological comparison between the "lord" who was *coming* and Jesus. This duality of usage is consistent with a pattern in Israelite traditions whereby one mode of revelation for Yahweh is angelic, and narrative stories typically ascribe action both to Yahweh and the angelic messenger. Luke shows that he is aware of this pattern in his treatment of the burning bush incident and the Sinai theophanies (Acts 7:30, 38), and in his description of the work of Gabriel (Luke 1:26, 45).

This nascent Christology addresses the difficulty raised and answered in different ways by Dunn and Turner: how can *Luke* attribute eschatological bestowal of the Spirit to the messiah when "pre-Christian Judaism expected no such thing"?[112] Turner meets this difficulty by asserting, contrary to the consensus approach, that

> ...it is intrinsically much more likely that his words [John the Baptist's] 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.[113]

Dunn's conservative alternative is that John the Baptist took the "step of fusing the two thoughts, of an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit and a Spirit-anointed messiah".[114]

Turner and Dunn correctly see a pneumatological difficulty. The repetition in Acts of the contrast between the baptism of John and Pentecost shows that Turner's proposal is not *Luke's* reading, even if it were a plausible construal of a hypothetical original intent in John's preaching. Further.

---

[112] Turner, *Power*, 179; Turner considers this a difficulty both for any historical judgment about the Baptist's preaching and any Lucan presentation.

[113] *Power*, 180.

[114] "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism", 102; Dunn is followed by Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 152.

whether John the Baptist originated the innovation suggested by Dunn is a moot point for our approach. Luke simply presents Jesus in the *role* of Yahweh vis-à-vis the bestowal of the Spirit. For Jesus to bestow the Spirit[115] *is* for Yahweh to bestow the Spirit; the minimum Christology[116] required for this supposition is that Jesus be viewed as an agent of Yahweh. This possibility *is* advertised in the analogous relationship between Yahweh and the "Angel of the Lord".[117]

The actions attributed in Malachi 3 to the one who was coming included a work of purification (vv. 2-4). That this is *not* the work of the forerunner is shown by the statement that the lord "shall sit" (v. 3, ישב/καθίζω); this is a static and positional remark complementary to the act of judgment and consistent with existing traditions associating "sitting on a throne", a "lord" and "the temple" elaborated in Isaiah's call narrative (Isa 6:1).[118] Malachi predicts a "lord" (אדון/κύριος) coming to his temple (היכל/ναός) and sitting (ישב/καθίζω) in judgment (v. 5), and Isaiah had seen a vision of a "lord" (אדון/κύριος) sitting (ישב/κάθημαι) in the temple (היכל/οἶκος). Furthermore, in both narratives there is an element of purification and fire: Isaiah is cleansed with a coal from the altar (Isa 6:7), and the Levites are purified by

---

115 The bestowal of the Spirit through agents is also illustrated by Moses (Deut 34:9, cf. Acts 8:17).

116 The qualification "minimum" is important. It is possible to develop the Christological implications of Jesus' bestowal of the Spirit, for example, see M. M. B. Turner, "'Trinitarian' Pneumatology in the New Testament?—Towards an Explanation of the Worship of Jesus" *The Asbury Theological Journal* 57/58 (2002/2003): 167-186.

117 For diachronic introductions see W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Baker; 2 vols; London: SCM Press, 1961-67), 2:23-29, and G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; 2 vols; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962-65), 1:285-289. S. A. Meier, "Angel of Yahweh", in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (eds., K. van der Toorn, R. Becking and P. W. van der Horst; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 96-108, is a recent overview. W. G. Heidt, *The Angelology of the Old Testament* (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1949), 69-101, offers a synchronic study.

118 Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 129-132, asserts that Israelite traditions hold the work of judgment to be more properly that of Yahweh rather than a messenger.

the refiner's fire (v. 3). Subsequent to this purification, Isaiah is "sent" with a commission and the Levites offer sacrifices.

Isaiah's vision had currency in Johannine tradition (John 12:41)[119] as a presentation of the exaltation of Jesus, and this allows the hypothesis that Luke knew of such an exegetical trajectory and intended his readers to see a similar connection between the work of Malachi's "lord" and Isaiah's exalted "lord". Since Luke connects the baptismal work of the coming "lord" with *Pentecost* rather than anything else in Jesus' ministry, a connection between Malachi 3 and Isaiah 6 should be carried forward by him into the details of the Pentecost narrative, and this is in fact what we find.

While Luke takes Malachi to distinguish the "messenger" from the "lord" who was to come, it is not certain whether he regarded the "messenger of the covenant" to be a further description of the "messenger" or the "lord". B. Glazier-McDonald argues for an equation with the "lord", but this is because she is anxious to attribute the actions of vv. 2-4 to the "lord".[120] Our contrary suggestion is that Luke equated the "messenger" with the "messenger of the covenant", but not because he regarded the whole oracle (vv. 1-5) as entirely about the "messenger". Rather, the description the "messenger of the covenant" has Levitical associations that make it more applicable to John the Baptist[121] rather than Jesus, whom he places in the line of Judah (Luke 3:33).[122]

---

[119] For a discussion of this connection see N. A. Dahl, "The Johannine Church and History" in *The Interpretation of John* (ed., J. Ashton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 147-167 (154-155).

[120] Glazier-McDonald's reading treats the conjunction (ומלאך הברית/καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης) as conjunctive rather than epexegetical. For a discussion of ו including epexegetical examples (2 Sam 14:5; Isa 44:1; Exod 24:7), see B. T. Arnold and J. H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 146-149.

[121] Josephus (*Ant.* 8.13.12) and the LXX (1 Kgs 17:1) record that Elijah was from Θεσβωνης/Θεσβων, which may be spelling variants for Heshbon, a Levitical city (1 Chron 6:81).

[122] Scholars have commented upon the Jewish expectation that the messiah was to be Levitical; this presumption may lie behind the denial recorded in

The oracles before Mal 3:1 describe an ideal, in which the priest's lips should "keep knowledge", and a people who should seek the Law at "his mouth", because "he" was the "messenger" of Yahweh (Mal 2:7). However, the priests had departed from "the way", corrupting "the covenant" (Mal 2:8, 10, 14). Consequently, Yahweh declared that he would send "his" messenger instead to prepare "the way" before him. This messenger was also to be a true "messenger of the covenant"—a priest in whom the people would delight. He would come before a "lord", who would come to the temple and purify the Levites (Mal 3:2-3).[123]

This temple and priestly context in Malachi informs several details in Luke's "Baptist Narrative".

1) Luke opens his Baptist material with a pointed contrast: Annas and Caiaphas were the high priests, but the word of God came unto John the son of Zacharias (Luke 3:2), a lower-order priest. This contrast introduces the intended target of both John's preaching and the work of the messiah. This juxtaposition reflects Isa 40:2-3 (LXX) in which there is a mention of priests alongside "the Voice".

2) John was a Levite (Luke 1:5), a "messenger of the covenant" (Mal 2:7; 3:1), and one in whom the people delighted (Mal 3:1; Luke 1:14; 20:6). His assertion of unworthiness, "the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose", can be construed as a parabolic[124] utterance spoken from a Levitical perspective. If Luke regards the priesthood in Jerusalem to be corrupt, John the Baptist *qua* a Levite would not be worthy to "unloose the

---

John 1:20, to a Levitical delegation, "I am not the messiah", see E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1955), 24.

[123] This expression of hope alludes to the pattern whereby the "good" Davidic kings institute religious reform (Asa, 2 Chron 14:3-5; Jehoshaphat, 2 Chron 17:6; Joash, 2 Chron 24:5; Hezekiah, 2 Chron 29:5; Josiah, 2 Chron 34:5).

[124] This would be an enacted parable in the manner of the classical prophets, e.g. Isa 20:2.

shoe" of the one who was coming, because he was to purify the priesthood.[125] It is perhaps significant that John's speech quotes Moses' words to Yahweh—οὐχ ἱκανός εἰμι (Exod 4:10).

3) The temple focus of the Malachi prophecy suggests that the threshing floor of the Baptist's prophecy is the *temple floor* viewed as a threshing floor (גרן/ἅλων, 2 Sam 24:21; Luke 3:17, cf. *Ant.* 7.13.4). This suggests an action of cleansing the temple, and a work of purification[126] in respect of the Levitical priesthood (Mal 3:3), a work of baptism with holy Spirit and fire.[127]

4) Luke describes the crowd as the "offspring of vipers" (Luke 3:7): in Matthean tradition it is the Pharisees and Sadducees which receive this approbation (Matt 3:7), and in Johannine tradition it is the "priests and Levites" (John 1:19) to whom John directs his remarks. These traditions explicitly identify a leadership focus in John's preaching. Luke weakens the identification, nevertheless, "vipers" is more likely to be vituperative of a social group, rather than the "people" as a whole, and their offspring would likewise be part of this group.[128]

5) Luke presents John the Baptist as an "ideal" priest in his narrative build-up of the reader's expectations. Thus, Luke echoes Malachi at several points in his birth narratives. For instance, i) Malachi contrasts the ideal Levite. as one who "turns" (ἐπιστρέφω/שוב) many away from iniquity, and this was to be the function of John the Baptist (Mal 2:6; Luke 1:17); and ii) the ideal Levite keeps knowledge for the people (Mal 2:7), and the function of John the Baptist was to give "knowledge" of salvation (Luke 1:77).

---

[125] Matthean tradition (Matt 3:14) has recorded that John expressed a need to be baptized by Jesus which, in the context of Malachi 3, would indicate an acknowledgement of the need for Levitical purification.
[126] This theme carries forward into Acts in Luke's remark, "and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:5).
[127] Alternatively, there may be an allusion here to "the Sanhedrin was arranged like the half of a round threshing floor" (*m. Sanh.* 4:3).
[128] Dunn, "John the Baptist's Use of Scripture" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998). 118-129 (123).

4.1.1 Malachi and Pentecost

Luke's use of Malachi 2 and 3 sends a reader to *this* eschatological context for an interpretation of "fire" in the assertion, αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, rather than to any other eschatological tradition mentioning fire. The refining figure in Malachi describes a *beneficial* effect on a single group of people (Levites),[129] and this is different from the destructive unquenchable fire of Luke's purging metaphor (Luke 3:17). Accordingly, it is likely that Luke is presenting two distinct "fire" metaphors in his account of the Baptist's preaching. Luke's use of a single preposition to govern πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί, and his application of this enhanced kind of baptism to a single group (λαός), agrees with Malachi's focus and beneficial intent. Furthermore, the beneficial purpose of this baptism coincides with and develops the salvific effect of John's water-baptism, with which it is contrasted,[130] and which was also applied to a singular group.[131]

Bock argues that,

> Acts 2:3 does not say that the baptism associated with the Spirit is *of* fire, but that it spread through the crowd *like* a fire. Thus, the Acts image of fire discusses only the Spirit's spreading through the crowd and does not discuss the nature of the baptism itself...Thus, the baptism with fire in Luke 3:16 does not have literary contact with Acts.[132]

---

[129] See C. H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 72. Scobie cites 1QS 4.20, 21 as a parallel which links purification, water and the "Spirit of truth".

[130] Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 172.

[131] While agreeing with Turner, *Power*, 183, on the "cleansing" intent in the spirit-and-fire baptism, our emphasis is on the wholly beneficial nature of the purification, and hence we do not include texts such as Isa 4:4 as relevant background; see Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 185.

[132] *Luke*, 1:323.

Parsons and Culy note the "awkwardness of the construction"[133] in διαμεριζόμεναι γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς καὶ ἐκάθισεν (Acts 2:3). but observe that ὡσεί is a conjunction that "indicates an analogy or comparison between the connected ideas".[134] If γλῶσσα and πῦρ are conjoined as an analogy. the tongues *as of* fire are distributed to each person. The stress would appear to be on the appearance of tongues as of fire, especially as the narrative goes on to describe a miracle involving tongues.

In a corresponding way the holy Spirit fills *each one* (Acts 2:4). and this happening is tied to the appearance of the tongues of fire. The literary contact therefore with Luke 3:16 is the co-incident happening to one group of something involving spirit and fire and as such Acts 2:3-4 is a reasonable narrative fulfilment of the Baptist' prediction.[135] Against Bock we would argue that Acts 2:3 does not discuss the Spirit spreading like fire; the Spirit is not mentioned until Acts 2:4.

There is an obvious *dissonance* between Malachi and Luke's portrayal of the work of the Coming One: a literal Levitical fulfilment is not described in the Gospel or Acts, since the focus of Malachi's oracle is the priesthood and a direct engagement with the priests. The result of the work of purification is described in terms of their "offerings" (מנחה/θυσία, Mal 3:3). Recognition of this dissonance is too obvious for it not to be *part* of what a reader *might* have brought to Luke's text.

Alternative scriptural contexts suggested by scholars for understanding the Baptist's prediction are susceptible to the criticism that they do not follow the *lead* supplied by Luke, even if they are part of a plausible reconstruction of the historical content of the Baptist's preaching. Thus, while Luke will subsequently use Isa 32:15 and Joel 3:1-5 in relation to Pentecost (Luke

---

[133] *Acts*, 24.

[134] *Acts*, 24.

[135] Bock's argument is also subject to the following difficulty: something that can spread like fire is itself not fire in such a simile; but Acts 2:3 seems to describe a (possibly visionary) phenomenon involving fire.

24:49; Acts 2:16-21), these texts are not being brought to bear upon his description of the Baptist's prediction about the Coming One: a "pouring" figure is not the same as a figure of "baptism". Similarly, eschatological scriptural contexts that jointly mention "fire" and "spirit" (e.g. Isa 4:4;[136] 30:27-28;[137] 33:11), or just one of these terms (Isa 66:15[138]), *may* depict the work of the messiah, but this does not mean that such contexts are being used in *Luke's* presentation of the Baptist's logion. On the contrary, Luke's presentation of Jesus' ministry and the witness in Acts lacks acts of wrath and judgment; instead Luke interposes Jesus' death before any casting of fire upon the earth (Luke 12:49-50; 18:7-8; 21:22).

Dunn notes that the absence of "and fire" from the report of Jesus' prediction (Acts 1:5; 11:16) remains "something of a continuing puzzle".[139] The most common kind of proposal to the puzzle revolves around Luke's use of sources, and whether Luke is here dependent on sources closer to Markan tradition against his earlier preferences in Luke 3.[140] Our contrary proposal is that the conjunction of "fire" with "holy Spirit" in Luke 3:16 is epexegetical, and that Luke drops "fire" in Acts because the explanation of baptism in/by the Spirit is supplied immediately by the actual narrative story of Pentecost and the ensuing working out of that bestowal.

Malachi uses the simile of a refining fire to describe the work of the "lord". The simile receives its sense by way of contrast with Malachi's description of what was wrong with the Levites: they had not kept knowledge (Mal 2:7). and corrupted the teaching of the Law (Mal 2:8, 17), and this had resulted in various false practices. The work of the "lord" is not therefore one that relates to atonement and cleansing of iniquity *per se*; it is concerned specifically with reformation in teaching and practice. The work of John the Baptist was concerned with a water-baptism signifying repentance and

---

[136] Marshall, *Luke*, 147; Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, 153; Dunn, *Baptism*, 12; Turner, *Power*, 174.
[137] Dunn, "John the Baptist", 126.
[138] Conzelmann, *Acts*, 16.
[139] "Birth of a Metaphor", 113.
[140] For a discussion of these solutions see Marshall, *Luke*, 144-149.

remission of sins. Luke's presentation of the Coming One *adds* to this kind of work, viz., a bestowal of the Spirit that would result in a *reformation in teaching and practice.*

Turner argues that the Baptist' prediction indicates that the disciples would be cleansed/purified by the Spirit. He asserts that,

> John baptized using water to wash and so to *cleanse* the repentant Israel of the contagion of sin; *mutatis mutandis*, the messiah will wash and so 'cleanse' the repentant Israel with Spirit-and-fire: he will 'cleanse it' in the fuller sense, that is, restore it as Utopian Zion.[141]

Cleansing is implied by the comparative figure of baptism, and we would argue that Malachi shows the "sin" of Israel to be a matter of teaching and practice.

There is dissonance and fit between Malachi and Pentecost. Malachi has a material focus in the institution of priesthood and the work of the Levites; Pentecost has no such focus. Further, in material terms the "lord" is present in Malachi's prophecy and absent in Acts 2. The end-result envisaged by Malachi is that the "offering" of Judah and Jerusalem will be acceptable (Mal 3:5); no such material end is even adumbrated in Acts. However, despite such material inappropriateness, there are echoes of Malachi's prophecy in Luke's narrative that suggest he regarded Pentecost as a *typical* fulfilment of Malachi:

1) The forerunner of Malachi is followed by the "lord", who comes "suddenly" to the "temple" (Mal 3:1). Scholars have long noted that Luke's Gospel has a "journey" narrative. Luke begins this journey with an allusive use of Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 in Luke 9:52, "and [he] sent (ἀποστέλλω) messengers (ἄγγελος) before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans,

---

[141] *Power*, 183; he also attaches the idea of "restoration" to "cleansing" in what the implied reader would take from Malachi, 176.

to make ready (ἑτοιμάζω) for him". Luke appears aware of the prophetic requirement that messengers be sent before the arrival of the lord in Jerusalem.

Malachi says of this "lord" that he was sought by the people (בקש). and in this detail the prophet alludes to Psalm 24, in which there is a description of a king who is likewise sought (בקש) by the people, and who comes to Jerusalem in glory (Ps 24:6). Luke presents Jesus' arrival in Jerusalem in terms of Psalms 24 and 118 (the coming of a king—Luke 19:38). accompanied by praise of God's "mighty works" (Luke 19:37).

However, Luke is careful to limit reader expectation at this point in his story, thereby showing that he is sensitive to the fuller scope of the scriptural source material and its descriptions of the eschatological age. Thus, Luke follows the narrative aside, "because he was near to Jerusalem" (Luke 19:11), with the parable of the nobleman who goes into a far country (Luke 19:12-27). The "reign" of the nobleman is reserved for the time of the return from this far country (Luke 19:27). Further, at the point of entry to Jerusalem, Luke records Jesus saying that "peace" was then "hid" from Jerusalem (Luke 19:42) and prophesying its destruction. In this way, Luke invites his reader to see Jesus' triumphal entry as *a typical but not actual* fulfilment of Jewish expectations.[142]

2) There is a parabolic demonstration of Malachi's prophecy in Jesus' cleansing[143] (Luke 19:46) of the temple, followed by his teaching in the temple and engagement with the priests and scribes (Luke 19:47; 20:1; 21:37-38). In a fuller sense, it is this *teaching* activity that Luke presents as the work of purification on the part of the "lord" from Malachi.

---

[142] Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 132.
[143] Luke's redactional changes, compared to the Markan account, have deleted the detail of Jesus' stopping temple routines (Mark 11:16), and dropped the story of the cursing of the fig tree, thus emphasizing the purification aspects of Jesus' action in the temple.

3) While there is this parabolic demonstration, Luke is careful to continue the work of the Malachi "lord" beyond his death, but through the Spirit. Luke states that his second volume continues what Jesus "began to do and teach" (Acts 1:1). Hence, Pentecost is a baptism *by* Jesus (Luke 3:16; 24:49) and Luke is careful to echo details of Malachi's prophecy:

i) The bestowal of the Spirit is accompanied by the "sudden" occurrence of sound (Acts 2:1, ἄφνω) intimating the "sudden" arrival of the lord (ἐξαίφνης/פתאם, Mal 3:1).[144] Luke is here applying the idea of a sudden coming of the "lord" in terms of "sudden" coming of the Spirit.

ii) We argued above (Section 2.3.1) that the Pentecost theophany occurred in the temple. We suggested that Luke's descriptive detail alludes to Isaiah's vision and call theophany which took place in the temple. Such a location would also cohere with Luke's use of Malachi 3 insofar as the lord comes to his temple. (Acts 2:2; Mal 3:1[145]).

iii) There is a manifestation of "fire" (πῦρ, Acts 2:3) which sits (καθίζω, Acts 2:3) upon the disciples. This picks up on two details in Malachi: first, the "lord" is *like* a refiner's fire (אש/πῦρ, Mal 3:2), and this can indicate the language of theophany (Exod 24:17); secondly, the "lord" sits (ישב/καθίζω, Mal 3:3)[146] when refining and purifying the silver.

---

144 The echo here is not lexical across the Greek but Abbott-Smith notes that the related ἄφνω and ἐξαίφνης translate פתאם in the LXX, *Manual Greek Lexicon*, 71, 158. Luke may therefore be echoing Mal 3:1 with a nuanced change from ἄφνω to ἐξαίφνης. Daube notes, *Sudden*, 30, that disaster is no longer the implication of ἄφνω in NT usage, whereas apart from Mal 3:1, this is the dominant sense of פתאם. Barrett concurs with Daube and sees an overtone of "wondrous" and "awesome" in ἄφνω, *Acts*, 1:113.

145 Malachi uses ναός whereas Isaiah uses οἶκος. Luke's multiple use of Malachi and Isaiah in the same narrative account requires a choice of term and he has chosen to echo Isaiah with οἶκος.

146 This detail may also be echoed in Jesus sitting at God's right hand (Acts 2:34).

4) The disciples at Pentecost are not Levites and there is no material fit with Malachi on this point. However, the disciples go forward in the power of the Spirit (Luke 24:49) and act as agents of the "lord" in purifying the people through preaching. Further, as J. Bradley Chance has shown,[147] Luke develops a temple-directed apologetic in the early chapters of Acts. Such an apologetic reflects an understanding of the work of the *Coming One* as focused on the temple and the Levites. Several details support this theme:

i) The focus of fellowship is the temple (Luke 24:53; Acts 2:46): a) participation in temple services and cultic observances continues (Acts 3:1; 21:26); b) Luke does not transfer temple motifs to the early disciples, as in other early Christian writings; c) he excludes the "destroy this temple" slogan from Jesus' lips (Mark 14:58; John 2:19); d) early preaching and witness is centred in the temple (Acts 5:19, 42); and finally, e) he records that as the number of disciples multiply in Jerusalem "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7).[148] This last detail signals for Luke the *partial* typical "cleansing" of the Levitical priesthood. The hope expressed by Malachi was that "the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant" (Mal 4:4), and Luke translates this hope into a record of rising mass conversions in Jerusalem (Acts 2:41; 4:4; 5:14; 6:1; 21:20), remaining "zealous of the Law" (Acts 21:20).[149]

ii) After the report of the conversion of the priests, the structure of the first part of Luke's story culminates in the scattering of the disciples from

---

[147] See Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, chs. 3 and 4.

[148] It is ironic that Luke records three thousand souls were "added" on the day of Pentecost, as this is the number that were killed by the Levites after the incident of the Golden Calf (Exod 32:28). A similar irony can be discerned in Malachi's prophecy insofar as it alludes to the same day of faithful Levitical triumph (Mal 2:6; 3:6). In both Malachi and Luke the ironical point is the same: the Levites had failed the people; on this see Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 149.

[149] This stress on Jerusalem in Luke-Acts reflects a current expectation that the messiah would "purge" Jerusalem, *Ps. Sol.* 17:30.

Jerusalem (Acts 8:4), but Luke is careful to position this after Stephen's speech which is constructed to address the charge that Jesus would destroy the temple and change the customs of Moses (Acts 6:14). The themes of this speech do not *directly* answer the charge, but rather legitimate the worship of God in other places. Thus, Acts 7:7 quotes Exod 3:12 (עבד/λατρεύω) that legitimates worship of God at Sinai, holy ground (Acts 7:33); Acts 7:44-45 authenticates worship in the wilderness, and throughout the promised land during the period of the amphictyony, using the tabernacle; and Stephen concludes by asserting that "the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands" (Acts 7:48).

iii) Luke's story thus moves away from Jerusalem. Luke is not attached to the Herodian temple, as he includes predictive material about its destruction (Luke 21:6); he is aware of its ultimate failure. Luke has no explicit statement about the restoration of the temple, and he has expressed the view that the Deity does not dwell in temples made with hands (Acts 7:48).[150]

The only text that might be construed as a reference to a future restoration of the temple is Luke's citation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 and its reference to the "tabernacle of David" being restored.[151] Scholars have argued variously that the expression "tabernacle of David" refers to the restoration of Israel,[152] the nascent church,[153] and Jesus.[154] Chance argues that Luke expects the restoration of Jerusalem, but on the question of a

---

[150] *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 137-138; see also Fuller, *Restoration*, 266, 268.

[151] The citation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 is a complex textual question, discussion of which lies beyond the scope of this study—see McLay, *Use of the Septuagint*, 17-36 for an analysis of the relationship between Amos 9:11-12 (MT and LXX) to Acts 15:16-17.

[152] Dunn, *Acts*, 203-204; Pao, *New Exodus*, 137.

[153] Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 37-41. R. Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles" in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 154-184.

[154] Haenchen, *Acts*, 448. See also Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 232-238.

restored temple he avers, "Given the close association between the city and temple throughout Luke-Acts, one *might* offer a positive answer. though with great reserve".[155]

R. Bauckham has recently analysed Luke's citation from the point of view of Luke's source and Luke's own design. He notes that the building term, ἀνοικοδομέω, replaces the two instances of ἀνίστημι in the LXX of Amos, and affirms, "they would not have been made had the exegete who produced this form of the text not wished it to be quite clear that the reference is to the restoration of a *building*".[156] He supports this argument with the claim that the omission of καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς from the citation of Amos was made because this phrase suggests the rebuilding of city walls rather than a temple.

After reviewing Second Temple texts[157] which refer to the eschatological temple being built by God or his agent, Bauckham concludes, "Thus the exegete whose work is embodied in Acts 15:16-18 may have understood the phrase σκηνή Δαυίδ to mean God himself will build the eschatological temple miraculously through the agency of the Davidic Messiah, though he may simply have taken it to refer to the Temple of the messianic age, which God will build when 'David' rules God's people".[158]

Bauckham further argues that "In a Jewish Christian context in which Amos 9:11-12 is understood to predict the inclusion of Gentiles in the eschatological people of God, it is clear that the eschatological Temple must be understood as the Christian community".[159] His evidence is based on texts outside Acts[160] and he shows that "the Temple as the community" was a prevalent idea in early Christianity. His point is that scriptural

---

[155] *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 137-138.
[156] "James and the Gentiles", 157.
[157] 4QFlor I, 1-13, *1 En.* 90:29, *Jub.* 1:15-17, *Syb. Or.* 5:414-434.
[158] "James and the Gentiles", 159.
[159] "James and the Gentiles", 165.
[160] 1 Cor 3:16-17; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:20-22; Heb 13:15-16; 1 Pet 2:5: 4:17: Rev 3:12; 11:1-2; *Did.* 10:2; *Barn.* 4:11; *Herm. Vis.* 3; *Herm. Sim.* 9 Ign. *Eph.* 9:1.

prophecies of the Gentiles coming to worship God were seen to be fulfilled in them joining the Christian community.[161] While Chance has shown that the idea of the Christian community as the eschatological temple is not prevalent in Luke or Acts,[162] Bauckham points to Acts 15:16 as evidence that Luke saw the community in this way.[163] We conclude, following Bauckham, that the speech of James is therefore part of Luke's temple-directed apologetic.

iv) Luke presents the work of the apostles as "teaching" (Acts 4:2, 18; 5:21, 25, 28, 42), and an extension of Jesus' own teaching (Acts 1:1). A "fire of purification" mediated by the Spirit on behalf of the "lord" would be a suitable symbol for pure teaching, and a mission directed towards the Jews in which there is a separation of true and false in the thinking of the people (a separation of elements[164]). The baptism of the Spirit is not a separation of two groups of people, a sifting of those who respond in faith from those who reject the Gospel. Rather, it is a bestowal of gifts in order to effect reformation in teaching. Of course, a consequence of apostolic preaching was a separation of people,[165] but this is not the meaning of the bestowal-metaphor "baptize with holy spirit and fire". Several aspects of the Malachi prophecy support this application:

a) Malachi's charge is that the priest should "keep" (שמר/φυλάσσω) knowledge, remain in the "way" (דרך/ὁδός), and "turn" (שוב/ἐπιστρέφω) many away from iniquity (Mal 2:6-8); the people should seek the Law at their mouths and the benefits to all would be "life" and "peace" (Mal 2:5). Luke transfers these

---

161 "James and the Gentiles", 167.

162 *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 35-37.

163 *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 41. Chance nuances his view by saying that Luke saw the "Jewish followers" of Christ as a "tabernacle" rather than a temple.

164 This notion of a "separation of elements" is minimalist and should be contrasted with Dunn's notion of the purgative destruction of the dross in the refiner's fire; this stronger figure is not carried across into Luke, nor is it present in Malachi, because there is no information about "the dross" as a group.

165 Hence, Luke's Baptist Logion continues with a gathering of the wheat away from the chaff that is to be burnt (Luke 3:17).

characteristics to the apostles and the body of the disciples: thus Peter's preaching is designed to "turn" the people from iniquity and to the "lord" (ἐπιστρέφω—Acts 3:19; 11:21; 15:19; 26:18, 20; 28:27); the early communities were called "the Way" (ὁδός—Acts 9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14; 24:22) and the disciples claimed to teach the right ways of the "Lord" (Acts 13:10; 18:25, 26); and Luke continues to relate how the early Jewish disciples uphold the Law in teaching and practice (Acts 21:20; 24:14; 25:8; 28:23). The result was that the disciples had peace and walked in the fear of the Lord (Mal 2:6; Acts 9:31).

b) Malachi's answer to the apostasy of the priesthood is that they would be purged as "gold and silver" (Mal 3:3). Within the Book of the Twelve, the post-exilic prophet Zechariah also uses this figure, "And I will put this third into the fire, and refine (צרף/πυρόω) them as one refines silver, and test them as gold is tested. They will call on my name, and I will answer them. I will say, 'They are my people'; and they will say, 'The Lord is my God.'" (Zech 13:9). Malachi's focus is the priesthood, Zechariah's is the people; in each case the refining produces a faithfulness among the people.

It is probable that Luke was aware of this text. It follows on immediately from a prophecy that is used in Matthean tradition to relate the circumstances of the crucifixion (Zech 13:7; Matt 26:31); it also follows on from a prophecy that predicts decimation of two-thirds of the land (Zech 13:8). The last third, however, do not suffer this destructive fate[166]—they are refined through the fire. Luke certainly has themes of "calling upon the name of the Lord" (Acts 2:21; 9:21), and reforming a "people" (Acts 2:14, 47; 4:2; 5:20), which shows an application of Zechariah's prophecy as well as that of Malachi in the context of Pentecost.

---

[166] This would be a further argument against reading Luke's baptism with "spirit and fire" as having a destructive aspect. A third of the people are preserved from destruction and *then* purged. The decimation of the land predicted in Zechariah could easily be read with reference to the Jewish War.

c) Finally, the refining simile is suitable for expressing the apostolic reform in teaching.[167] The Psalmist describes the words of the Lord as "pure words, silver tried (צרף, cf. Mal 3:2-3) in the furnace of the earth" (Ps 12:6), and this is a common figure for the "word of the Lord" (2 Sam 22:31; Ps 18:30; 119:140; Prov 30:5). Luke represents this reform in teaching in the major speeches.[168]

5) Finally, G. K. Beale has presented a case that the Pentecost theophany is an inauguration of a new temple.[169] Several strands of typology lead him to this conclusion. He sees Pentecost as a reversal of Babel,[170] but regards it as significant that Babel was a temple complex. He also views Pentecost as an evocation of Sinai, which he argues was a sanctuary.[171] While we have argued against both of these typologies, Beale also notes some correspondence between Pentecost and the temple theophany of Isaiah 6.[172] We would suggest therefore, with Beale, but choosing different ground, that the Pentecost account may be designed to intimate that there was a new temple emerging in the nascent church.

4.1.2 Conclusion

Contrary to those strands in scholarship that equate the baptising work of the Coming One (Luke 3:16) with the work of destructive purging (Luke 3:17), we have argued that these are distinct activities; the paradigm for understanding the baptismal work of the Coming One is Pentecost. This eschatological work is a work of purification in relation to the Levites in Malachi, but Luke extends the work to include the people. Insofar as this

---

[167] A. Robinson further notes that the refiner (the "lord") would test the purity of the refining process according to the extent that the silver reflected his image, see "God, the Refiner of Silver" *CBQ* 11 (1949): 188-190.

[168] The idea of an eschatological refining (צרף) of the faithful community is also expressed in 4Q177 II, 10-11. The text also expresses the idea of the instrumentality of the spirit (ברוח) but it is not clear how this is to be related to the process of refining. The text also uses Ps 12:6 as a gloss explaining the refining process.

[169] *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, ch. 6.

[170] *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 201-203.

[171] *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 204-208.

[172] *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 205 n. 15.

figure involves a separation of elements, it implies the removal of false thinking on the part of the people.

The work of the Coming One through the apostles thus continues the work of the Baptist in "turning" the people from their iniquity. There is therefore a direct comparison to be made between the work of the Spirit through John the Baptist and the work of the Spirit through the apostles. In Luke's programme, just as John the Baptist was a forerunner to the Coming One, so too the apostles are the forerunner to the return of the Coming One; the spirit and power of Elias was now in the apostles: Luke presents his narrative within the framework of the "last days".

4.2 Using Isaiah

Luke's use of Malachi 3 establishes that the work of the "lord" did not finish with any ascension, but continued in the reformation of the people through the disciples by the Spirit; in addition, with the absence of the "lord", the apostles also function as a "forerunner" to his return. Luke's use of Isaiah 32 brings to the table a different but complementary set of ideas to those found in Malachi 3. These ideas revolve around the nature of Israel's restoration and they complement Luke's use of Isaiah 58 and 61 in the Nazareth pericope. His use of Isaiah 32 therefore raises the question as to whether there is any consistency both with Malachi 3 and Isaiah 58 and 61.

4.2.1 Luke's Use of Isaiah 32

Luke anticipates Pentecost in the following prediction,

> καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.
> (Luke 24:49)

Luke ties this prediction to Pentecost with lexical links: i) ἐπαγγελία occurs in Acts 1:4, 2:33 and 2:39;[173] ii) πατήρ occurs in Acts 1:4 and 2:33; and iii) δύναμις and ἐφ' ὑμᾶς occur in Acts 1:8—all in connection with the Spirit.

---

[173] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 237-241, also discuses Luke 11:13.

Luke's allusion[174] here is to Isa 32:15, using the fragments ἐφ' ὑμᾶς and ἐξ ὕψους ("upon you" and "from on high"), even though he does not use the word πνεῦμα. The allusion is secured by Luke's subsequent connection of πνεῦμα and ἐφ' ὑμᾶς in Acts 1:8, which compensates for the absence of πνεῦμα in Luke 24:49.

Luke's allusion implies a "messianic" reading on his part, but this inevitably raises questions of "fit" for his own readers. Would his readers accept that this text was a suitable context for understanding Pentecost? Furthermore, this text carries its own intertextual links, and it is set within a broader collection of oracles. What might a reader bring from these intertexts to the table of interpretation? This raises the question of the *scope* and therefore the *identity* of Luke's allusion.

4.2.1.1 Readings of Isaiah 32

Scholars have offered messianic and non-messianic readings of Isaiah 32. Childs' opinion is that "both of these interpretations contain elements of truth, but neither has been able to bring forth a convincing portrait of the whole".[175] The problem is that while vv. 15-18 has commonly been taken to be messianic, the unit vv. 9-12, about the women of Jerusalem, has not been seen in this context, and opinion is divided over the unit vv. 1-8 and how to treat its mention of corrupt rulers being replaced by a righteous king and his princes.[176]

Accordingly, there is variety in the constructions of Isaiah 32 offered by scholars. Wonsuk Ma puts forward an exilic reading of Isa 32:15-20, and argues that it is an interpolation, added to balance the judgment oracle of

---

[174] This allusion is not listed by Kimball, *Exposition*, Appendix B, but it is discussed by Litwak, *Echoes*, 153, and it forms the title of Turner's book, *Power from on High*, and is noted by scholars, for example, Pao, *New Exodus*, 92; Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 239; and Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:103. Litwak does not discuss issues of typology or the question of what an implied reader might bring from Isaiah 32 to the text of Luke 24.

[175] *Isaiah*, 239.

[176] Childs, *Isaiah*, 236-239.

Isa 32:9-14. He sees in its language "the antimonarchical attitude in the exilic period as well as the expectation of Yahweh's direct rulership".[177] R. J. Sklba argues[178] that the language of "the Spirit" takes root in Israelite traditions as a result of exile and as part of a theology of re-birth. He highlights a reading pattern whereby the Spirit is associated with the work of restoration and re-vitalization.[179]

However, other commentators present an eighth century reading centred on the events of 701 B.C.E.,[180] and still other commentators have proposed readings based on the reigns of Ahaz,[181] Hoshea,[182] and Josiah.[183] Consequently, Childs is doubtful of the value of any "historicizing" of the oracle,[184] and Barton observes that "arguments about dating and authenticity tend to become very subjective".[185] The problems of interpretation internal to Isaiah are compounded by the paucity of historical data for the eighth and seventh centuries and the conflicting nature of the relevant evidence.

However, neither the critical arguments of this debate nor any adopted historical reading on our part can determine Luke's own historical

---

177 Wonsuk Ma, *Until the Spirit Comes* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 83.

178 R. J. Sklba, "Until the Spirit from on High is Poured out on Us" (Isa 32:15): Reflections on the Role of the Spirit in the Exile" *CBQ* 46 (1984): 1-17.

179 See also L. R. McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit: The Cry of a Prophetic Hermeneutic* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 40.

180 For example, C. Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39* (Interpretation; Louisville: WJK Press. 1993), 229-233, and R. F. Youngblood, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1993), 92. Seitz's analysis is that the series of six woes (Isaiah 28-33) have reference to all aspects of society in Judah and anticipate 701 B.C.E. They are broken "in the middle" by the oracles of Isaiah 32 which correspond to the later exultation of Hezekiah—a righteous king delivering the city.

181 G. W. Wade, *Isaiah* (London: Methuen, 1911), iv.

182 J. H. Hayes and S. A. Irvine, *Isaiah: The Eighth Century Prophet* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), 352.

183 R. E. Clements, *Isaiah 1-39* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

184 *Isaiah*, 239.

185 J. Barton, *Isaiah 1-39* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2003), 19.

perception. In terms of the data in Luke-Acts, we have narrative story elements, and on this level, the story elements of the *collocated* oracles of Isaiah 32 are relevant to a determination of what an implied reader might bring from Isaiah 32 to the understanding of Pentecost. Furthermore, the intertexts of Isaiah 32 contribute to the story elements that a reader might bring to Acts. It is these elements that are relevant to our study, and this exercise leaves open the question whether such a story can be applied to the historical events of any century.

4.2.1.2 Story Elements in Isaiah 32

If Isa 32:15 was read as part of a coherent story by Luke, it implies recognition of a proximate bestowal of the Spirit in relation to other story elements. Scholars have tended to see Isa 32:15-18 in terms of restoration.[186] Our contribution to this consensus is to show that the bestowal of the Spirit is parochial to Jerusalem and pertains to the restoration of the counsel and wisdom needed for good government. It is this "restoration" that Luke brings to bear upon his story in Acts.

Commentators divide the oracle units of Isaiah 32 into vv. 1-8, 9-14 and 15-20.[187] Regardless of this arrangement, redactional links have been noted between v. 14 and v. 15 in that the restoration oracle unit of vv. 15-18 begins with the particle עד.[188] A further link also lies in the rhetorical contrast between v. 13 and v. 15, which is conveyed by the preposition על and the apparent conversational structure implied by the change of voice from Yahweh to a community:

> Upon (על) the land of my people shall come up thorns and briers...upon (על) all the houses of joy...until (עד/ἕως) the Spirit be poured out upon (על/ἐπί) us from on high... Isa 32:13-15

---

186 Turner, *Power*, 301-302; Ma, *Spirit Comes*, 79-83.

187 Childs, *Isaiah*, 239-242; Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, 257-261. Motyer notes that vv. 19-20 are an "epilogue", 261. Equally, they could be a footnote to the oracles as a whole (vv. 1-18), a footnote expanding on v. 2.

188 This particle is used with the imperfect here denoting a future time: see BDB, 724-725.

This link establishes the contrast between the desolation of the land and the city, but they also lend support to a different division of the oracle units so that vv. 9-12 are set off as a unit about "the women" of the city and vv. 13-18 are a unit about the *transition* from desolation to restoration pivoting around the bestowal of the Spirit. This is the division of material that we will presuppose.

The story elements of the oracle units of Isaiah 32 can be enumerated as follows:

1) Negative dialectic against government surfaces in Isaiah 32.[189] In the first oracle unit, those ruling the nation called themselves "noble" (v. 5—נדיב, cf. Isa 13:2), but were in effect "fools" (נבל/μωρός); they would be replaced by princes who were truly "noble" or "godly" (v. 8, נדיב/εὐσεβής). Fools will not be told to "rule" (v. 5, ἄρχω).

2) At the same time a man (איש/ἄνθρωπος) would be a hiding place "from the wind" (v. 2). This figure of hiding from a "wind" suggests an invasion (Hos 13:15; Isa 5:28; 17:13; 29:6). The LXX prefaces this figure of a "hiding place" with καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος κρύπτων τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, and then hide himself from rushing water (καὶ κρυβήσεται ὡς ἀφ' ὕδατος φερομένου). This figure is also one connected with invasion of the land (Isa 17:13; 28:15, 18, LXX).

Such a man would be "as rivers of water" (כפלגי מים/ὡς ποταμός) in a dry place[190] and appear in Zion (v. 2, LXX).[191] As a result of this happening. a group identified as having "eyes and ears" would have "eyes to see and ears to hear" (v. 3, cf. Isa 6:10) and speak to the people.

---

189 Childs, *Isaiah*, 239-240; Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, 257.

190 Wenk discusses Isaiah 32 in relation to Luke 3:16-17 and the desert motif, *Community-Forming Power*, 185-186.

191 This may be one of the texts that informs the Johannine conception of the bestowal of the Spirit (John 7:38).

This effect is likely to begin *before* the king and princes rule in righteousness, because *a man* is to be a hiding place from an invading wind. The emergence of this group of individuals is presented as the necessary counter to the "fools" who currently rule (vv. 3-8). Any restoration could not begin until the rule of the king was restored, the invading army beaten, and the rule of "fools" replaced.

3) The rhetoric of the oracle indicates that it would be the ordinary man that would shelter people from "the wind", but this sense is also supported by links with Isaiah 28. In Isa 28:9-11, Yahweh poses and answers the question (through the prophet) of who will replace the erring priest and prophet (Isa 28:7). The answer is those who are "babes" (Isa 28:9) and who have been mocked (Isa 28:11, לעג/φαυλισμός—"have mocked lips", cf. Ps 35:16). This is the type of person that God will use to speak to the people and be "another tongue" to the scornful rulers of Jerusalem (Isa 28:14, לשון/γλῶσσα).[192] This theme of using less regarded people[193] to speak on behalf of God is picked up in Isa 32:4 with the reference to the "tongue of the inarticulate" (עלג/ψελλίζω) which will be ready to speak plainly or speak peace (v. 4, לדבר צחות/λαλεῖν εἰρήνην).[194]

The similes used in the oracle are designed to contrast with earlier invective: so, an ordinary man will be "as the shadow of a heavy rock in a weary land" (v. 2, MT) reminds the reader of the rock that provided water in the wilderness. Moreover, such a shadow contrasts with those who "trusted in the shadow of Egypt" (Isa 30:3); or again, the ordinary man would be a "hiding place" (מחבא) from the wind, and this contrasts with the falsehood

---

[192] The *content* of what is spoken by the other tongue is prophetic, as shown by Isaiah's use of ירה (e.g. Isa 2:3; 9:15; cf. 44:8).

[193] *Contra* Barton, who interprets the "another tongue" to refer to the language of the conqueror, *Isaiah 1-39*, 39.

[194] We will discuss in the next section how Luke's account in Acts alludes to Isaiah 28 and the "another tongue" of the inarticulate. A connection between the gift of tongues and Isaiah 28 was being made in the early church—1 Cor 14:21.

under which the corrupt rulers "hid" (Isa 28:15 —חסה).[195] The ordinary man being like "rivers of water" and a "hiding place" from the "wind" identifies a work for the Spirit prior to the removal of the invader. This bestowal both prepares a people and invites others to take refuge in a community.

On this reading, a specific reference to propaganda and spin can be seen in the comment in v. 7, "wicked devices to ruin the poor with lying speeches (באמרי שקר)" or "the counsel of the wicked will devise iniquity (ἡ γὰρ βουλὴ τῶν πονηρῶν ἄνομα βουλεύσεται)". It was upon these "lies" (שקר/ψεῦδος—Isa 28:15), that the corrupt rulers relied, and thereby deceived "the poor" (Isa 29:19, 32:7—ענו; Isa 11:4, 14:32, 25:4—ταπεινός), who were otherwise the object of Yahweh's favour (cf. 4Q177 I, 6-7).

In this scenario, the ordinary man is a shelter from the wind or rushing water, because he offers the words of Yahweh as a source of comfort in desperate times.

4) The second oracle unit predicts that women will quake or tremble (רגז—vv. 10, 11). This "quaking" is a common figure for an invasion and its consequences (e.g. Isa 5:25; 14:16; 23:11; 28:21; 37:28-29). Typical of such invasions would be devastation of the land (vv. 12-13) and an expectation of destruction of Jerusalem (v. 14).[196]

The LXX describes the women with the imperatives, ἔκστητε λυπήθητε (v. 11), which are terms similarly used in contexts of invasion (e.g. Isa 7:2; 8:21; 13:8; 33:3).

---

[195] Other points of contact between Isaiah 28 and 32 include: the "ears to hear" and "rest" motifs (Isa 28:12; 32:18; cf. 11:10).
[196] Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, 259.

5) Against this background, the bestowal (ערה[197]/ἐπέρχομαι) of the Spirit in the third oracle unit is linked with the effect of the invasion on the city (v. 15). The citadel (ארמון, v. 14) is forsaken, and the city de-populated, until (עד/ἕως) the Spirit is bestowed. The bestowal of the Spirit signals the *end* of the crisis, and the effects of the crisis upon "the city" are typical, as people seek to escape the approaching invader.

In structural terms, the careless women and the fools respond to the same crisis of invasion. Correspondingly, there are two opposite responses: the ordinary man and those who come to understand (vv. 2-3) are a contrary response and a source of security from the invading wind or rushing water, and the group upon whom the Spirit is bestowed are a contrary response to that of the women. The Spirit imparts judgment and righteousness, peace and assurance (vv. 16-17), which in the context of the oracle are the qualities of good government absent from the ruling elite.

6) The principal intertext for Isa 32:15 is Isa 29:17, which in addition to lexical links (יער/δρυμός, כרמל/Χερμελ, חשב/λογίζομαι), includes the concept of waiting (עוד מעט,עד/οὐκέτι μικρός). Within the oracle there is a comparable criticism of those who hide their counsel from God (v. 15) and turn things upside down. In response, the Lord proposes to replace the wisdom of the

---

197 Firm conclusions from the use of ערה in Hiphil about the nature of the figure of bestowal cannot be made because the database of usage is too small (Lev 20:18, 19; Isa 32:15; 53:12). Essentially, because Lev 20:18-19 is a sexual context (uncovering nakedness), the only other Hiphil occurrence of ערה for comparison is Isa 53:12, and here the sense could equally be "to make bare (his soul)". Most uses of ערה occur in Piel and convey a sense of making bare (Ps 137:7; 141:8; Isa 3:17; 22:6), uncovering (Hab 3:13; Zeph 2:14), or emptying (Gen 24:20; 2 Chron 24:11). While some eschatological "spirit" texts (Isa 44:3; Ezek 39:29; Zech 12:10) use "pouring" verbs (שפך/יצק), this is not necessarily the case here in Isa 32:15, and it is likely that these other texts have unduly influenced lexicographers; the LXX uses ἐπέρχομαι to translate ערה which does not support the view that the Hiphil of ערה in Isa 32:15 is a "pouring" verb. Accordingly, it is probably safest to conclude that Isa 32:15 speaks of the Spirit being "emptied" upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem. (Interestingly, Luke conjoins ἐνδύω with his allusion to Isa 32:15, which is rather the opposite idea to ערה).

wise men (v. 14). Hence, as in Isa 32:3, Isa 29:18 goes on to note that "in that day" the deaf will hear and the blind shall see. responding to a renewed spirit-inspired proclamation of the word of God that accompanies the restoration of good government (cf. Isa 29:24).

7) The dynamic of the oracle units in Isaiah 32 make the bestowal of the Spirit the catalyst from which good government flows, but the oracle units do not include a story element corresponding to the removal of the invading wind and rushing water. The location of the bestowal of the Spirit in relation to this element is therefore indeterminate within these units. The deliverance presupposed by the oracle of Isaiah 32 is specified in the collocated oracles of Isaiah 29. Immediately after the expression of hope for the fruitful field becoming a forest (Isa 29:17, cf. 32:15b), the fact that the "terrible one" (עריץ/ἄνομος) will be brought to nothing (Isa 29:20) is affirmed. In this way, a lack of information in Isaiah 32 about deliverance is supplied by Isaiah 29 and warranted by intertextual connections. The bestowal of the Spirit is part of the same *complex* that sees the deliverance of the city (cf. Isa 29:1), the restoration of good government, and the subsequent restoration of the land.[198] The Spirit is given,[199] good government is restored, and economic restoration follows.[200]

---

[198] This reading fits with Luke's use of Isaiah 61 once it is perceived that the accent of Isa 61:1-2 is about *proclamation of deliverance*: those who would take over the government in Jerusalem would proclaim imminent deliverance to the cities of Judah. The bestowal of the Spirit in Isaiah 32 is a guarantee that deliverance for the cities will take place.

[199] Conrad, *Reading Isaiah*, ch. 4, argues that the bestowal is limited to a faithful community in the city, a community mentioned in other eighth century oracles of Isaiah. Thus he observes an interjection in Isa 1:2-31 at vv. 9-10, "If the Lord of hosts had not left us a few survivors, we should have been like Sodom, and become like Gomorrah. Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the teaching of our God, you people of Gomorrah!". Conrad interprets the "us" to be the remnant in Jerusalem facing the consequences of the Assyrian invasion with the rest of the people. It is this community that receives the Spirit and offers a refuge of hope in Jerusalem for those otherwise deserting the city (Isa 32:14); this reading has obvious resonance with Luke's narrative.

[200] J. N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1986), 583-589, argues that the desert (v. 2) represents Judah's national life transformed into a forest.

4.2.1.3 Isaianic Typology

In addition to the lexical fragments, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς and ὑψηλός, Luke uses story elements from Isaiah 32 and the associated intertexts in his presentation of Pentecost:

1) The disciples are to "wait" (καθίζω—Luke 24:49) in "the city" (Jerusalem—Luke 24:47) until they received the Spirit; this corresponds to the waiting for the Spirit in Jerusalem that is implied in narrative flow from desolation to restoration. The prospect of the oracle unit of Isa 32:13-18 is that the city shall be forsaken and deserted *until* the Spirit is bestowed. This concept of waiting is a notion of patient endurance *until* salvation comes from the hand of the Lord (cf. Isa 33:2). While Luke does not have a political and military setting for his bestowal of the Spirit, there is a comparable *waiting* for the reception of the Spirit *in Jerusalem*.

2) Luke may also have seen a mention of the Spirit in the simile that an ordinary man would be "as rivers of water" (כפלגי מים/ὕδατος φερομένου, Isa 32:2). This is echoed by Zechariah in his prediction that "living waters shall go out from Jerusalem" (מים חיים/ὕδωρ + ζάω—Zech 14:8), which is picked up in Johannine tradition (ὕδωρ + ζάω, John 7:38-39) and connected to the Spirit. Within the compass of John's gospel, this is "fulfilled" in John 20:22, however, the tradition shows early Christian interpretation connecting bestowal of the Spirit to Jerusalem.

3) Luke provides detail in his story that corresponds to detail from Isa 32:2-4, and this shows that he does not isolate Isa 32:15 from its context:

i) Ordinary people[201] are the recipients of the Spirit (Isa 32:2; Luke 5:1-10), people described as "babes" (Isa 28:9; Luke 10:21; cf. Matt 11:25).

---

[201] This typical detail may also be represented in Luke's citation of Hab 1:5 (Acts 13:41), which prophesies that people would not believe the onslaught of the Babylonians "though a man declare it unto you" (ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν).

ii) The disciples have "eyes to see and ears to hear" (Isa 32:3: Luke 8:8: 14:35; cf. Matt 13:16). This motif is echoed in Isa 29:17-19 along with the figure of the "fruitful field" which occurs in Isa 32:16.

iii) The disciples have inarticulate tongues (Isa 32:4[202]) and constitute "another tongue" (ἕτερος + γλῶσσα, Isa 28:11; Acts 2:4), which is "mocked" (Isa 28:11; Acts 2:13).[203] The apostles are ordinary men (Acts 4:13; 13:41) speaking to the "inhabitants of Jerusalem" (Ἰερουσαλήμ, Isa 28:14; Acts 2:5) and the people (λαός, Isa 28:11; Acts 2:22; 3:12; 5:35; 13:16; 21:28, "men of Israel" refrain) in contradistinction to the erring prophet and priest (Isa 28:11; Acts 4:1, 13).[204]

These details illustrate a typical comparison by Luke, *that the Spirit will be bestowed upon ordinary people.*

4) Isaiah 32 describes impending trouble for women, and in particular it describes those who lament upon "the breasts" (v. 12—שד/μαστός). Luke places a similar prediction of imminent trouble for women on the lips of Jesus,

> Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. For behold, the days are coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the

---

[202] The LXX states that "the tongue of the inarticulate" shall be ready "to learn" (μανθάνω) to speak peace.

[203] A further playful link between Acts 2 and Isaiah 28 is that whereas Isaiah lambasts the erring priest and prophet for being drunk (Isa 28:7, ἐξίστημι), Luke describes the mockers with this term (Acts 2:12, ἐξίστημι). This typological use of Isaiah 28 is noted by C. A. Evans, "Prophetic Setting", 215, but Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:103 states „Daß Lukas Jes 28,11...im Blick habe und im Reden in fremden Sprachen ein »Zeichen für Israel« erkenne, ist fraglich" ("It is questionable whether Luke has Isa 28:11f...in mind or sees speaking in foreign languages a 'sign for Israel'").

[204] Litwak, *Echoes*, 157, observes that "there is nothing in Joel 3 that suggests speaking in tongues" and uses this text as part of his justification that Luke offers a new (revisionary) reading of Joel. However, two points go against this suggestion, first, Joel concerns speech acts, and secondly, Luke is reading Joel *with* Isaiah 28 and 32.

wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never gave suck!" Luke 23:28-29, cf. Hos 9:14, 10:8).

The implication in Jesus' rebuke is that the daughters of Jerusalem were over confident, and this resonates with "confident daughters" (θυγατέρες ἐν ἐλπίδι) from Isa 32:9. The advantageous state of those not giving suck is the inverse of the prediction in Isaiah, that there will be those who lament upon the breasts.

A fourth typical connection implied by Luke's allusion to Isa 32:15, therefore, is an *expectation of impending trouble for women.*

5) Isaiah 32 includes a contrast between a king and his princes who will reign in righteousness. Luke presents such a contrast between Jesus and the disciples in the symbology of choosing twelve disciples to be judges over the twelve tribes (Luke 22:30),[205] and in his application of the "ears to hear, eyes to see" refrain (Isa 6:10; 29:10; 32:3) to the people (Luke 8:8; 14:35; Acts 28:27).

A fifth typical connection implied by Luke's allusion to Isaiah 32 is therefore *the contrast between those who have ears to hear and eyes to see in Jesus' day and the corresponding groups in the story of Isaiah's oracles.* Luke sees in the bestowal of the Spirit upon the disciples the appearance of good government in Jerusalem. Such an event precedes the deliverance of the people that Luke intimates will be achieved with the return of the Son of Man to the cataclysm that will engulf Jerusalem (Luke 21:20-28).[206]

---

[205] Scholars have recognised the symbolic significance of this text—see C. A. Evans, "The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds., C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 154-170; Fuller, *Restoration*, 239-264.

[206] *Contra* Pao, *New Exodus*, 92, who argues that "the allusion to Isa 32:15...suggests that the coming of the Spirit will signify the end of the desolation of Judah and introduce the coming of the new age".

4.2.1.4 Dissonance

Luke's use of Isaiah 32 brings a restoration perspective to the Pentecost bestowal; however, there is significant dissonance both with Acts 2 and Isaiah 58 and 61. The nature of this dissonance limits the notion of restoration that we can attribute to Luke.

We have not attributed a particular historical reading of Isaiah 58 and 61 to Luke (pre-exilic, exilic, or post-exilic). If Luke read Isaiah 58 and 61 in the context of a post-exilic restoration of the land, he may have seen this as comparable to the earlier pre-exilic restoration of Judah after 701 B. C. E., if he read Isaiah 32 in a pre-exilic way.[207] We cannot assume for any group of oracles in Isaiah that Luke read them in accordance with a current (but shifting) historico-critical consensus. We can however attend to the story elements in the oracles and the coherence and consistency that they display for an author making multiple quotations and allusions. In this connection the following points can be made:

1) Isaiah 32 has a focus on the "land" and this is consistent with the Jubilee restoration of the land that we noted for Isaiah 58 and 61. Luke's use of Isaiah 32 is further support for our argument that he is not using Isaiah 58 and 61 in terms of a restoration from exile. Similarly, the "city" is central in these restoration oracles (Isa 32:13-14, 19; 61:3). The use of the "wilderness" motif in Isa 32:15 would be consistent with its use elsewhere in Isaiah for the state of the land prior to restoration.

2) Certain motifs are shared between the oracles. Isa 61:4 details the work of restoration and Isa 32:17 specifies a "work of righteousness". The "righteousness" of Isa 32:17 is conveyed by the figure "trees of

---

[207] An "eighth century" reading of Isaiah 32 is not difficult to construct, based upon intertextual links with clearer eighth century oracles in Isaiah 1-39 as Seitz and Hayes and Irvine have shown in their different ways—see Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, 229-233 and Hayes and Irvine, *Isaiah: The Eighth Century Prophet*, 352-360. The possibility that Luke read Isaiah 32 against an eighth century background means that we cannot simply apply an exilic return model of restoration to the plot of his story in line with Fuller's proposals for Luke-Acts in *Restoration*, ch. 3.

righteousness" in Isa 61:3. The outcome of the work of righteousness is peace, quietness and safety (בטח), and this is the picture given in Isaiah 61 through the image of God's people dwelling among the nations.

3) The focus of Isa 32:15-18 is the bestowal of the Spirit upon a group whereas in Isa 61:1 it is upon an individual. However, Isa 32:1 mentions the Davidic king and his princes ruling in righteousness and judgment, and it is precisely judgment and righteousness which are connected to the bestowal of the Spirit in Isa 32:15. An anointing of a Davidic king in Isa 61:1 is therefore suggested by the collocation of Isa 32:1, 15, and this may have prompted Luke's usage of Isaiah 61.

4) The oracle unit of Isa 32:15-18 is brief compared to oracle units of Isa 61:1-11. The difference between the two texts is their implied catalyst. In Isaiah 61, the invader has been removed and the anointed herald is proclaiming a forthcoming Jubilee year of restoration. Isaiah 32:15-18 is an expression of hope set against the reality of desolation. This is conveyed by the rhetorical contrast implied in "Upon (על) the land of my people...yea, upon (על) all the houses...until (עד/ἕως) the Spirit be poured out upon us..." (Isa 32:13-15).[208]

5) Luke places the idea of *deliverance* to the foreground in his anticipation of the bestowal of the Spirit (Luke 24:49). He describes the promise of the Spirit upon the disciples as a "clothing" (ἐνδύω) with power from on high, and this verb echoes the general Israelite traditions of a deliverer being *clothed* with power (e.g. Gideon—Judg 6:4). This choice of verb is significant given that the verb in Isa 32:15 is ערה/ἐπέρχομαι and Luke uses ἐπέρχομαι in Luke 1:35 and Acts 1:8. His redactional choice of ἐνδύω suggests a deliberate echo of Israelite deliverance traditions. However, in respect of Isaiah 32, this

---

[208] The rhetorical contrast is less clear in the LXX which brings the first על into the verb ἀναβαίνω, and uses ἐκ for the second על. The change of voice from Yahweh in v. 13 to a community in the city in v. 15 is indicative of a command-response conversation: the community are responding to Yahweh and accepting his judgment.

introduces a measure of dissonance since an act of deliverance is absent in the sequence of the oracle units. Nevertheless, deliverance is a reasonable presupposition of the oracle units as they move from a state of desolation to restoration. In the context of a need for deliverance, prophetic reassurance, and leadership, both Isaiah and Luke feature "signs and wonders"[209] performed by the Spirit (Isa 8:18; Acts 5:12).

6) Isa 32:15 juxtaposes material restoration in respect of the land alongside bestowal of the Spirit. The oracle unit of Isa 32:15-18 has an emphasis on qualities to do with good government (judgment, righteousness, peace, quietness and assurance), but these are set against the figure of the wilderness becoming a fruitful field which indicates economic restoration of the land and its infrastructure. This latter aspect is obviously absent from Luke-Acts.

These points, (1)-(6), limit the notion of restoration that we can attribute to Luke. While Isaiah 32 presents a single matrix of interlocked details involving both the bestowal of the Spirit and the restoration of the land, Luke has divided the material and selected the anticipation of the Spirit as the detail fulfilled at Pentecost; he has not included the political dimension of the oracles. Insofar as Isaiah 32 presents the bestowal of the Spirit as part of the revitalization of the people, Luke may very well see Pentecost as a *precursor* to a full restoration of "the kingdom" to Israel.

4.2.1.5 Restoration in Acts

The disciples' question about the restoration of Israel (Acts 1:6-7) concerned the time (χρόνος) for restoration rather than any fact of the matter. Jesus' reply was that it was not for the disciples to know the "times or the seasons" (χρόνους ἢ καιρούς). In addition, he replied that they were to wait in Jerusalem to receive power (δύναμις) after the holy Spirit had come upon them (Acts 1:8).

---

[209] For a recent review of this theme in Luke-Acts, see K. J. Hacking, *Signs and Wonders: Then and Now* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2006), chaps. 18-20.

The use of δύναμιν and ἐφ' ὑμᾶς in Acts 1:8 links this promise of the Spirit to Luke 24:49 and the use of the same lexical fragments in that context. A more significant link lies in the use of ἐπέρχομαι in Acts 1:8 which is cited from Isa 32:15 and changes the choice of ἐνδύω in Luke 24:49 back towards greater conformity to Isa 32:15. This use of Isa 32:15 in Acts 1:8, as part of Jesus' reply to the disciples' question about the restoration of Israel, is clearly jejune, but it directs the disciples attention to the bestowal of the Spirit rather than the time or season for any political restoration.

Luke's source material in the scriptures is set at the level of matters of state and this is the cause of the dissonance with Luke and Acts. Whereas Luke has a king and princes (Isa 32:2, Jesus and the Twelve), he does not have palaces, towers and fortifications in his story (Isa 32:14). He has a bestowal of the Spirit (Isa 32:15), but the restoration of the land of God's people is not initiated (Isa 32:13). The effect of the Spirit is to engender righteousness (Isa 32:16), but peace and security for the people in their homes is not expected (Isa 32:17).

Within Acts this dissonance is handled in Peter's second speech (Acts 3:12-26) and the prospect of the Second Advent is signalled as the time for the fulfilment of all that has been spoken of by the prophets:

> ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν.
>
> Acts 3:21

These expectations are set within the second part of the speech which begins in v. 17 with the salutation 'brothers'. This part of the speech is a call to repentance,[210] and the outcome of such repentance is stated in part to be ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου (v. 19).[211]

---

[210] Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:117; Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte*. 1:322; Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:154. See also R. F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's*

Theological difficulty[212] in interpretation surrounds the expressions καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως and χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως. Weiser interprets v. 20 with v. 21, and says,

> Die VV 20f. Geben an, was durch die Umkehr von Gott her bewirkt werden soll: Zeiten des Aufatmens, womit in der Sprache der Apokalyptik das endgültig vollendete Heil gemeint ist, die Parusie Jesu, des gerade für die Juden erwählten Messias, Zeiten der Wiederherstellung all dessen, was Gott von Anfang an durch die Propheten verheissen hat.[213]

In support of this approach, R. Pesch adds 4 Ezra 11:46 and *2 Bar.* 73-74:1 as comparative texts indicating the "refreshing" times that come are at the end of times. He also notes that the concept of the eschatological Sabbath of rest (Heb 3:11; 4:9, 11) is comparable to Luke's notion of "times of refreshing".[214] J. Jervell agrees with this approach and affirms that the expressions καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως and χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως shows „Die Vorliebe des Lukas in dieser Rede für das, was doppelt gesagt warden kann...".[215] Of the καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως Jervell states, „es geht um die Wiederherstellung aller Dinge. Das kann nur ‚das Reich für Israel', Apg 1,6, bedeuten".[216] Haenchen

---

Speeches of Acts 2 and 3 (SBLMS 15; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), 61-66.

[211] Barrett, *Acts*, 1:203, calls this the "wider cosmic-historical consequence".

[212] There are issues of tradition and redaction, but these lie outside the scope of our study. For a discussion see Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:323-324.

[213] "Verses 20f show what effect repentance toward God should have: times of refreshing, which means in the language of Apocalyptic the final complete salvation, the Parousia of Jesus, who has been chosen to be Messiah especially for the Jews, and times of restitution of all things, which God has prophesied through the prophets", *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:118.

[214] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:155.

[215] "The partiality of Luke in this speech for that which can be said twice...". *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 167. Jervell, like Pesch, cites 4 Ezra 11:46 and *2 Bar.* 73:1-74:1 in support of his apocalyptic reading.

[216] "...it is about the recreation of all things. That can only mean 'the kingdom for Israel, Acts 1:6...", *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 168.

also follows this line and asserts that "The χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων will descend upon the faithful as καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως".[217]

Barrett disagrees with this approach and regards it as "improbable".[218] He makes a number of points: First, it does not explain the plural καιροί: secondly, it does not respect the meaning of ἀνάψυξις,[219] which suggests temporary relief rather than the enduring benefits of the messianic age.[220] Hence, Barrett proposes that the καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως are the period between the resurrection and the Parousia during which men receive forgiveness of sin and the gift of the holy Spirit.[221] He concludes, "It is characteristic of Luke that he does not abandon the notion of a futurist collective eschatology but believes this to be anticipated in a series of individual realizations".[222] Such "times of refreshing" could then be the respite offered during the eschatological woes.

For our purposes, it is not important which of the two lines of interpretation regarding καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως we follow. Our interest is principally in χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως which are uncontroversially related to the Second Advent.[223]

---

[217] *Acts*, 208.

[218] *Acts*, 1:205; see also Pao, *New Exodus*, 134.

[219] L&N, 22.35 suggest "relief" from stressful circumstances. BAG, 63 give "breathing space, relief, relaxation". In both lexicons, a figurative sense is noted for the expression καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως as the messianic age, but L&N suggest that "to have a state of relief 'coming' may be semantically impossible" and propose that the expression "may be restructured as 'so that the Lord may cause you to have relief from trouble' or '... cause you to no longer be troubled'".

[220] Barrett, offers a number of comparative texts in support including Exod 8:11 (LXX), which is also noted by Conzelmann, *Acts*, 29 and Haenchen, *Acts*, 208. Pao, *New Exodus*, 132, notes that Symmachus' translation renders Isa 32:15 with ἀνάψυξις.

[221] See also Dunn, *Baptism*, 90.

[222] *Acts*, 1:205.

[223] Scholars have noted that there is here an attempt to include an explanation of the delay of the Parousia. Schneider states, "Luke firmly sticks to the expectance of the Parousia and tries to explain the so-called 'delay' of the Parousia" („Lukas halt entschieden an der Parusie-Erwatung fest und versucht, ‚Verzögerung' der Parusie zu erklären."), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:327. Nevertheless, as Weiser states, Luke does **not** indicate "the awareness of a long period of time to the Parousia". (.....das

If the "times of refreshing" are the times of the apostles. the "times of restoration" relate more clearly to the coming of Christ.

Pesch notes of χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως that, „Auf die Vorstellung von seiner »Sendung« zur »Wiederherstellung von allem« scheint die Elija-Tradition Mal 3,23f...".[224] The link revolves around ἀποκαθιστάνω in Mal 3:23 and ἀποκατάστασις in Acts 3:21, but also includes the Elijianic notion of being in heaven and waiting until the end-times.

Synoptic tradition supports such an allusion. Both Matthew and Mark use ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα (Matt 17:11) and ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα (Mark 9:12) of Elijah's work. However, as Barrett notes,[225] and as we have also argued. Luke does not use ἀποκατάστασις or ἀποκαθιστάνω of Elijah's work. In Luke 1:17 he uses ἐπιστρέφω, of John the Baptist, his chosen Elijah figure; and the focus is the renewal of the people.[226] The exhortation of Peter in Acts 3:19 is precisely this Elijianic mission: ἐπιστρέψατε. This difference in verb casts doubt on the analogy drawn by Pesch.

The problem with Pesch's proposal is that it introduces a forerunner Christology in connection with the person who is precisely not the forerunner. The "restoration" associated with the return is therefore different to the Elijianic renewal of the people which the apostles were

---

Bewusstsein eines langen Zeitraumes bis zur Parusie..."), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:113.

[224] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:156, ("In regard to its idea of a 'sending' for 'the restoration of all things', it appears to have been influenced by the Elijah tradition of Mal 3:23f..."). Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:325 notes the same connection and discusses the question of pre-Lucan tradition expecting Elijah; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:202, asserts pre-Lucan tradition behind Acts 3:19-21, but Conzelmann, *Acts*, 29, does not think it is possible to trace a source or Baptist tradition behind Luke's text. Regardless of the determination of this issue, Pesch's point can be sustained as a typological analogy.

[225] *Acts*, 1:206.

[226] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 155-156.

undertaking—the times of refreshing.[227] The question therefore arises as to the scope and sense of the "restoration of all things".

As the antecedent noun, the relative clause would usually indicate that it is the χρόνων of which the prophets have spoken.[228] However, as Barrett notes[229] Luke has just mentioned that "things" (ἅ) have been spoken by the prophets (v. 18), which suggests that the relative clause ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν is picking up on the πάντων.[230] Luke's point is that the prophets have spoken of "all things" pertaining to restoration rather than that they have spoken of the "times" of restoration. Jesus would remain in heaven until the times for such restoration.

The relative clause is comparable to one used in Luke 1:70, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ,[231] and this text affords some intertextual purchase upon the scope of the "all things" envisaged by Luke. In Luke 1:71-75 a picture of political liberation is emphasized—deliverance from enemies—and the Abrahamic "oath" is mentioned which specifies possession of the gate of the enemies (Gen 22:16-17). Sovereignty and self-determination are implied and this reading of the sense of χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων is supported by the inclusion of Jesus' answer to the disciples' question as to whether he would restore the kingdom to Israel (Acts 1:6, ἀποκαθιστάνω).[232]

---

[227] Wenk notes that rabbinical views of the Elijianic renewal are similar but without the Spirit, *Community-Forming Power*, 161.

[228] Parsons and Culy, *Acts*, 60, state that ὧν is "Probably a genitive of reference rather than genitive by attraction to πάντων".

[229] Barrett, *Acts*, 1:206.

[230] The ὧν refers to πάντων and not χρόνων—Haenchen, *Acts*, 208. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 29; this parses ὧν as neuter rather than masculine.

[231] Weiser notes that this clause may be a conventional idiom for referring to the Prophets or Luke may have consciously taken the phrase from his gospel, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:113.

[232] We can also add that the phrase here, ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, bears comparison with the Markan prediction ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα (Mark 9:12). and suggests that these "times" are times in which Israel repents thus making the return of Jesus possible.

F. F. Bruce suggests that ἀποκατάστασις should perhaps be "rendered 'establishment', 'fulfilment', referring to the fulfilment of all OT prophecy". although he also says that the "sense of 'restoration' should perhaps not be entirely excluded".[233] However, Barrett states that Bruce's proposal "cannot be supported".[234] The notion of "restoration" therefore suggests a return to a previous state, and in respect of the disciple's question in Acts 1:6. the previously good state is one of long-past self-determination.

Accordingly, we propose that Luke's notion of full restoration in Acts 3:21 is centred on Israel and its scope is political.[235] It is possible to broaden the notion. Bruce states that the sense of ἀποκατάστασις "cannot be restricted to the restoration of the kingdom to Israel",[236] and could be broadly construed. By merging χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων with the καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως, Pesch broadens the scope of πάντων to include the "order of salvation" („Heilsordnung").[237] Further, Barrett has interpreted Luke's point to include the restoration of creation.[238] However, this broadening of Luke's concept can only cluster around the central place accorded to the restored Israel.

---

[233] *The Acts of the Apostles*, 112; see also Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *Beginnings*, 4:38.

[234] *Acts*, 1:206; Barrett is supported by the lexica—L&N 13.65 offers "to change to a previous good state" and BAG, 92 offers "restoration".

[235] Accordingly, we would argue that Fuller's thesis needs to take into account the role of the Second Advent. To say, *Restoration*, 249, "Israel's restoration must await the messiah's death, resurrection, and enthronement *in heaven*. From there, the Spirit of restoration will fall from the messiah on the Twelve, who will implement God's kingdom over the world", does not give sufficient attention to this aspect of Luke's thinking. This deficiency also applies to Fuller's stress on the heavenly thrones of the Twelve, *Restoration*, 252-253. We cannot say that "In Acts 1-2. Luke *completes* his description of Israel's eschatological restoration", *Restoration*. 258.

[236] *Acts*, 112. Pao, *New Exodus*, 134, cites A. Oepke, "ἀποκαθίστημι" *TDNT* 1:388, in noting its use in the LXX in connection with the restoration of Israel.

[237] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 156.

[238] Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 112; Barrett, *Acts* 1:206;

4.2.2 Conclusion

Luke's allusion to Isaiah 32 offers a model for understanding Pentecost. The model is not exilic; the language of a *return from exile* is absent.[239] The language does not echo or allude to the exodus; there is no "new Exodus" paradigm being invoked.[240] The story-model for Luke's typology is one where the land is invaded (v. 2), there is bad leadership (vv. 5-7), and Jerusalem is besieged (vv. 13-14), until the Spirit is poured out and the land is restored (vv. 15-18). The material aspects of Isaiah 32 are not *obviously* in view in the events of the first century and Luke does not echo these details. Indeed, as we have noted, Jesus rebuffs the question of the disciples as to whether Israel was to be restored at that time (Acts 1:6).[241] Nevertheless, the Roman occupation of the land, the retrospective anticipation of war and the prospect of deliverance of a remnant of the people—these provide a reasonable motivation for Luke's readers to perceive links with Isaiah 32 in their search for a *tradition-based* theological understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit. The infusion of prophetic knowledge and leadership corresponds to the anticipations of the oracles in both Isaiah 29 and 32. The time of the apostles was a time of refreshing by the Spirit while the church waited for the Parousia in which time a fulfilment of all the things spoken by the prophets would be consummated.

---

[239] *Contra* Fuller, *Restoration*, 267, "Against the exilic landscape (both figurative and literal), Luke presents his version of Israel's restoration that is centred around a heavenly messiah who re-gathers Israel *from Israel*".

[240] *Contra* Turner, *Power*, 300, "Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8 together evidently rest on Isa 32:15...which is about the New Exodus restoration of Israel and transformation of her 'wilderness' estate". See also Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 166, who allows Turner's New Exodus reading.

[241] Pao's discussion of the programmatic citation of Isa 40:3-5 characterizes the point of that text in terms of "the dawn of the era of salvation and deliverance" and "the promise of the restoration of Israel", *New Exodus*, 46-47, 93-95. However, Luke anticipates a yet future destruction of Jerusalem and a scattering of the people before any completed restoration, and this factor delineates how the process of restoration has begun (95). He states, "While it must not be denied that the futuristic aspect is present in the Lukan conception of the restoration of Israel, the beginning of the process in Acts has to be acknowledged", 96.

4.3 Using Joel

Luke sets his main legitimation of Pentecost within an opening speech. Speeches are a characteristic of Luke and Acts that scholars identify as indicative of "history-writing" and coupled with the existence of prefaces. the argument is made that these two characteristics are *jointly sufficient* for such a classification.

Thucydides gives classical expression to the role of speeches for Hellenistic histories,[242] and Polybius followed Thucydides' example; he states,

> ...the peculiar function of history is to discover, in the first place, the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success. For the mere statement of a fact may interest us but is of no benefit to us: but when we add the cause of it, study of history becomes fruitful.[243]

We see here the typical emphasis given to speeches as causally significant events in the explanation of the flow of events. Accordingly, Polybius is critical of other writers who make up speeches or engage in rhetorical excess, and who fail to make the connection between speeches and events.[244]

Luke obviously follows this practice, insofar as he places set-piece speeches at critical junctures in his narrative. His speeches may be more or less accurate in terms of the words and/or content of what was said by the historical individual. They may illustrate his own theology, or they may reflect the concerns of the communities with which he associated; or again, they may represent a point of view appropriate to the character delivering the speech and function wholly within the narrative-world; yet again, the

---

[242] Thucydides (trans., C. F. Smith; Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1919), Book I.22.1.
[243] Book XII 25.1-2.
[244] Book XII 25. 3-4.

speeches may reflect the point of view of any sources used by Luke.[245] These possible readings (and combinations of them) are represented in scholarship and applied to the speeches grouped and classified according to a chosen scheme.[246]

M. Dibelius' analysis of Luke's speeches distinguished missionary speeches (Acts 2; 3; 5; 10; and 13[247]) from those speeches that function to explain and advance the plot (e.g. speeches at the Jerusalem Council, or the speeches of characters such as Felix and Festus).[248] Dibelius regarded[249] Luke's missiological speeches as a new form of speech, unrepresented in Hellenistic history-writing, and to have a common form and content; he viewed the non-missiological speeches as analogous to speeches in Hellenistic histories.

Bruce observed that "the speeches in Acts should not be considered in isolation from those in the Third Gospel".[250] The "speeches" in Luke's gospel have a different character to those in Acts; they are substantially aphoristic, didactic, and parabolic, whereas in Acts they are much more apologetic, although as M. L. Soards notes, "there is much deliberative and epideictic rhetoric".[251] The apologetic quality of the speeches is conducted with a

---

[245] In addition, Luke may be influenced by his knowledge of preaching patterns. Schneider observes, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:264-265, „Das weitgehen gleiche Schema der Missionsreden vor Juden deutet veilmehr darauf hin, daß der Acts-Verfasser einem übernommenen Predigtmodell folgt" ("The more or less same scheme for the missionary speeches in front of Jews indicates that the author of Acts follows an adopted sermon pattern").

[246] For a review of scholarship in relation to Acts, see. M. L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), ch. 1.

[247] Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 152, excludes the speeches in Acts 14:14-17 and 17:22-31 from being "missionary speeches" characterizing them as "polemical speeches" („polemische Reden").

[248] M. Dibelius, "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography" in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1956), 138-185.

[249] "Speeches" 166; however, he describes the Areopagus speech as "a Hellenistic speech about the true knowledge of God", 57.

[250] F. F. Bruce, "The Significance of the Speeches for Interpreting Acts", *SWJT* 40 (1990): 20-28 (20).

[251] *Speeches in Acts*, 142.

scriptural deliberation that is absent in the gospels. The Lucan Jesus claims to teach from the scriptures, but he does not engage (ironically) in the kind of scriptural debate evidenced throughout Acts.

The *existence* of speeches in Luke and Acts has been cited as evidence of historical genre. However, scholars have gone further and identified corresponding characteristics between Luke's speeches and Hellenistic histories. Soards cites[252] E. Plümacher's[253] six points of contact between speeches in Acts and Hellenistic histories. Even if some are questioned Soards asserts that "one cannot deny some relationship between Acts, especially the speeches, and Hellenistic historiography".[254]

Given the large number of speeches cast across the classical and Hellenistic histories available to an educated person such as Luke, it is likely that his speeches in Acts do have correspondences in style and content to some speeches in some other histories, although such parallels do not *of themselves* establish that Acts is a Hellenistic history. However, the structural use of speeches by Luke is *jointly sufficient* with other characteristics of his writing (e.g. the presence of a preface) to warrant the genre assignment of "Hellenistic History".

Peter's speech has been extensively discussed,[255] but our questions concern the implications of the Joel quote for the implied reader.

> ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ· καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν

---

252 *Speeches in Acts*, 138-141.
253 E. Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
254 *Speeches in Acts*, 141.
255 Pesch offers an analysis which notes that each of the parts of the Pentecost sermon close with a substantial scriptural quotation and observes, "This peculiarity of the Pentecost sermon is without analogy in the remaining missionary speeches" („Diese Besonderheit der Pfingstpredigt ist ohne Analogie in den übrigen Missionreden"), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 117.

καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται· καί γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται. Acts 2:16-21

Luke's use of Joel places Pentecost in a broadly eschatological framework (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, cf. Isa 2:2), but his variations[256] from the source text and the extent of his quotation from Joel raise questions of "fit" and

---

[256] There are Western and Alexandrian variations to be noted and the question of Luke's *Vorlage*. For a discussion, see G. J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of Petrine and Pauline Speeches of Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 72-99. Steyn's text critical conclusion on the question of Luke's *Vorlage* is that, "it was probably a LXX text (as becomes clear from the similarities between the LXX and NT, against the Hebrew), but it seems, on some points, to be nearer still to the Hebrew", *Septuagint Quotations*, 99. Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 142, notes that Acts 2:16 is closer to the MT. Whether variations from the LXX/MT are due to a *Vorlage* or to Luke's hand, our presumption is that Luke "owns" such variations. Menzies concludes that the various alterations are Lucan in origin, *Development*, 224, while Turner, *Power*, 268, takes the opposite view; Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 119, presumes that the quotation from Joel was already in the pre-Lucan version of the Pentecost sermon. Apart from ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, Alexandrian and Western differences at the text-critical level do not appear significant for our purposes. Bock rightly observes that this variation "is the most debated and important for understanding the citation's context", *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 160. In respect of this variation, some scholars like Haenchen, *Acts*, 179, follow Codex Bezae and regard μετὰ ταῦτα as original to Luke. However, Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 142, says that Codex Bezae is „offenbar sekundär ist" ("obviously secondary"), and Weiser states that it is a „korrigierende Angleichung" ("correcting adjustment"), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:91. The principle of *lectio difficilior* would support Weiser and Jervell, and this principle is followed by Metzger in *Textual Commentary*, 295. Other scholars to follow this line include Conzelmann, *Acts*, 19; Carroll, *Response*, 135-137; Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 160-161; and Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 76. Accordingly, we take ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις as original to Luke's text. However, we reserve judgment on the source-critical debate, and consider both the MT and the LXX as indicative of what Luke's implied reader *might* bring to the text of Acts.

"material dissonance" vis-à-vis the phenomena that he has just described and the intention of Peter's declarations. "this is that which was spoken" (τοῦτό ἐστιν[257] τὸ εἰρημένον, Acts 2:16), and "poured out this which you see and hear" (ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὑμεῖς [καὶ] βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε, Acts 2:33).[258] The demonstrative refers to the inspired speech acts,[259] which they both saw and heard,[260] but clearly the narrative does not present a fulfilment of all of Joel's details.

Whether Luke applied Joel to an original historical context is left open by our analysis. Our case is that Luke uses story-elements from the oracle in Joel in a typological fashion. Luke adds detail to his narrative seeking to show how his story "fulfils" his scriptural source material, but this detail falls short of a complete fulfilment, and that therefore he applies a *typical* perspective to his prophetic sources. Luke sees in Pentecost a typical fulfilment of Joel, because the event takes place at a time of a crisis, it initiates a call for repentance, and signals the contingent[261] possibility of deliverance.

---

257 Kimball usefully notes that in the LXX, "οὗτος ἐστιν renders Semitic terms that are employed as formulas...to introduce interpretations of divine revelation", *Exposition*, 55.

258 R. Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 138, avoids this dissonance by asserting that Luke is only interested in the beginning and end of his Joel quotation, and regards the intervening elements as "unnecessary". However, Luke has not been averse to using similar language elsewhere (Luke 21), which would suggest that Maddox is just arbitrarily avoiding the question of "fit". Jervell is correct when he observes that Luke is not averse to quoting freely and fragmentarily and that he incorporates an important change in v. 19, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 144.

259 Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:91; Haenchen, *Acts*, 186.

260 Luke is also echoing here the "seeing and hearing" motif from Isaiah 6, which is an important closing theme in Acts (Acts 28:25-26).

261 Carroll notes that one of the ways that the earlier failure of prophecies of salvation and restoration was handled by redactors and later prophets was to make such prophecy contingent upon repentance (e.g. Jer 26:19). *When Prophecy Failed*, 37, 67-69; Luke incorporates the same link in Acts 3:19.

4.3.1 Isaiah 2:2

The opening phrase, ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is not from Joel, and the only LXX occurrence of the phrase is Isa 2:2, although Mic 4:1, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, is similar and the more common rendering of אחרית הימים. Redaction critical views about the phrase are mixed,[262] but given Luke's skill with composite quotation, it is unsafe to conclude that the inclusion of the phrase is not part of his design, and so we can place to one side the redactional debate.

By including this device (rather than the more common expression in Micah), Luke transforms the temporal index of μετὰ ταῦτα/אחרי כן in Joel's prophecy. It may be his own (or that of his source) exegetical lead to the Joel quotation, or a conventional idiom, and coincidently the same expression as that found in Isa 2:2; he may regard ἐσχάτος as a synonym for μετὰ ταῦτα, or he may be consciously combining the two contexts of Joel and Isaiah in a composite quotation.[263] In this latter case, the implied reader would be expected to consider two scriptural contexts and their "fit" to Pentecost. Some discussion of whether Luke cites ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις from Isa 2:2 is therefore necessary.

---

[262] Menzies reviews the redaction critical scholarship for this expression. *Development*, 215-17 and concludes, (principally on the grounds of Luke's preference for duplicating words in quotations), that it "is to be attributed to his hand" rather than his *Vorlage*; this conclusion however does not exclude Luke drawing upon Isaiah, see Turner, *Power*, 285, and Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 87, who also notes other scholars who have made this link. Bock takes the contrary view and attributes the Joel quotation to "tradition" on the grounds that the quotation has too many disagreements with the LXX and Luke's use of the LXX elsewhere is too conservative to support his making all the changes in the Joel citation, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 163. Dunn, also attributes the phrase to Luke's source on the grounds that "Acts seems to play down the idea that 'the last days' were already in train", *Acts*, 28.

[263] These three possibilities are offered by Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations*, 88, but with little discussion and no verdict. He puts forward Isa 44:6 and Hos 3:5 as texts that may equate ἐσχάτος and μετὰ ταῦτα, but these texts have no parallel structures which might exhibit a synonymy.

It is likely that Luke is consciously linking Isa 2:2-5[264] with Joel 3:1-5, because אחרי כן/μετὰ ταῦτα occurs in Isa 1:26 in contra-distinction to an earlier time:

> And I will restore your judges as at the first, and your counsellors as at the beginning: afterward (אחרי כן/ μετὰ ταῦτα) you shall be called, The city of righteousness, the faithful city.[265]

This is clearly a prophecy of reformation: Yahweh complains about cultic and governmental malpractice (Isa 1:11-15),[266] and threatens "the sword" if the ruling class do not repent (Isa 1:16-20); Yahweh further states that he will purge (צרף) the dross from the silver (cf. Mal 3:2-4), and in this context he will then restore (שוב) her judges (Isa 1:21-25) "as at the first" (כבראשנה) and "as at the beginning" (כבתחלה).[267]

Such a context[268] of reformation would be germane for Luke, as he has used motifs of reformation and renewal from Malachi 2-3 as one of the backdrops

---

[264] The extent of the oracle is disputed; we include v. 5 because the expression לכו/δεῦτε occurs in both v. 3 and v. 5 and forms a closing cohortative; see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1-12* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 88.

[265] Wildberger makes the connection between the time periods of Isa 1:26, 2:2 in *Isaiah 1-12*, 88.

[266] This theme resonates with Isaiah 32, which Luke has used in his narrative anticipation of Pentecost.

[267] The earlier time, כבראשנה, becomes dispensational in Jer 33:7, "And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them, as at the first (כבראשנה)."

[268] H. G. Reventlow, "The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books" in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed., H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 169-188 (185), argues that the consensus of historico-critical scholarship has shown that Isa 2:2-4 is post-exilic. Wildberger has reviewed the arguments and concludes that "there are, therefore, no adequate objections which can be marshalled which decisively speak against this passage coming from Isaiah [of Jerusalem]", *Isaiah 1-12*, 88. A principal argument here would be the superscription in Isa 2:1, which would have directed Luke to read Isa 2:2-5 as an eighth century oracle.

for understanding the work of the Spirit (Luke 3:16). Further, the emphasis upon judges and counsellors and righteousness in the city resonates with the emphasis upon good government in Isaiah 32 from which Luke has selected his other anticipation of the Spirit.

The eschatological message of Isa 2:2-5 follows an oracle which describes reformation of the cult (Isa 1:10-25) and then a time period "afterward" characterised by righteousness and faith in Jerusalem (Isa 1:26-31).[269] The oracle in Isa 2:2-5 presupposes this work of reformation insofar as it describes the law going forth from Jerusalem to the nations, and the establishment of the "house" of the Lord.[270]

Further, intertextual links between Joel and Isa 2:2-5 make a composite quotation by Luke plausible. Thus, the "swords into plowshares" proverb (Isa 2:4) reverses the "plowshares into swords" battle-cry in Joel 4:10. This battle-cry precedes the coastal nations "coming up" (עלה) to the Judean hills (Joel 4:3, 9) to fight; Isaiah would therefore be read as painting the *aftermath* of this battle. Accordingly, the intention for Yahweh to judge the nations occurs in both Joel and Isaiah (Isa 2:4; Joel 4:2, 12. διακρίνω/κρίνω/שפט).

In addition to this adversarial material, both Joel and Isaiah share a missiological motif: the law goes forth (Isa 2:3, ἐξέρχομαι/יצא) out of Zion, and a "fountain" goes forth out from the house of the Lord (Joel 4:18, ἐξέρχομαι/יצא). The presupposition of this is that there has been deliverance in Zion (Joel 3:5; Isa 2:3). Further, scholars have observed that "Judah and

---

[269] Barton notes that many scholars regard Isa 1:2-9 as deriving from the Assyrian invasion, *Isaiah 1-39*, 37; we would add that the repetition of "Sodom" and "Gomorrah" in Isa 1:10 invites a similar reading context for vv. 10-15, 16-20, 21-31.

[270] Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 209.

Jerusalem" (Isa 2:1; Joel 4:1) is sufficiently unique as an expression in the Prophets[271] to require an association between the oracles.[272]

In terms of expressions denoting periods of time, ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις of Isa 2:2 bears comparison with ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις of Joel 3:2 and 4:1. In the perspective of Joel's collocated oracles "those days" will see the re-gathering of Israel and the subordination of the nations, detail which complements Isa 2:4 and its description of the nations being judged.[273]

The question raised by ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is how Luke regards these last days *as* the last days of the Jewish commonwealth. Conzelmann regards the formula as "stereotyped" and therefore it does not convey an "expectation of an immediate end".[274] Conzelmann does not support his claim that a stereotypical formula prevents ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις from expressing expectation of an imminent end. Conzelmann needs to argue a case for ossification,[275] if the expression conveys *no* expectation of an imminent end. However, the use of the expression in a Pauline letter as part of an urgent warning (2 Tim 3:1) does not suggest a contemporary ossification;[276] nor

---

[271] Outside Jeremiah, the only other occurrence is Mal 3:4, which is significant for our study given that Luke is using a combination of Joel 3, Malachi 3 and Isaiah 2 to legitimate Pentecost.

[272] Wildberger notes older scholarship which attributed the authorship of Isa 2:2-4 to Joel, *Isaiah 1-12*, 85.

[273] Accordingly, Litwak, *Echoes*, 156, is mistaken to argue that Luke's use of Isa 2:2 "recontextualizes" Joel in a "different eschatological context". Litwak uses this point to support his thesis that Luke is offering a revisionary reading.

[274] Conzelmann, *Acts*, 19; see also his *Theology*, 95, and compare Schweizer's view, partly based upon Conzelmann's *heilgeschichtliche* scheme, that Pentecost is "not eschatological for Luke", *TDNT* 6:410.

[275] For a discussion of ossification in relation to idiom see, Gibson, *Biblical Semantic Logic*, 110-125; ossification would exist if an expression's original semantic ingredients were no longer functioning.

[276] See also the discussion of this expression in the context of the Dead Sea Scrolls in J. J. Collins, "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds., C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74-90 (75-76); this evidence does not support ossification.

does its use in sectarian Qumran documents[277] suggest that the expression was not allied to an expectation of an end. Accordingly, we have to attribute *some* theological significance to the expression in Acts and decide what is implied for a reader in Luke's use of the expression.

Commenting on Luke's use of ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις rather than μετὰ ταῦτα. Weiser insightfully observes, „Lukas will mit seiner Änderung des Joel-Textes aber nicht etwa sagen, dass nun das Ende eintrete; sondern für ihn ist die ganze Zeit seit Jesu Wirken bereits ‚Endseit', deren Ende aber unberechenbar beleibt".[278] Jervell states, "Die Endzeit, oder vielleicht: Endzeiten - ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ist Pluralis – gangen mit der Geistausgiessung an und dauern bis zur Parusie".[279] These suggestions are not contradictory since the time of the Parousia is not predicted in Luke. Our proposal is that we should see the "end" in view as a composite one involving both the end of the Jewish Commonwealth and the coming of the Son of Man (Luke 21:27).[280]

4.3.1.1 The "Last Days" and the "Two Ages" of History

The expression "last days" appears throughout the Jewish scriptures (ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν/אחרית היימים[281]—Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5) and can be considered to

---

[277] Collins, "Expectation", 75-76; Fuller, *Restoration*, 261. See also A. Steudel, "אחרית היימים in the Texts from Qumran" *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225-246. Steudel documents over thirty occurrences of the expression in the scrolls.

[278] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:92, ("Luke does not really want to say with the quote from the prophet Joel that the end would now come; but that for him the whole time since Jesus' work began was 'the end-time', which end of course remains unpredictable").

[279] *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 143, ("The end-time, or perhaps: end-times — ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is plural — begin with the outpouring of the Spirit and last until the Parousia").

[280] The focus of our study is on how Luke embeds the bestowal of the Spirit in the last days of a Jewish Commonwealth and hence we do not discuss the topic of the "delay of the Parousia". We do however position this topic in relation to our study in Chapter Six as a direction for future research.

[281] BDB, 31, defines the phrase as "a prophetic phrase denoting the final period of the history so far as the speaker's perspective reaches; the sense thus varies with the context".

be a technical eschatological term for a first century audience: in Dan 2:28 (Aramaic), and 10:14 it appears as an apocalyptic[282] term. Further. the use of the expression in the Qumran literature and elsewhere reflects a broader literary co-text, and this is evidence that a broad eschatological context would have also been assumed by Luke in his incorporation of Isa 2:2 alongside Joel 3:1-5.

Certain Second Temple texts describe the past and present of history and envisage a time to come, which will be qualitatively different for humankind, and which has indefinite extent. In addition, some texts include a clearly defined segmentation of history. This division of history into two ages provides the framework for the concept of the "last days". These texts associate "troubles" or "woes" [283] with the "last days" and describe the "New Age" in utopian terms. For example,

1) Daniel offers various visions of history and a periodization that proved influential in Second Temple Judaism.[284] The four kingdoms of Daniel 2 lead to a kingdom that will never be destroyed; the seventy weeks of Daniel 9 lead to a period of "everlasting righteousness". Daniel includes material

---

[282] We use this term here in a derivative sense, i.e. an expression is "apocalyptic" in virtue of being used in a topic-specific way in an "Apocalypse". While scholars may disagree on the extent of this genre and argue for "apocalyptic" elements in works that are not Apocalypses, Daniel 7-12 is usually taken to be an "Apocalypse" because it shares features with other Second Temple Apocalypses. An "Apocalypse" may have some or all of the following aspects: periodization of history, predictions surrounding the end of history and the establishment of a new age, eschatological wars and woes, the intervention of a heavenly figure, a day of judgment, and the national restoration of Israel. In addition, the genre involves revelation by an angelic mediator, heavenly journeys, and symbolic visions of Israel and its relation to the nations.

[283] For an introductory overview of these woes in Jewish apocalyptic writings, see C. Rowland, *Open Heaven* (London: SPCK, 1982), ch. 7; D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), ch. 1.

[284] J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), ch. 2, outlines the influence of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls; see also the discussion of L. T. Stuckenbruck, "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed., J. H. Charlesworth: 3 vols; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:101-130.

that attempts to calculate the end of history and when the transition to the new age will happen (Dan 7:25; 9:24; and 12:11-12).

In Ezekiel 38 and Daniel 10 the expression is used to denote a *period* where war(s) are waged against Israel. In Dan 10:14, the angel Gabriel (Dan 8:16) promises to make Daniel understand what would happen to Israel in the last days, and this "vision" is detailed in the *history* of the Ptolemies and Seleucids outlined in Daniel 11.

2) The *1 Enoch* corpus contains several eschatological blocks of material, however, at a certain level of generality, there is a uniform approach to the end of time. There is an awareness of periodization in history in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En.* 93:1-10; 91:11-17), which concludes with "many weeks without number forever" (*1 En.* 91:17).[285] It is the contrast with the linear progression[286] of historical events with an indefinite period that forms the substance of Jewish "two-age" thinking.

A "two-age" view of history is expressed in the remark, "they will corrupt until the day of the great conclusion, until the great age is consummated, until everything is concluded (upon) the Watchers and the wicked ones" (*1 En.* 16:1, cf. 72:1), but this idea is presupposed throughout the component parts of the corpus.

The righteous are exhorted to follow the ways that leads to life (e.g. in the *Epistle of Enoch*, *1 En.* 94:4; 96:1-3; 99:3), and so ensure the survival of a remnant from the eschatological trouble (e.g. in the *Dream Visions*, *1 En.*

---

[285] For a discussion of this form of Jewish historiography in relation to the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal Apocalypse, see Ida Fröhlich, *Time and Times and Half a Time: Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996), 82-90.

[286] The principle upon which the periodization is organised is not solely linear, but may include chiastic or parallel elements, for a discussion of this issue see M. Henze, "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End of Time" in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed., G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 207-209.

83:8-9, and in the *Epistle of Enoch*, *1 En.* 106:19: 107:1). This group of "the righteous" emerges in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* during the seventh week of human history (*1 En.* 93:10, cf. the "small lambs" of 90:6).

The new age that awaits the righteous is described in terms such as, for example, peace, truth, kindness and prosperity (*1 En.* 1:8: 11:1-2), or freedom from sin (*1 En.* 5:7-8), a new heaven and a new earth (*1 En.* 45:4-5), or as a restored Eden with the tree of life (*1 En.* 25:5-6).

3) *2 Enoch* expresses a dispensational view of the ages that comprise the "age of creation", and states that,

> ...when the whole of creation...shall come to an end, and when each person will go to the Lord's great judgment, then time periods will perish...they will constitute a single age. And all the righteous, who escape from the Lord's great judgment, will be collected together with the great age. *2 En.* 65.7-8, cf. 66:6, 50:2

This prospect is made the basis of living a righteous life (*2 En.* 66:1-2).

4) J. J. Collins asserts that the "last days" in the Dead Sea Scrolls "has two aspects. It is a time of testing, and it is a time of at least incipient salvation".[287] This generalization can be illustrated from a selection of texts:

i) 11Q13 assigns various distinct happenings to the "last days" (לאחרית הימים, II, 4). There is a proclamation of "release" to the captives (II, 3-4), who are made to return by a Melchizedek figure (II, 5-6); there is a time for the "rule of judgment" (II, 9) and "the vengeance of Go[d's] judgments" (II, 13) upon the peoples. This figure is "anointed of the spir[it]" (II, 18), a messenger who announces good news. The text does not describe a situation where Israel has been restored, but rather the events that bring about her restoration: a return of captives and judgment upon the peoples. The text achieves this

---

[287] *Apocalypticism*, 57.

through its pesher interpretations of Jewish scriptural texts such as Lev 25:13, Deut 15:2, Ps 82:2, Isa 52:7, 61:1-2, and Dan 9:25. If an identity is assigned to the "last days", it is a tenth Jubilee "week" in which both release of the captives occurs and vengeance upon the peoples. At the end of this week there is a Day of Atonement (II, 7) after which God will rule. This text *presupposes* the presence of Melchizedek as a precondition for the transition to God's rule.

ii) 4Q174 offers a pesher interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10 to predict that the temple will be established in the last days (I, 1-5). After this Yahweh will "appear over it forever" (I, 5). It also offers a pesher interpretation of Amos 9:11 to predict that the "branch of David" will be raised up in the last days to save Israel (I, 11-13). This "salvation" appears to be set against a "time of trial" (II, 1) in which the nations conspire against Israel (I, 18), which is the pesher offered for Ps 2:1.

iii) 4Q246 II, 1-9 describe a figure called the "son of God" whose kingdom replaces a state in which peoples wage war against one another.

iv) 4Q177 describes a time in the last days when the faithful community will be tested and refined by those in Israel who are a "congregation" of the wicked (II, 10-16). This is a "period of distress" (IV, 13, עת ענות). 1QpHab II, 3-6 may offer a further identification of this group as "the traito[rs of the] new [covenant]", and 4Q169 Frags. 3-4, II, 2 may also refer to the same group as "those looking for easy interpretations" (compare also 4Q385a Frag. 41, 4, and 4Q387a Frag. 2, 6).

v) 4Q398 describes the last days as the time when there will be a "turning to the Law" (Frags. 11-13, line 4) after there has been "blessing [and the] curse" (Frags. 14-17, Col. I, line 6). This implies a period of eschatological

woes insofar as blessings and curses run up until[288] the last days and fulfill the terms of the Deuteronomistic "blessings and curse" list (Deuteronomy 28). The text exhorts the faithful to persevere (Frags. 14-17, Col. II, lines 1-8) in the face of the behaviour of those of Belial.

vi) 1Q28a states that Community Rule was "the rule of all the congregation of Israel in the last days (באחרית הימים), when they gather [in community to wa]lk" (1Q28a I, 1). This implies some recognition on the part of the text's authors that they were living in the last days to the extent that the Community Rule was a guide for the Qumran covenanters.

vii) 4Q504 Frags. 1-2, III, 13-14 states that "evil would [over]take us in the last days", and this follows a broken clause that refers to the "precepts" of Moses, and which presumably constituted the antecedent condition that the people had disobeyed the Law. The provenance of the "last days" is not clear, but it offers further evidence of the link between eschatological woes and the "last days".

viii) CD 19:10-15 describes the coming of the "messiah of Aaron and Israel" and the "day of visitation" in which the wicked rulers of the people will be punished. CD 20:14 includes a calculation of the arrival of the "age of wrath", at 40 years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. 1QpHab VII, 6-13 includes an exhortation to wait patiently for the last days, which offers evidence that the Qumran community recognized a delay in the arrival of the age of wrath.

ix) Various Qumran texts also presuppose a periodization of history (e.g. 4Q180 lines 1-5; CD XVI, 4; XX, 14; 11Q13 II, 7, 18, 21). Thus, 1QS IV, 18-19 presumes a two-age model of history in the remark, "God...has determined an end to the existence of injustice and on the appointed time of the visitation he will obliterate it forever". This model is developed in

---

[288] Collins appears to be overly fussy in his reading of the text when he says, "the fulfilment of these curses and blessings, then, is not part of the end of days at hand", *Apocalypticism*, 61.

conjunction with the dualism of the "two spirits": the new age will bring an end to the conflict between the two spirits. It is this period of time which can be termed a "new age" rather than any preceding time in which there is conflict.

The texts cited in (i)-(ix) state or assume a two-age view of history. Some offer a nationalistic eschatology centred on the presence of a heavenly individual (11Q13, cf. 4Q174) whose actions lead to the new age; others focus on the faithful community and its testing in the last days (4Q177).

Events that presage the new age such as the coming of eschatological deliverers or the building of the eschatological temple are future, but it is possible that some Qumran texts reflect the view that the eschatological woes had begun (1Q28a, 4Q398). This seems to be the implication in coupling woe material with exhortations to faithfulness (4Q177). On the other hand, some texts (1QpHab) imply that there is a delay in the arrival of the age of wrath.

5) *Jubilees* does not devote much space to eschatology, but it does give an account of various "woes" that would come upon an "evil generation" of the people (*Jub.* 23:14, 16, 22) including war, famine, plague (*Jub.* 23:13-25) and cause them to return to the Lord and his commandments (*Jub.* 23:26, cf. 1:23-29). In consequence the people have their lives extended so that they approach a thousand years and they will enjoy blessings from God and "rejoice forever and ever with joy" (*Jub.* 23:30). The picture here contrasts a period characterized by "joy" with a period characterized by "evil". There is no cataclysmic transition to the "new age", no single event, but the text presents the view that a period characterized with "evils" would not be the time of "joy". This text identifies the transition as a "day of the great judgment" (*Jub.* 23:11), when Israel will "see all of their judgments and all of their curses among their enemies" (*Jub.* 23:30).

6) The two-age view of world history is also found in Jewish apocalypses that in part respond to the destruction of Jerusalem.

i) *4 Ezra* expresses extensive eschatological teaching expressed from a post-70 C.E. perspective. Set against the question of how God will act to relieve Israel's post-70 C.E. plight, Ezra is given an eschatological answer as a basis for hope. In the first vision, the current age was "hastening swiftly to its end" (*4 Ezra* 4:27) and various "woes" would come upon the earth and the land (*4 Ezra* 5:1-13) prior to the coming of the "good field" (*4 Ezra* 4:29). In the second vision, signs are described which are for "when the seal is placed upon the age which is about to pass away" (*4 Ezra* 6:20). In the third vision, *4 Ezra* explicitly expresses a two age view, "the Most High has made not one world but two" (*4 Ezra* 7.50).

The future age is again contrasted with the present age in terms of various "evils" and "goods" (*4 Ezra* 7.12, 13, 31), and the transition to the new age occurs on the Day of Judgment, "the day of judgment will be the end of this age and the beginning of the immortal age to come" (*4 Ezra* 7.112-14). Those who survive the "woes" will see God's salvation "in the land" (*4 Ezra* 9:8). In the fifth (Eagle) vision, the people are delivered from the Eagle-power by the messiah (*4 Ezra* 12:32-34). While there are differences in detail to be marked between the various visions, a broad two-age pattern is present and the transition to the new age is predicated upon the Day of Judgment and the advent of a messiah-figure.

ii) *2 Baruch* also expresses a post-70 C.E. perspective. Eschatological woes are described (*2 Baruch* 27:1-15; 70:2-10), after which "the Anointed One will begin to be revealed" (*2 Baruch* 29:3; 70:9; 72:2) for the judgment of the nations (*2 Baruch* 72:1-6), and then there is a restoration of fruitfulness to the earth (*2 Baruch* 29:5-8; 73:1-74:4) and a resurrection of the dead (*2 Baruch* 30). *2 Baruch* like *4 Ezra* predicates a transition to a new age upon the advent of a messiah-figure.

iii) The *Apocalypse of Abraham*, another post-70 C.E. work. categorizes the eschatological woes as a series of plagues in the "last days" conceived of as the twelfth "hour" of twelve assigned to "the impious age" (*Apoc. Ab.* 29:1-2: 30:1-8). These woes come on the heathen before the "age of justice", which is characterized by truth and justice (*Apoc. Ab.* 29:18). The transition to this new age involves God's "chosen one" (*Apoc. Ab.* 31:1-2) who will take vengeance on the heathen who have humiliated God's people.

7) The *Testament of Moses* details war and persecution for Israel by a "king of kings" (*T. Mos.* 8:1) as well as the misrule of godless men from within the nation (*T. Mos.* 7). These conditions will happen when times "will quickly come to an end" (*T. Mos.* 7:1), and scholars have noted that allusions to Maccabean events suggest that the author of this part of the *Testament of Moses* believed that these eschatological woes were currently in process.[289] After these happenings, other woes will occur presaging the new age (*T. Mos.* 10.4-5), woes that echo such "Day of the Lord" texts as Joel 2:10, 4:15, and Isa 13:10. These woes are enacted on the nations by the "Heavenly One" arising from his throne "on behalf of his sons" (*T. Mos.* 10:3-7) after which Israel will be established (*T. Mos.* 10:8-10).

8) *Pss. of Solomon* 17:21-46 delineates the Davidic messiah's role to be one of restoration: Jerusalem is to be purged of Gentiles and unrighteous rulers (v. 22), Israel is to be regathered (v. 26), land is to be redistributed (v. 28), and nations will be ruled over (v. 29) in righteousness (v. 32). This expression of hope is invoked by the psalmist in response to the destruction of the land and Jerusalem (vv. 11, 14) and the scattering of the people (v. 18). This text petitions for the *advent* of the messiah to effect the transition to the new age.

9) The *Sibylline Oracles III* depicts a pattern where "woes" precede the advent of a saviour. For example, the last oracle (589-808) describes the end-time from the perspective of the writer. There are appeals for

---

[289] For example, see the discussion by Allison, *End of the Ages*, 8.

repentance (545-570, 624-634, 732-740, 762-767), description of the woes of war (635-651, 796-808), the sending of a "king from the sun" (652-656), an assault on Jerusalem (657-668), the cosmic judgments of God (669-701), the deliverance of Jerusalem (702-709), and the conversion of the nations (710-731); then there will be established a "kingdom for all ages" (766-795). This text identifies a critical advent of a messiah-figure to bring about deliverance, but it also juxtaposes appeals for repentance (624-631) with descriptions of the eschatological woes.

This brief review of eschatological texts, (1)–(9), is not designed to be exhaustive or enter into the complexities of exegesis. Second Temple texts do not present a uniform view of the "last days"; furthermore many texts have a complex redactional history, and this affects their value as evidence of Jewish thought contemporary with Luke. We present this evidence to support the proposition that at a certain level Jewish thought worked with a two-age view of history. The transition to the new age is focused around the actions of an individual (sometimes two individuals). The new age is to be preceded by woes, during which an eschatological community is encouraged to persevere. When the eschatological deliverer[290] comes he will inflict judgments and usher in the new age; the beneficent rule of the deliverer characterizes the new age.

D. S. Russell offers a heavily qualified generalization of what he defines as "apocalyptic eschatology".[291] He avers that Second Temple "apocalyptic texts" assume a two-age view of history, characterize the new age as one that is free of all that is wrong in the old age, and describe a transition to the new age that is cataclysmic. Russell enumerates additional characteristics shared between his selected apocalyptic texts. Allowing for a difference in detail across Russell's "apocalyptic" texts, this body of literature presents a *violent* transition to the new age.

---

290 We use the notion of an "eschatological deliverer" as a catch-all term for expressions used in eschatological texts that refer to an individual who performs critical actions that bring about the new age.

291 D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 269.

D. C. Allison comments that "many of the ancient Jewish texts that foretell the end of the present world order also announce the coming of a great tribulation, a final time of trouble that is to mark the transition between this age and the messianic age or the age to come".[292] Collins concludes his analysis of the phrase "the last days" in Qumran texts by saying.

> ...this period includes the time of testing and eschatological distress. It includes the dawning of the era of salvation, with the coming of the messiahs, and at least in some sources it extends to the final war. It does not, however, include the final salvation that is to follow the eschatological battle.[293]

4.3.1.2 Agreements with Acts

Luke's use of ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις from Isa 2:2-5 agrees with the Isaianic oracle in respect of its implicit two-age perspective.

1) Although Luke does not include any discourse that schematizes Israel's history, nor does he include apocalyptic material that eulogizes about a forthcoming new age, his use of the expression "the last days" in conjunction with Joel shows that he has a dispensational perception of God's purpose.

This perception also surfaces when he has Peter say that the prophets "have likewise foretold of these days" (Acts 3:25). Similarly, the expressions, "times of the Gentiles" (Luke 21:24, καιροὶ ἐθνῶν), "times of refreshing" (Acts 3:19, καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως), and "times of restitution" (Acts 3:21, χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως) also show an awareness of periodization in God's dealings with Israel. Some of these "times" are subsequent to Luke's story-time, but their anticipation is integrated into that story. The "times of restitution" are the locus of the completed new age for Luke.

---

[292] *End of the Ages*, 5.
[293] "Expectation", 62.

Conzelmann[294] proposed a three-epoch eschatological model. and others such as Dunn have followed him. However, it is more likely that Luke[295] had the more common two age view of history.[296]

2) Luke includes predictive material about the *coming* of the kingdom of God (Luke 13:28-29; 14:15; 18:24; 19:11; 21:31; 22:16, 18; 23:51: Acts 14:22), and he associates exorcism and healing with the "nearness" of the kingdom (ἐγγίζω, Luke 10:11; φθάνω, Luke 11:20).[297] If Luke had a notion of a "new age" then it is likely that he thought of this age in terms of the coming kingdom of God. Luke may have thought of "the kingdom" as near and/or present in the ministry of Jesus, but this does not preclude the expectation that the new age was more fully yet to come.

3) The motifs in Isa 2:2-5 occur elsewhere in the Jewish scriptures and these other texts combine to paint a picture of an eschatological time. Thus the use of the Niphal participle, נכון[298] ("establish") echoes its use in Davidic promise texts (2 Sam 7:16, 26; 1 Kgs 2:45; 1 Chron 17:14, 24), and the expression "top of the mountains" (בראש ההרים/ἄκρων τῶν ὀρέων) resonates with Ps 72:16 and the reign of the ideal Davidic king. The end to war and a return to agricultural work, and "many" (רבים/πολύς) from the "nations" (גוי/ἔθνος) going up to the "house of the God of Jacob", echoes similar

---

294 *Theology*, 150.

295 See Mattill, *Last Things*, ch. 1.

296 Hence, S. Mowinckel asserts that, "every eschatology includes in some form or other a dualistic conception of history, and implies that the present state of things and the present world order will suddenly come to an end and be superseded by another of an essentially different kind", *He That Cometh* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 125.

297 These terms have been the subject of debate in older scholarship as to whether they connote the spatial or temporal nearness of the kingdom, or the actual presence of the kingdom in the ministry of Jesus, see N. Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1963). 58-66; Marshall, *Luke*, 422, 476. Perrin's review of scholarship identifies the classic expressions of "thorough-going eschatology" and "realized eschatology" respectively in the work of Albert Schweitzer and C. H. Dodd. It is beyond the scope of our study to consider how the kingdom might be near or present in the ministry of Jesus.

298 There is no corresponding verb in the LXX, just what will be in the last days (ἔσται).

emphases in Jer 31:12, 50:5, and Zech 8:21-23. The "judging" and "rebuke" of the nations are messianic motifs used elsewhere (יכח שפט/ἐλέγχω κρίνω—Isa 2:4; 11:3-4).

There are strong thematic links between Isa 2:2-5 and Isaiah 32 and 61, which would explain Luke making a composite quotation of Joel 3:1-5 and Isa 2:2. For example, the good government of the king and his princes in Isa 32:1 resonates with the "law going forth from Jerusalem" in Isa 2:3; the subordination of the nations in Isa 2:4 is reflected in the motif of God's people "eating the riches of the Gentiles" in Isa 61:6.

In Acts, as many scholars have noted, the word of the Lord does go forth from Jerusalem (e.g. Acts 8:25; 13:49; 15:36; and 19:10); this is likely the typological significance of Isa 2:2-5 for Luke—he sees in the preaching of the apostles a proleptic anticipation of the word of the Lord going forth from Jerusalem in the future age.

4) Luke uses common Second Temple motifs in Jesus' eschatological discourses (Luke 17:20-37 and 21:6-36), and this indicates that he presupposes a two-age framework in Acts:[299]

---

[299] A comparison between Luke-Acts and Second Temple texts is possible, provided it is recognised that such texts use comparable details in different configurations describing what will happen in the last days. Both Luke and Second Temple authors adapt Jewish scriptural material in their presentation of events that are to "come to pass". We are not arguing here for any relation of dependency between Luke-Acts and any Second Temple texts. Our argument is that they evince a common framework.

Motif in Luke-Acts	**Corresponding Second Temple Text**
Signs (σημεῖον, Luke 21:7; Acts 2:16)	*Sib. Or. III* 796; *4 Ezra* 5:1; 6:11-12; and *2 Baruch* 70:7, 72:2.
Wonders in heaven (Luke 21:11, 25)	Sun darkened (*As. Mos.* 10:5: cf. *Sib. Or. III* 802; *4 Ezra* 5:4).
	Moon turned into "blood" (*As. Mos.* 10:5).
	Signs in the stars (*1 Enoch* 80:7; *4 Ezra* 5:5).
Earthquakes (Luke 21:11)	*As. Mos.* 10:4; *T. Levi* 4:1; *4 Ezra* 9:3; *2 Baruch* 27:7; 70:8, *Apoc Ab.* 30:6.
Famine (Luke 21:11)	*2 Baruch* 27:6; 70:8; *4 Ezra* 6:22; *Apoc. Ab.* 30:5.
Betrayal of friends and family (Luke 21:16)	*1 Enoch* 56:7; 100:1-2; *4 Ezra* 6:24; *2 Baruch* 70:3-5; *Jub.* 23:16.
Climate of Wars (Luke 21:9-10, 20)	*1 Enoch* 90:6-19; *4 Ezra* 9:3; *2 Baruch* 27:4; 48:32, 37; 70:3, 6, 8; 72:2.
Eschatological Deliverer wages war (Luke 21:27)	*1 Enoch* ("Son of Man"), *Assumption of Moses* ("Heavenly One"), *Sibylline Oracles III* ("king from the sun"), 11Q13 ("Melchizedek"), *2 Baruch* ("the Anointed One").
Escape (Acts 2:21; Luke 21:19-21)	*1 Enoch* 62:13; *2 Baruch* 70:9.

The implied-reader of Luke-Acts would be expected to take Luke's eschatological framework from Luke 17:20-37 and 21:6-36 and structure his understanding of Acts within that framework.[300] Such a reading would place the disciples into the *middle* of the eschatological woes. The persecutions of Acts would fulfil what was predicted before the final woes (πρὸ δὲ τούτων

---

[300] For further discussion of this point see W. S. Kurz, "Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible", *SBLSP* 19 (1980): 283-300 (284).

πάντων, Luke 21:12; θλίψεις, Acts 11:19; 14:22; 20:23). The final woes involving Jerusalem would then lie beyond[301] the story of Acts, and include such events as the siege of Jerusalem[302] (Luke 21:20), the "days of vengeance" (ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως, Luke 21:22, cf. 18:7-8), and redemption (ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις, Luke 21:28). Luke's positioning of Pentecost as an event of the "last days" invites this reading strategy for Acts.

5) Within this framework, Luke presents the return of Jesus as conditional[303] upon the repentance of the people (Acts 3:19-21, cf. Luke 13:35).[304] If "the people" did not repent, they would be "cut off" and not share in the future age.[305]

The above points, (1)-(5), show that Luke's story corresponds with broad Jewish ideas about what will happen in the last days. In Isa 2:2-5 the end result of these last days is described, and Luke's citation of ἔσται ἐν ταῖς

---

[301] Luke offers a conclusion to his story in Luke 17 and 21, and reinforces this with expressions of imminent eschatological expectation in Acts (Acts 3:19-21; 7:56; 10:42; 13:40-41; 15:16-17; 17:26, 31; 23:6; 24:15). If Luke-Acts was written and circulated prior to 66 C.E., this expectation is unaffected by the readers' knowledge of external events, but if Luke-Acts is a later work (circa. 90 C.E.), then the reader has unfulfilled predictions to handle in his comprehension of the story of Acts.

[302] The inclusion of this detail and the redactional change in respect of Mark's parallel text may indicate awareness that Jerusalem has fallen; on the other hand, it is just as possible that the text represents a prognostication based on existing "last days" scriptural patterns of "Jerusalem under siege".

[303] The conditional nature of the *eschaton* is also expressed in *T. Dan.* 6:4; *T. Simeon* 6:2-7; *T. Judah* 23:5; *T. Moses* 18:1; *4 Ezra* 4:39; R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus (80-120 C.E.) *b. Sanhedrin* 97b; R. Simeon b. Yohai (140-160 CE), *b. Shabbat* 118b; and R. Judah 170-200 C.E.) *b. Baba Bathra* 10a. While the evidence of the *Testaments* may be Christian (circa. 2c.), rather than Jewish, the rabbinical texts suggest they reflect Jewish thought on this point. Fuller makes the observation that sin-exile-repentance-return is the pattern of the Deuteronomistic history, *Restoration*, 2; see also Pesch, *Acts*, 1:155; Weiser, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:118; and Barrett, *Acts*, 1:203.

[304] See Chance, *Jerusalem, The Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*, 130-132; D. C. Allison, "Matt. 23:39 = Lk. 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy" *JSNT* 18 (1983): 75-84.

[305] The linkage between being "cut off" from the people and loosing out on the age to come is found in texts such as *Jub.* 6:12, 14; 1QS II. 16; and *m. Kerithoth* 1:1-2.

ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις from Isa 2:2 brings the goal of the last days to the foreground for the implied reader.

4.3.1.3 Dissonance

Luke's use of Isa 2:2 brings a measure of dissonance to Luke-Acts. As we have seen in respect of Isaiah 32, 58 and 61, Luke takes elements from what are otherwise integrated Isaianic oracles. This requires the reader to juxtapose both fulfilment and non-fulfilment in his reading of Luke-Acts and Isaiah. Two points of dissonance can be discerned:

1) Isa 2:2-5 describes a political *status quo* rather than the dynamics of events in the last days. The key point is the establishment of the "mountain" of the house of the Lord and the subordination of the nations. An individual will judge the nations and an age of peace will be introduced. Luke does not match these elements in his narrative.

2) Acts presents the preaching of the Gospel as going forth from Jerusalem, but the Gospel is not "the Law" as it would have been envisaged when the Isaianic oracle was delivered. Furthermore, the Law in Isa 2:2-5 goes out to the nations, whereas Pentecost is focused on native and Diaspora Jews. Luke may see a typology here but it is one that stands in tension with the intent of the original oracle.[306]

The above points, (1)-(2), are the natural consequence of Luke's handling of the Jewish scriptures. He is not reading his texts in isolation but rather he sees their broad applicability to the events he is narrating. An allusion or quotation in respect of one text brings the intertexts of that text to the table of interpretation. In each text there exist elements that pertain to the end of the age and the commencement of the new age that do not apply to Luke's story. The implied reader is drawn to see some typological correspondences and hold over unfulfilled elements for the "time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets" (Acts 3:21).

---

[306] *Contra* O'Reilly, *Word and Sign*, 24-25.

4.3.2 Joel 3:1-5

The oracles in Joel 1:2-2:27 form a coherent collection, and while historical markers are indeterminate to modern scholarship, there is a story in these oracles, and it is this story (at least) that Luke's implied reader considers before reading about the bestowal of the Spirit in Joel 3:1-5.[307]

The oracles in Joel 1 and 2 depict Zion as still inhabited, but with the land over-run; the temple exists and there is a priesthood/governing class directing the people (Joel 1:15; 2:15-16). Barton observes that,

> ...the description of locusts in 1:1-7 and 2:2-11 raises difficult questions of interpretation. In both cases it is possible to argue either that the locusts are intended literally or that they symbolize a human army.[308]

P. R. Andinach adds to these two interpretations a distinction in the kind of army envisaged in Joel. He suggests that the locusts might either symbolize the eschatological army of God or the army of an invading people.[309] In making this distinction, he reflects a common interpretative issue for OT scholars in deciding whether an oracle has contemporary application or an original eschatological or redactional intent. Andinach argues for a contemporary application without identifying a particular historical situation.[310] We do not need to determine an *original or a redactional* eschatological intent in the oracles of Joel 1 and 2, as our interest lies in Luke's use of Joel, which is plausibly taken to be eschatological. What is important for our purpose is to show that the "story" in the oracles that lead

---

[307] Wenk, *Community-Forming Power*, 252, admits Joel 2:12-27 as relevant.
[308] J. Barton, *Joel and Obadiah* (Louisville: WJK Press, 2001), 42.
[309] P. B. Andinach, "The Locusts in the Message of Joel" *VT* 52 (1992): 433-441 (433-434).
[310] Andinach concludes that the locusts are "a metaphor which clarifies and enforces the characteristics of a human army in its action against the people and the land", "Locusts", 441.

up to Joel 3:1-5 is about the effect of a metaphorical invading army of locusts.[311]

The terms used for the "four" types of locust[312] in the MT are difficult to identify, but for our purposes it is sufficient to take a generic approach to the locusts. Several commentators[313] propose that the locust invasion (Joel 1:4) is symbolic of an invasion by a northern power (Joel 2:20). The following arguments have been put forward in support of a metaphoric construal of locusts as an invading army:

1) If we take the oracles of Joel 1 and 2 as a literary continuity, the detail in Joel 2 is of actions performed by an invading army (slash and burn, 1:19-20, 2:3; climbing walls, 2:7; use of arrows, 2:8; plundering, 2:9). These are actions unrelated to locusts.[314]

2) The extraordinary character of the event in Joel 2 does not fit the natural phenomenon of a locust plague. Further, locust plagues come from the south, whereas the calamity in Joel comes from the north (2:20).[315]

---

311 J. Lössl, in "When is a Locust Just a Locust?" *JTS* 55 (2004): 575-599, discusses the reception history of Joel 1:4 (the first locust text) amongst early church fathers. This interpretation included allegorical treatment of the four types of locust in terms of successive conquests of Israel, as well as more literal interpretation of the locusts as a natural plague. Such allegorical sequencing rests upon an initial metaphorical construal of the locusts. Luke's use of Joel is set at a particular point in God's purpose ("the last days") rather than within a fourfold allegorical framework.

312 In the *Targum of the Minor Prophets*, 65 n. 3, Cathcart and Gordon observe that a precise translation is "no easier" for the Aramaic equivalents. J. Lössl, "When is a Locust Just a Locust", 585, observes that English translations are "on the same level with the 'seventy', the Rabbis, and Jerome" in not being certain of the MT. For our purposes, it is sufficient to think of all four terms in terms of "locusts".

313 In addition to Andinach, J. L. Crenshaw, *Joel* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 88-94, proposes that the locusts are metaphorical for political disaster in the history of the nation.

314 Andinach, "Locusts", 434.

315 Andinach, "Locusts", 433, 435; B. S. Childs, "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition" *JBL* 78 (1959): 187-198, (197).

Moreover, whereas locusts are a regular occurrence during the spring,[316] the calamity in Joel extends over years (2:25).

3) There is a preponderance of military language in Joel 2 (army, 2:11, 25; horses, 2:4; chariots, 2:5) and it seems incongruous to postulate that the calamity facing the nation was not military. Further, "locusts" are explicitly used as a metaphor for an army in 2:25, and this is a common metaphor in other texts.[317]

4) The devastation wrought by the locusts (Joel 1:4), is explained as the result of a nation coming upon the land (כי, Joel 1:6),[318] a "great people" (Joel 2:2). They are described with the figure of a lion (Joel 1:6), and the response of the priests is an appeal to Yahweh to deliver his people from the reproach of the nations (Joel 2:17).

Against this interpretation, argued in (1)-(4) above, other commentators have proposed that the locusts are *just that*—a natural disaster. Barton adopts this position[319] for Joel 1 and 2 as does L. C. Allen.[320] M. A. Sweeney reads Joel 1:2-20[321] as an oracle about a locust plague but Joel 2:2:1-4 as an oracle about an invasion.

Barton raises the problem of identifying a historical catalyst in post-exilic times for the oracles if the locusts are a metaphor for an invading army.[322] However, this is less of a problem if the oracles are pre-exilic, as the invader could be Mesopotamian. Barton's main argument is that the locusts are

---

316 Y. Palmoni, "Locust" *IDB* 3:144-8. Palmoni adopts a metaphorical reading of Joel (145).
317 *ANET*, 144, 649; CAD 4:256-258; Judg 6:3-5; Jer 46:23; 51:27-33; Nah 3:15-16—Andinach, "Locusts", 438-439.
318 Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 44.
319 *Joel and Obadiah*, 42-48.
320 L. C. Allen, *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976), 48-50, 67-76, 86-90, 94-96.
321 M. A. Sweeny, *The Twelve Prophets* (Berit Olam; 2 vols; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000), 1:154-156.
322 *Joel and Obadiah*, 44.

compared to an army in Joel 2:4-9 and he avers that "One can hardly describe an army as being like a plague of locusts while saying that the locusts in question are like an army, unless one is very incompetent in using metaphors, which the Old Testament prophets certainly were not".[323]

This point is not decisive. A term for locusts does not occur in Joel 2:4-9; rather, we have the expression "a great and powerful people". These people are described in terms of horses and chariots and not locusts. Against Barton, we would argue that the nation that comes up upon the land (Joel 1:6) is described with several metaphors including "locusts" (Joel 1:4), "lions" (Joel 1:6) and "horses and chariots" (Joel 2:4-5). When Barton states "provided we think that the locusts have the same meaning in chapters 1 and 2, the description in chapter 2 seems to me difficult to reconcile with the idea that they stand for an army",[324] he is using an undifferentiated notion of meaning. The metaphorical reference of the various expressions for locust in Joel 1:4, 2:25 can be the same while different metaphors and similes with differing sense are used to secure that reference. The relationship of the "great people" to the expressions for "locusts" is one of reference to a metaphorical description. We can however agree with Barton in rejecting a middle position in which Joel 1 is about a plague of locusts and Joel 2 is about an invasion.[325] There is a close parallelism in the chapters: an oracle of calamity is followed by an oracle of lament (Joel 1:14-20; 2:12-17) and then a first response of Yahweh in Joel 2:18. Sweeney's middle position does not respect the literary continuity across the oracles.

The decisive argument in favour of the invasion reading is the parallel language used to describe the locusts and the northerner (Joel 1:4, 2:25—גזם חסיל ילק ארבה/ἀκρὶς βροῦχος ἐρυσίβη κάμπη). The locusts are described as a "nation" (Joel 1:6—גוי/ἔθνος) coming upon the land, and the invader is characterized as the "army" of the Lord (Joel 2:11, 25—חיל/δύναμις). This language might be construed in eschatological or contemporary terms, but it

---

[323] *Joel and Obadiah*, 44.
[324] *Joel and Obadiah*, 44.
[325] *Joel and Obadiah*, 46.

sets up the necessary counterpoint for the deliverance and vengeance oracles in Joel 3-4. Barton seems to acknowledge the importance of the motif of "the northerner" in the conclusion to his discussion by asking whether such a designation could have been used for an army of locusts.[326] While maintaining that there "is no reason it could not have been so used",[327] we would argue that the motif of the northern *invader* is instead a strong reading presumption based in the Prophets.[328]

It is not implied by Luke's use of Joel 3 that a reader necessarily brings allegory to Joel's "four" locusts and therefore to Acts, nor is it implied a reader must have a specific historical context for Joel 1 and 2. Further. while Luke makes an eschatological application of Joel 3:1-5, this does not imply that such an eschatological reading was the *original* intent of Joel's oracles at any point in their redactional history. The story of the oracles is, however, that of invasion, and the counterpoint to these oracles is the deliverance offered to the people in Jerusalem (Joel 3:5), and the revenge taken upon the nations in the oracles of Joel 4. The final form of the book of Joel carries this story.

The complaint in these first oracles is not, as might be expected, the threat to the existence of the state, but rather the consequences that the invasion has had for the cult. Thus, the devastation of the land has the consequence that the "the meal offering and the drink offering is cut off" for want of supplies (Joel 1:9-12). Accordingly, the priests are challenged to lament this state of affairs (Joel 1:13, 16). They are exhorted to repent and the prospect of a restoration of the meat and drink offering is made the leading reward for such repentance (Joel 2:14). The oracles then describe the restoration of the land in terms of "corn", "wine" and "oil" (Joel 2:19, 24), which were the very commodities utilised for the meat and drink offering (Joel 1:10).

---

326 *Joel and Obadiah*, 48.
327 *Joel and Obadiah*, 48.
328 Childs, "Enemy from the North", 190-193, discusses the pre-exilic evidence for this motif.

Joel places the bestowal of the Spirit μετὰ ταῦτα/אחרי כן (Joel 3:1) which, for Luke's readers, given the placement of the pericope *in the book*, makes the bestowal subsequent to *some* happening previously recorded by Joel. Whereas it is open to a critical scholar to identify Joel 3:1-5 as a separate oracle with no particular connection to previous oracles,[329] it would be anachronistic to offer historico-critical reasons for such a reading on the part of Luke. The exegetical task therefore is to identify clues in the text that interpret μετὰ ταῦτα/אחרי כן.[330]

A sequential reading would place the bestowal of the spirit after the restoration of the land. Thus, it can be argued that the pattern of first-person announcements of Joel 2:19-27 (vv. 19, 20, 25) is interrupted with the occurrence of והיה/καὶ ἔσται in Joel 3:1. This device has the effect of introducing a pause in reading, which separates off the quick-fire sequence of actions that follow the הנה/ἰδού of Joel 2:19: Yahweh invites the people to "look"[331] at what he is about to do—restore their honour, remove the invader, and restore the land; as a result, they will know that Yahweh is among them (Joel 2:27). These actions are a distinct response to the calamity that forms the catalyst for Joel 2:19-27, viz. the invader is *already* in the land. They restore the land and the bestowal of the Spirit follows these achievements.

This sequential reading cannot be adopted as the most natural pre-critical reading without an analysis of the content of Joel 3:1-5 and a consideration

---

[329] See Barton, *Joel and Obadiah*, 97, "we simply have another fragmentary prophecy of the end-time, which cannot be arranged with others into a chronological sequence".

[330] The expression אחרי כן is regularly used to construct sequences—see e.g. Gen 41:31; Exod 11:1; 1 Chron 19:1; Isa 1:26. It would be clumsy to suppose that a pre-critical reader of Joel would disregard this factor in setting a context for understanding Joel 3:1-5. For a discussion, see W. A. VanGemeren, "The Spirit of Restoration", *WTJ* (1988): 81-202 (84-86).

[331] The importance of הנה in biblical narrative has been noted by narrative critics; see A. Berlin, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (BLS 9; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983), 61-62. This is the first occurrence in Joel and shifts the perspective of the reader from what has been described as *already* upon the land to what can be expected in response.

of the possibility that the some of the oracle units in Joel are parallel responses to the invasion of the land. If Joel 3:1-5 was a parallel oracle to the unit Joel 2:19-27, this would make the bestowal of the Spirit subsequent to the invasion of the land. Our proposal is that *the event* after which (μετὰ ταῦτα/אחרי כן) the Spirit is bestowed is the invasion of the land rather than the restoration of the land.[332] A number of textual points support this conclusion:

1) Joel 3:1-5 is an oracle unit, and this is partly indicated by the repetition of והיה/καὶ ἔσται Joel 3:1, 5 which sets up an *inclusio* for the oracle. This makes the "calling on the name of the Lord" (v. 5) a co-incident event with the bestowal of the Spirit. This "calling" is part of a deliverance centred on Zion and Jerusalem, and this suggests that the bestowal of the Spirit is part of the *work of deliverance* rather than restoration.

2) The bestowal of the Spirit takes place "in those days" (בימים ההמה, Joel 3:2). This expression occurs again in Joel 4:1, where the fortunes of Jerusalem and Judah are restored. Elsewhere the motif of "the days" in which the prophet prophesied is important (Joel 1:2), including "the day of the Lord" (Joel 1:15; 2:1-2, 11; 4:14). This intertextual thread is one way in which the oracles in Joel are bound together as an integrated story of events. This texture suggests that Joel 3:1-5 should be read in parallel to other oracles in Joel as a description of the days that make up the "day of the Lord".

3) The bestowal of the Spirit is announced as a *first-person action* and as such continues a pattern of first-person announcements which begins in Joel 2:19. These include the sending of oil, wine and corn (Joel 2:19), the removal of the northerner (Joel 2:20), and the restoration of the "lost years"

---

[332] Many scholars see the placement of Joel 3:1-5 immediately after an oracle of restoration and propose that the bestowal of the Spirit is part of the work of restoration. See McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit*, 39-43; Van Gemeren, "Spirit of Restoration", 87, 126; Crenshaw, *Joel*, 163-164; and W. S. Prinsloo, *The Theology of the Book of Joel* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1985), 80.

of agricultural prosperity (Joel 2:25). The pattern continues in the oracles of Joel 4 and it contrasts with the predominance of the third-person address to the nation in the earlier oracles (Joel 1:2-2:17). This illustrates the extent to which the later oracles of Joel have been dovetailed.

4) Within Joel 3:1-5, the events relating to the sun and the moon take place "before" (לפני/πρίν) the great and terrible day of the Lord[333] (v. 4). In Joel 2:10, the earth "quakes" and the heavens "tremble" in the face of the invading army and this is the timing of the sun becoming dark. In Joel 2:11, God responds with "his" army in a great and terrible day. The day is "very" (מאד) terrible because his camp is "very" (מאד) many. The same detail is repeated in Joel 4:16: the Lord utters his voice from Zion (Joel 2:11: 4:16) and this gives the people hope in a deliverance that is centred on Zion. The darkening of the sun, moon and stars is a different figure to that of the shaking of the heavens and the earth,[334] but whatever their symbolic meaning, they are co-incident happenings with an invasion.[335] It is during this time that the bestowal of the Spirit takes place.

Rather than disconnecting Joel 3:1-5 from previous oracles, recapitulation of elements from Joel 2:10 in Joel 3:4 supports a reading of Joel 3:1-5 as an oracle of response and hope set within the framework of earlier oracles. This recapitulation suggests that Joel 3:1-5 is an oracle describing Yahweh's response to the invasion.[336]

---

[333] G. von Rad, *The Message of the Prophets*, ch. 12, supplies a typical description of "day of the Lord" material in the Prophets, and notes that alongside variations in the traditions, the theme of warfare is common.

[334] The shaking of heavens and earth is a figure for the devastating effect of invasion on the nations and city states around Judah; similarly, it is a figure for God's response with his great army on the day of deliverance (Joel 2:16); for a discussion of the motif of "shaking" see Childs, "The Enemy from the North", 187-190.

[335] *Contra* Prinsloo, *Theology*, 85.

[336] The same elements are recapitulated in Joel 4:15-16 and this makes Joel 4:9-17 descriptive of the same kind of scenario where the land is invaded and Zion stands alone as an island.

5) The motif of "wonders" (Joel 3:3, מופת/τέρας) alludes to Exodus traditions of deliverance (e.g. Exod 4:21; 7:3; 11:9, 10).[337] This motif suggests a context of deliverance for vv. 1-2 and this agrees with v. 5, and its offer of deliverance to a remnant centred in Jerusalem.

If we locate the significance of "blood", "fire" and "pillars of smoke" in exodus deliverance traditions, these details do not pick up on the theophanic details of Sinai;[338] the motif of "wonders" is used when Israel are still *in Egypt* (cf. Deut 34:10-12).[339]

Intertextual connections between Joel and the oracle in Isa 4:1-6 support this exodus deliverance typology. Thus, Isaiah states that the Lord will create a cloud and smoke "by day", and create flaming fire "by night" (יומם. לילה/ἡμέρας, νυκτός—Exod 13:21; Isa 4:5; Joel 3:3). This will take place in Mount Zion (הר ציון/τοῦ ὄρους Σιων—Isa 4:5; Joel 3:5) and Jerusalem (Isa 4:3; Joel 3:5), and "upon all" (על כל/πάσῃ—Isa 4:5; Joel 3:1) there would be glory, and these will constitute a remnant (שאר—Isa 4:4, שריד—Joel 3:5).[340] Joel's point is therefore that just as the pillar of cloud protected Israel at the Red Sea by day, and the pillar of fire by night —these will now protect Jerusalem against the invading horde.

The mention of "blood" in an Exodus deliverance context could evoke recollection of the river being turned into blood, or more likely (because closer to the actual day of deliverance), the smiting of the firstborn. The

---

337 Prinsloo, *Theology*, 84.

338 It is worth noting here that Luke uses Joel as his interpretative text rather than texts that became associated with Sinai in Jewish lections. for an itemization of these see Lohse, *TDNT* 6:47 n. 19.

339 This correspondence *in plot* further militates against the proposal that Luke sees in Pentecost an anti-type to Sinai. Turner is therefore mistaken to say, "...the Pentecost theophany is full of Sinai allusions with which the reference to 'clouds of smoke' in the Joel citation will especially cohere". *Power*, 274.

340 This oracle also describes that "in that day" (ביום ההוא—Isa 4:1: Joel 4:18), the Lord will "purge" (רוח—Isa 4:4) or "cleanse" (נקה—Joel 4:21) the blood of the sacrifices through a spirit of judgment and a spirit of burning (Isa 4:4).

blood of the Passover Lamb was designed to save the Israelites in their houses. The "blood", the "cloud" and "fire" were three significant details of the exodus and could be easily applied in any oracle of deliverance in which an invading army was slain. J. L. Crenshaw observes that "these three things appear to conjure up terrifying images of warfare".[341] However, he also collapses Joel 3:3-4 together, and fails to distinguish invasion from deliverance.[342] He recognises that the "wonders" evoke the memory of Egypt, but he does not take this connection to the conclusion that the "wonders" are acts of deliverance; an invasion necessarily precedes deliverance.

6) The structure of Joel 3:1-5 is complex.[343] In addition to the *inclusio* indicated by והיה/καὶ ἔσται in vv. 1, 5, there is another *inclusio* indicated by the repetition of אשפוך את רוחי/ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου in vv. 1, 2. This in turn marks off v. 3 as a separate unit, but one connected with vv. 1-2 by the continuation of the first-person verbal form; thus v. 3 is marked off in turn from v. 4 by a change of voice to that of the prophet, in keeping with the use of this voice in the parallel passages of Joel 2:10 and 4:15. This change of voice is indicated by the reference to the Lord in the third-person which continues into v. 5.[344]

Recognising the distinction of speaker in the unit enables a reader to distinguish change of *perspective*. Thus Yahweh's declaration that he will show "wonders" in the heavens and on the earth is not the same descriptive information as that contained in the prophetic declaration that follows—about the sun and the moon. The intertextual connections suggest a change of focus in these two verses in Joel.[345] Accordingly, it is entirely plausible to

---

[341] *Joel*, 167.
[342] Barton makes the same mistake in *Joel and Obadiah*, 97-98.
[343] Prinsloo offers a syntactic discussion, *Theology*, 80-83.
[344] *Contra* Crenshaw, *Joel*, 171, who restricts the change of voice to v. 5. However, if we recognise a change of voice in v. 4, we will match the voice of Joel 2:10-11 and 4:15-16 in which action from Zion is attributed to the Lord.
[345] This approach differs from that offered by Crenshaw, *Joel*, 19, who states of Joel 3:3-4 that "the language derives from ancient theophanies: blood.

suggest that v. 4 is about the condition in the land before the great and terrible day of the Lord, and v. 3 is about the wonders that the Lord will perform along with the bestowal of the Spirit as he *delivers* the people.

7) The question arises as to what the darkening of the sun and turning of the moon into blood means in Joel. Crenshaw[346] canvases the various suggestions that have been made: the darkening of the sky is due to the great number of locusts, a literal earthquake, a cosmic shaking of the heavenly realm, or a total solar eclipse; and he accounts for the moon being turned to blood with such ideas as the raging fires of burning cities, dust rising to the sky, or sandstorms. Barton takes a similar approach, adding the ideas of a lunar eclipse to the mix.[347] F. R. Stephenson documents the characteristics of total solar eclipses and lunar eclipses and argues that Joel denotes both types of eclipse.[348] While any or all of these suggestions are possible, we want to suggest an additional line of interpretation.

In the Isaianic Apocalypse (Isa 24:23, MT), the moon is "confounded" (חפר) and the sun is "ashamed" (בוש). These terms occur in Mic 3:5-7, "then shall the seers be ashamed (בוש), and the diviners confounded (חפר)". It is possible that the Isaianic text is referring to the oracles of temples in Jerusalem (or the land) associated with the moon and the sun (cf. Isa 2:6; Jer 8:3; Mic 5:12).[349] Given Joel's concern with the temple and the cult, it is possible that Joel intends the darkening of the sun and the moon being turned to blood to refer to temples associated with the sun and the moon in Jerusalem (or the

---

fire, mushrooming smoke, obscuring the sun and giving the moon a red glow".

346 *Joel*, 15-16, 168.

347 *Joel and Obadiah*, 97-98.

348 F. R. Stephenson, "The Date of the Book of Joel", *VT* 19 (1969): 226-229.

349 See T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 15-17, 121-124, 232, and J. Black and A. Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Mesopotamia* (London: British Museum Press, 1992), 135, 184.

land),[350] from which oracles went forth supplying false hope to the people. In the face of the overwhelming onslaught of invasion, none of the oracles supporting military and political actions would be of value—they would be shown to be "dark".

In the above points, (1)-(7), we have offered a close and harmonious reading of the oracles of Joel. They alternate between threat and resolution. The threat is the invasion and the resolution is deliverance and restoration. It is important to distinguish the two different aspects of Yahweh's response to the threat: deliverance comes before the restoration. An oracle describing deliverance presupposes the presence of the occupying army; an oracle describing restoration presupposes the absence of that army and the availability of the land for the work of re-building.

If Joel 3:1-5 is about invasion and deliverance, this has an obvious implication for the *scope* of the oracle. While there is the threat of invasion, there is a need to call people to escape that prospect and take refuge in Jerusalem; the movement implied in the oracle is towards Jerusalem. There is no escape outside of Jerusalem in the land, because the land is being overrun. The urgent requirement therefore is for there to be a widespread mission in the land to call people, and in particular those "survivors" from parts of the land that are already experiencing the ravages of war. This task is to be fulfilled by a widespread bestowal of the Spirit, without regard to age, gender or social group. The individuals who receive the Spirit at this time would be given prophecies, dreams and visions that describe the times and urge the people to find salvation in Jerusalem.[351]

The terms of Joel's prophecy do not suggest a static and positional bestowal of the Spirit, as if this is a grace falling upon the cultic centre in Jerusalem

---

[350] While it is conventional to give this language general scope, Joel's target might have been as specific as the destruction of a temple devoted to the moon.

[351] As Wenk notes, *Community-Forming Power*, 253, there is a "soteriological dimension" to Joel's oracle.

for the benefit of the priesthood, the court. or the general populace. The bestowal is set against an urgent and present threat, and the need to call survivors to Jerusalem. There is therefore nothing in these terms to suppose that the bestowal is *permanent* or for the function of maintaining the quality of spiritual life in a restored nation. The bestowal appears to be part of the pattern in the oral traditions of the nation, whereby the Spirit is bestowed upon an individual when the nation needs to be delivered, except that in this instance the bestowal is widespread.

4.3.2.1 Agreements with Acts

Expectations are engendered or reinforced by an author. There is obvious material dissonance between Joel and the Pentecost account. We will discuss, first, the *typical* correspondences that exist between Luke's narrative and Joel, and then, secondly, we will consider elements that do not fit with the story in Acts.

1) Joel 3:1-5 presents a theme of deliverance, and Luke makes use of this motif. It is likely that Luke has read Joel 3:1-5 in the light of the idea of deliverance rather than restoration for several reasons:

i) Luke deploys motifs of "escape" (φεύγω) and "wrath" (ὀργή) in the preaching of John the Baptist (Luke 3:5-7); this is contextualised in relation to "Judah and Jerusalem" (Luke 21:20-21, 23). In Acts this motif is translated into an appeal, "Save yourselves from this crooked generation" (Acts 2:21, 40).

ii) Luke's use of Isa 32:15 and Joel 3:1-5 legitimizes the bestowal of the Spirit, but these texts juxtapose such bestowal alongside different material. Joel embeds the prediction of bestowal inside an oracle that offers deliverance, and Isaiah relates the bestowal of the Spirit to a turning point in a city's fortunes. The city is "joyous" (Isa 32:13) but will suffer devastation (Isa 32:14) until the Spirit is bestowed. However, although the immediate material with which Isa 32:15-18 is joined is different, within the

setting of Isaiah 28-33 the theme of invasion and deliverance is clear.[352] and this would have provided a justification for Luke to use both Joel and Isaiah as anticipations of Pentecost.

iii) Luke uses Mal 3:1-5 and 4:5 in relation to the bestowal of the Spirit, comparing its effects to the work of the Elijah-prophet *before* the great and terrible day of the Lord. The activity of Yahweh before such a day concerns *deliverance* rather than restoration. This matches his use of Joel which also places the bestowal of the Spirit prior to a great and terrible day of the Lord (Joel 3:4).

2) The bestowal of the Spirit in Joel takes place in unique "days" (Joel 1:2) and is set against an invasion (Joel 1:6; 2:20, 25), and proximate to the "day of the Lord" (Joel 2:11; 3:4). Likewise, Pentecost takes place in unique "days" (Acts 2:17—ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις), and is set against the prospect of the Jewish-Roman war of 66-73 C.E. (Luke 17:26-37;[353] 21:6-28) as a comparable invasion. These are the "days of the Son of Man" (Luke 17:26, ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), in which (echoing Joel 2:10 and 4:15). there are signs in the sun, moon and stars (Luke 21:25). In keeping with Joel, the bestowal of the Spirit occurs before the deliverance implied in the coming of the Son of Man (Luke 21:27). Hence, Bock comments, "with the pouring out of the Spirit the movement towards the eschatological Day of the Lord is declared to have begun".[354]

More specifically, Beale has argued that the cosmic signs in Joel's prophecy are "stock-in-trade Old Testament cosmic dissolution language"[355] and that

---

[352] Seitz, *Isaiah 1-39*, 203-208.

[353] Luke may have alluded to the Jewish-Roman war in the remark about "eagles" and the carcass (Luke 17:37), which Matthew locates in the Mount Olivet prophecy (Matt 24:28). See D. C. Sim, "Rome in Matthew's Eschatology" in *The Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context* (eds., J. Riches and D. C Sim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 91-106 (97).

[354] *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 161.

[355] *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 212.

texts where these motifs occur are about the end of sinful nations.[356] As such, the signs that Luke expects could well be figures for the closure of the Jewish commonwealth and in particular the destruction of the temple.

3) Joel describes the voice (קול/φωνή) of the Lord uttered from Jerusalem (Joel 4:16); the noise is an assurance of deliverance. In a similar manner, Pentecost is accompanied by a noise (φωνή) in Jerusalem (Acts 2:6). The content of the "noise" at Pentecost is prophetic praise relating God's mighty acts of deliverance. Furthermore, some liturgical aspect to the phenomenon is implied by Luke's account of the "Gentile Pentecost". Speech acts of praise at Pentecost would seem likely, and the *content* of such acts would rehearse God's mighty acts.

4) Luke records the presence of the Diaspora Jews at Pentecost. The careful listing of nations is distinctive and suggests symbolic significance. L. T. Johnson observes that notionally the "audience represent all the lands to which the Jews had been dispersed".[357] Furthermore, Peter's speech is Yahweh's appeal to those Jews scattered among the nations to return; hence, he includes an appeal to those who are "afar off"[358] (Acts 2:39). This element of the narrative has a typical correspondence to Joel's Diaspora motif of the scattering and gathering of Israel (Joel 4:6-7). Yahweh's concern for the Diaspora is carried forward by Luke into Peter's speech.

5) Joel records the appeal of Yahweh to the Priests, Levites and the people to "turn" (ἐπιστρέφω/שוב, Joel 2:12[359]) and "rend" (διαρρήγνυμι, Joel 2:13) their

---

[356] Isa 13:10-13 (Babylon); 24:1-6, 19-23, 34:4 (Edom); Ezek 32:6-8 (Egypt); Joel 2:10; 4:15-16 (Israel/Judah); and Hab 3:6-11 (nations)—*The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 213.

[357] Johnson, *Acts*, 47.

[358] Haenchen, *Acts*, 184, sees this expression as an allusion to Isa 57:19 and Gentiles. But Brawley correctly observes, using Hays' terminology, "the volume of the echo is weak and neither Isaiah nor Acts specifically includes Gentiles", *Text to Text*, 82.

[359] We have already noted the link between this verb in Acts (e.g. Acts 3:19) and Malachi. The same motif in Joel is one reason why Luke is able to bring both prophetic texts to bear on his portrayal of Pentecost.

hearts. This corresponds to Peter's call for repentance which affects the hearts of the people (Acts 2:37, 46; 4:32).[360] As we noted above in connection with Luke's use of Malachi, Acts betrays a temple-directed apologetic.

6) Joel predicts dreams, visions and prophecies; Luke details various incidents that fulfil the "visions and prophecies" aspect (Stephen's vision. Acts 7:55-56; Ananias' vision, Acts 9:10-16; Peter's vision, Acts 10:3, 11:5; Agabus' prophecy, Acts 11:28; the commission of Paul and Barnabas. Acts 13:1-2); he does not record dreams.

7) Joel predicts wonders (מופת) in the heavens and on the earth. Scholars[361] have noted that Acts has an insertion of σημεῖα at this point in the LXX citation. Rese argues that, „Durch die Einfügung von σημεῖα in v. 19 werden v. 19 and v. 22 metienander verbunden".[362] He makes this connection because of his christological objective—this link allows him to argue that Luke is using Joel in a christological way, to show that the "wonders and signs" of Jesus' ministry is the inauguration of the last days.[363] Bock's assessment of Rese's analysis is sceptical and he says that the reason for the addition is "not clear" and "the source of the change, whether Lucan or traditional, again cannot be determined".[364]

Rather than look backwards to Jesus' ministry, it is more likely that Luke provides indicators in Acts as to how a reader is to take "signs and wonders". Thus τέρας and σημεῖον are used in Acts 2:43, "many wonders and signs were done by the apostles", and elsewhere (Acts 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 14:3; 15:12). This motif is then repeated in Stephen's speech to describe the

---

[360] This typical connection is noted by Brawley, *Text to Text*, 89.
[361] For example, see Rese, *Motive*, 49-50, 52-54.
[362] *Motive*, 49, ("Through the insertion of σημεῖα in v. 19, v. 19 and v. 22 have been bound one to another"). Rese adds, „Aber schon die Einfügung von σημεῖα in v. 19 läßt etwas von der Intention des Verfassers bei der Verwendung des Zitats erkennen", ("But from the insertion of σημεῖα in v. 19 something can be recognised of the intention of the author from the use of the quotation"), 49.
[363] Rese is followed by Turner at this point, *Power*, 272.
[364] *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 163.

exodus (Acts 7:46), and in this way Luke secures a deliverance theme for his "signs and wonders" motif. Regardless of the question of sources. Luke's use of σημεῖα is an attempt on his part to fit this detail of Joel's prophecy to his story, even if some dissonance remains.

8) Luke matches the *scope* of the prophecy in Joel. The bestowal of the spirit in Joel is על כל בשר/ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα (Joel 3:1), and in its original context this is not a universal sentiment; the nations are not in focus.[365] Rather, the pronominal limit (כם/ὑμῶν, Joel 3:1) defines the quantifier, and indicates a bestowal upon those of Judah and Jerusalem. Luke picks up on this restriction in Peter's address, ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν (Acts 2:39ab): these are the "sons and daughters" of Joel. The parochial nature of the speech is reinforced by expressions such as "men of Israel" (Acts 2:22), "the house of Israel" (Acts 2:36), and "brothers" (Acts 2:29). Luke further contextualizes this bestowal to specifically include the disciples with his addition of μου (Acts 2:18) to τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας (Joel 3:2).

The point of the prophecy in Joel was a promise that Yahweh would send out a "call" throughout the land by bestowing his Spirit upon many individuals. As each responded to the call and accepted that deliverance would be provided in Jerusalem, they too would receive the Spirit and add their voice to the call of God. Luke reflects this scenario in his account when Peter repeats the motif, "as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:39), from Joel 3:5c, "whom the Lord shall call", and explicitly notes that the promise was for those who were "afar off" in the land and in the Diaspora.

The above points, (1)-(8), detail typological correspondences between Joel and Acts. Joel's oracle does not describe a restored nation in which the Spirit is functioning as its new life; nor does he describe the Spirit being given in association with the work of restoration; rather, the purpose of the bestowal is related to the urgent need for deliverance in the face of invasion.

---

[365] See Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 143.

Luke's story of the "last days" is an account of a "generation" that was now subject to the wrath of God, and from which a way of escape had been provided (Luke 3:7; 7:31; 9:41; 11:29-32, 50-51; 17:25; 21:32; Acts 2:40). In this language, Luke matches the urgency of Joel, and the programme of preaching to that "generation" continues to the end of the book.[366] Thus Luke carries forward the purpose of the bestowal in Joel to his own story: throughout Acts he narrates a missiological outreach to the Jews.[367]

4.3.2.2 Dissonance

While there are some typical correspondences, the implied reader is faced with some dissonance between Joel and Acts.

1) Luke does not deploy the "cosmic omens"[368] of the "sun-darkening" or "moon-into-blood" motifs,[369] in his Pentecost account. However, he does record a prediction of "signs" in the sun, moon and stars (Luke 21:25) associated with the coming of the Son of Man. His narrative does not record any events surrounding the Jewish-Roman war, and this could account for any application of the motifs which he initially cites from Joel (Acts 2:20). Haenchen offers an alternative reason for this dissonance by suggesting that Luke included the whole text from Joel in order to include the linking theme of "whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord" to Peter's appeal

---

366 The final response is still mixed: some Jews believe and some do not (Acts 28:24).

367 Even when Paul announces he will turn to the Gentiles (Acts 13:46; 18:6), he still continues preaching to the Jews. This is happening even at the end of Acts when he makes the same assertion (Acts 28:17-29). The perception recorded at the end of Acts is that the Christians were a *sect* within the religion of the Jews (αἵρεσις, Acts 28:22).

368 Haenchen, *Acts*, 186; Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:270.

369 Thus, following the context of Joel, the implied reader would not be expected to see the darkening of the sun or the rending of the veil at the crucifixion as a fulfilment of this aspect of Joel, since this does not carry any overtone of an invasion, *contra* a suggestion by some commentators, for example, F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 62; I. H. Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980); 74, Rese, *Motive*, 54; Brawley, *Text to Text*, 88; and Turner, *Power*, 274.

(Acts 2:21).[370] This theme is important, but Luke's approach to Jewish scripture includes a penchant for including fragments from disparate sources. This methodology does not suggest that he would include redundant material and therefore a direction to the implied reader would seem to be that s/he is to look for a fulfilment of these signs in the coming of the Son of Man.

2) Joel's summation of his oracle is that "in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance" (Joel 3:5). Israelite historical traditions record this pattern for the eighth century. Scholars[371] have noted that Luke's quotation from Joel 3:1-5 breaks after τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται; they have also noted that the fragment κύριος προσκέκληται is reconfigured in Acts 2:39, "as many as the Lord our God shall call". The absence of ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιων καὶ ἐν Ιερουσαλημ from Joel 3:5 therefore has prompted comment. Scholars have disagreed as to whether this absence is part of a universalism in Luke.[372] However, it is more likely that while Luke sees the bestowal of the Spirit beginning at Jerusalem, and the mission going forth from Jerusalem, he does not see deliverance "in" Jerusalem, because he has already recorded

---

[370] Schneider agrees, commenting, "Furthermore, it has to be acknowledged that the wonders and signs proceeding the Day of the Lord in vv. 19-20a do not have an independent informative value themselves for Luke, but the quote is continued for the sake of the last line in vv. 20b-21" („Ferner muß beachtet warden, daß die dem Tag des Herrn vorausgehenden Wunder und Zeichen VV 19.20a für Lukas keinen selbständigen Aussagewert haben, sondern das Zitat um seiner letzten Zeilen VV20b.21 willen weitergeführt wird."), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:269.

[371] For example, Carroll, *Response*, 131, Pao, *New Exodus*, 232, and Lindars, *Apologetic*, 36.

[372] Rese, *Motive*, 50-54, and Pao, *New Exodus*, 232, argue that the absence of this element indicates a universalism, but Bock correctly observes that the speech takes place in Jerusalem, and so this element in Joel is not excluded from Luke's view, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 168. Brawley makes a similar point, *Text to Text*, 85. More conventionally, Pesch, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 120, grounds universal salvation in Acts 2:39 and the offer of salvation to all that are "afar off". For a discussion of the place of Jerusalem in Luke's symbolic space, see M. C. Parsons, "The Place of Jerusalem on the Lucan Landscape: An Exercise in Symbolic Cartography" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., R. P. Thompson and T. E. Phillips: Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 155-171.

predictions of disaster for Jerusalem (Luke 21:6. 21).[373] In this case. there is an obvious discontinuity with Joel.

Luke sets up a reading background for Acts 2 in Luke 21:25-27. There he cites the combination of ἥλιος, σελήνη, and ἄστρον from Joel 2:10; 4:15 and eliminates any mention of darkening in favour of σημεῖα. This change likely reflects Luke's view of the significance of the darkening of these bodies. which is to be seen as a "sign". In this allusion to Joel, Luke also typically combines an Isaianic text. He draws several elements from Isa 5:26-30: ἀπορία (perplexity, v. 30), the motif of the "roaring of the sea" (v. 30) and the nations (ἔθνος, v. 26). The reason for such a combination can be discerned in the motifs that Joel shares with Isaiah: the darkening of the heavens (v. 30) and invasion (v. 27).

Luke positions his statement about the darkening of the heavens immediately after a statement about the sacking of Jerusalem. Given that Joel and Isaiah use this motif in the context of an invasion, Luke clearly expects a reader to rewind the tape and see in Luke 21:25-27 another oracle describing the circumstances of the war. However, at some point in the sequence of events, after Jerusalem is "trodden down",[374] Luke positions the "coming" of the Son of man, which offers the prospect of some sort of salvation. A narration of salvation *in* Jerusalem, offered by Joel, is obviously absent in Luke-Acts; instead Luke issues a warning to escape from the city (Luke 21:21).

---

[373] Luke shows that he is aware of the theme of "deliverance in Jerusalem" in the indirect speech of Hannah, καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Luke 2:38). This may have generated expectation of a restoration of Jerusalem on the part of readers, or Luke may be revising an expectation of deliverance "in" Jerusalem with his predictions of destruction; on this see M. Wolter, "Israel's Future and the Delay of the Parousia" in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel* (ed., D. P. Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 307-324 (310).

[374] With this message prominent in Luke's account, it is implied that the restoration of Israel in the land is postponed beyond this event.

These dissonant elements are unexceptional in the context of Luke's whole story because he includes many unfulfilled predictions alongside fulfilled ones, e.g. a Davidic monarchy on earth (Luke 1:33);[375] conflagration (Luke 3:9, 17; 12:49-53);[376] destruction (Luke 17:22-35); a coming of the Son of Man (Luke 9:27; 18:7-8); a day of judgment (Luke 10:12-15; 12:8-10); resurrection (Luke 11:29-32; 14:14); and a kingdom (Luke 13:22-30; 18:29-30; 22:29). The reader is faced with non-fulfillment of elements of Joel alongside these predictions.

3) There is also dissonance between Joel and Acts with regard to the *scope* of Joel. Acts extends the bestowal of the Spirit to the Gentiles, and if the quotation of Joel serves a programmatic function in Acts, this represents a dissonant element.[377] The dissonance is registered more in the unfolding story of Acts rather than with the Pentecost account, which is instead laced with a parochial orientation. Nevertheless, although the Gospel is extended to the Gentiles, Luke presents this as a struggle of conscience (Acts 10:14-15), an astonishment (Acts 10:45), and a new development (Acts 11:18).[378] This suggests that Luke does not regard the ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα (Acts 2:17) as programmatic,[379] but he does see in Joel a universal principle. The reader is to experience this discovery as they read the story.[380] This dissonance with Joel is not one of absence of fulfillment but one of *extension* of fulfillment.[381]

---

[375] Turner, *Power*, 275, 295.

[376] Fuller, *Restoration*, 205.

[377] However, it should be noted that the terms of Joel's prophecy, τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας, may include foreigners functioning as slaves in Israelite households, McQueen, *Joel and the Spirit*, 41.

[378] As Jervell states, "Something special and new happens, in that the heathens, i.e. God-fearers, receive the Spirit" („Etwas Besonderes und Neues geschieht, indem auch die Heiden, d.h. die Gottesfürchtigen, den Geist bekommen..."), *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 143.

[379] *Contra* Johnson, *Acts*, 49, and following Witherington, *Acts*, 140.

[380] Hence, Luke intends his audience to read a "universal" *overtone* into Acts 2:17, when at the end of Acts they recognise the repetition of τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ from Luke 3:6 which in turn has πᾶς + σάρξ in common with Acts 2:17.

[381] Powell, *Acts*, 68, notes that the relationship of the Gentile mission to the Jewish mission is a "matter of some controversy in Lucan studies", and he reviews the major positions, 67-72. Our argument supports the line taken

The above points, (1)-(3), show that Luke makes a typical application of Joel in his narrative, and this is shown by the number of correspondences that can be drawn by the reader. The *deliverance* context of the Joel oracle is carried forward into Luke-Acts in the *offer of deliverance* sent out from Jerusalem. This matches a similar Jubilee message of liberation that is sent out to the cities and villages of the land (Isa 61:1-2a). The dissonant elements in Joel do not forestall Luke's application and likely apply after Luke's narrative ends. He anticipates that *all* that God had spoken by the prophets would be fulfilled upon the return of Jesus (Acts 3:21).

4.4 Conclusion

Luke's use of Mal 3:1 and 4:5; Isa 2:2; 32:15; and Joel 3:1-5 in his anticipations of Pentecost brings varied contexts to the table of interpretation. In each of these texts the constituent oracles and the surrounding oracles contain detail that is unrepresented in Luke's narrative. Nevertheless, he includes typical detail from these oracles.

The framework offered by these oracles is eschatological but they each bear a different emphasis: Malachi 3 and 4 is focused on reformation and renewal; Joel 3 is about deliverance in the face of an invading army; and Isaiah 32 is concerned with restoration of good government in Jerusalem. These changes and happenings are set in the context of the "last days" which includes the prospect that Israel would disseminate the Law from Jerusalem to the nations (Isaiah 2). The composite picture has been skillfully woven by Luke through details that echo his scriptural material. The notions of restoration to be derived from Luke's co-text vary and it is an historical judgment whether their realization in the details of Luke's story amounts to an *inauguration* of the restoration of Israel. Our proposal is that the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the people prevent this historical characterization of Luke's pneumatology.

---

by scholars who argue that Luke presents the Gentile mission as a "supplement" to the Jewish mission.

CHAPTER SIX
Conclusion

1. Introduction

In this chapter we will summarize our findings and then discuss their implications for other related questions and further directions of research. Any study inevitably leaves issues unaddressed on the penumbra of a topic and roads always lead out from a topic into other areas. Our discussion will be programmatic and suggestive, raising possibilities for argument, rather than advocating specific theses.

2. Summary of Findings

Our study reviewed three areas of Lucan scholarship on the Spirit: the Jewish background of Luke's pneumatology, the bestowal of the Spirit at Jordan and Pentecost, and the eschatological framework of this bestowal.

In our consideration of the Jewish background and the information contained therein about the functions of the Spirit, we followed a comparative method. Our findings challenged the prevailing consensus in Lucan scholarship—that Luke conceived of the Spirit as the "Spirit of prophecy". We have argued instead for the view that Luke had a variegated view of the functions of "the Spirit".

In our discussion of the bestowal of the Spirit at Jordan and Pentecost we followed an intertextual and typological method that sought to balance points of contact and dissonance in Luke's use of the Jewish scriptures. We investigated Luke's use of Isaiah, Joel and Malachi in relation to the programmatic narratives of the Nazareth Synagogue Address and Pentecost. We evaluated the contribution made to Luke's eschatological understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit by these scriptural texts and their intertexts.

Each of Luke's scriptural texts makes a distinct contribution to his understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit. The eschatological nature of this bestowal is set by Luke's citation of "the last days" from Isa 2:2 with Joel 3:1-5. We argued that the prophetic bestowal of the Spirit in the early chapters of Luke and at Pentecost were part of the same fulfilment of Joel's prophecy.

We advocated that Luke's use of Isaiah 58 and 61 to legitimate the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus at Jordan was part of a "Jubilee" restoration of the nation. We suggested that recent proposals of a "new exodus" or "exilic" model were inapplicable to Isaiah 58 and 61 and therefore Luke's use of these texts. Rather, we proposed that Luke saw the Jubilee message of liberation as a metaphor for Jesus' ministry in the land. We noted, however, that there was significant dissonance between Luke's Isaianic context and his application of Isaiah 58 and 61 in his gospel. This dissonance surrounded the socio-political dimension of Israel's restoration.

We proposed that the integrated picture of restoration in Isaiah was broken apart by Luke and distributed to Jesus' ministry and his Second Advent. Accordingly, we held back from affirming that Luke saw in the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus the inauguration of the full restoration of Israel. Instead, we stressed that Luke's own story has the destruction of Jerusalem and the scattering of the Jews at its climax. We suggested therefore that Luke's notion of restoration only pertained to the deliverance of a remnant in readiness for the full restoration of Israel.

The principal texts that anticipate Pentecost are Malachi 3 and Isaiah 32. We argued that Luke's use of Malachi 3 in predicting the baptism of the Spirit brought a typology of renewal and reformation of the people to the table. We suggested that Luke saw what was an original Levitical and priestly application in Malachi to be "fulfilled" in the appointment of John the Baptist as the "messenger of the covenant" and the conversion of the priests in the early chapters of Acts.

We judged that Luke's use of Isa 32:15 probably involved pre-exilic restoration material in contrast to the post-exilic material of Isaiah 58 and 61. Nevertheless, the material was seen to be complementary in that it shared a focus upon the land and a restoration of good government through ordinary people. We showed how Luke's portrayal of the apostles was a typical fulfilment of this bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost preparing a leadership for the government of the land. However, we also noted the dissonance that exists between Luke's Isaianic context and his story in Acts. The economic aspects of the restoration in Isaiah 32 are unrepresented in Luke's narrative. Once again we saw that Luke was breaking apart integrated oracles of restoration to apply elements to events prior to Jesus' Second Advent.

Rather than take "the last days" to be a conventional idiom, we suggested that Luke prefaced his citation of Joel with a quotation of the phrase "the last days" from Isaiah 2. However, the political dimensions of Isa 2:2-5 are not used by Luke. Through his use of Isa 2:2, Luke associates the bestowal of the Spirit with a picture of a restored Israel in the land, but he does not narrate the fulfilment of this picture; he only indicates a typological fulfilment in the fact of the Gospel going out from Jerusalem.

The primary text about Pentecost for Luke is Joel, and this brings a context of invasion and deliverance to the table. Invasion and deliverance are necessarily contemporaneous in Joel's picture, especially if we take that book as a whole, but isolating the details associated with each event is important for assessing Luke's usage of Joel. Luke's use of Joel in relation to Pentecost is not predicated on the contemporaneousness of an invasion with the presence of the Spirit. However, crucially, Luke does include predictive material relating to a forthcoming war (Luke 21).

In keeping with his method of treatment for Malachi and Isaiah, Luke has selected elements of Joel's latter day scenario to prefigure the bestowal of

the Spirit at Pentecost. When and where such a bestowal was to take place in Joel's story is not stated, but given the need to call "survivors" from the land, it would be incumbent on those who received the Spirit (perhaps in Jerusalem, perhaps in towns and villages) to proclaim the word throughout the land. It is this narrative pattern that forms the basis for Luke's typological use of Joel.

As a result of our analysis of Isaiah, Joel and Malachi, we proposed that Luke's eschatological framework was about deliverance, reformation and renewal, rather than the political restoration of Israel. Whether we then apply a notion of "inauguration of restoration" in this context is a matter of historical judgment. The purpose of bestowal was for reformation and renewal in order to avert impending disaster; to preserve a remnant of Israel; and for the purpose of incorporating the gentiles into this deliverance.

3. Implications and Prospects

Scholars have discussed the theological significance of Jordan and Pentecost principally in eschatological and ecclesiological terms, and these are complex topics with their own research histories. Our concluding discussion here is concerned with the implications of our findings for some related issues in Lucan eschatology, as the priority of eschatology for understanding the bestowal of the Spirit is suggested by Luke's use of Isaiah, Joel and Malachi. The issues that we highlight concern matters of theological and historical generalization. The axis of our discussion revolves around the ideas of *commencement and closure*, insofar as the beginning of an age implies the closure of another age.

3.1 Commencement Eschatology

Luke presents the preaching of the kingdom of God by John the Baptist as a new development (Luke 16:16). Similarly, there is a literary beginning in Acts—the mission of the disciples begins with Pentecost (Acts 11:15). Accordingly, there is a "commencement" in both Luke and Acts. The notion of commencement is one pertaining to a historical scheme and one

pertaining to the establishment of an independent body of people. Thus, scholars have discerned in the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jews and Gentiles the beginning of a new age in a broader Lucan framework of salvation-history.

There are four commencement motifs to be noted: new people; new teaching; new covenant; and new age. These are not exclusive readings of the bestowal of the Spirit—scholars may emphasize some or all of these motifs in their presentation of Luke's pneumatology.

1) The first commencement motif is that of a "new people". Dunn uses this and other commencement motifs when he says that, "...for Luke Pentecost constitutes the disciples as the new covenant people of God, and is the beginning of the period of the church",[1] and offers the rubric "extension of Israel".[2] B. Witherington states of Pentecost that, "it is the beginning of the creation of God's eschatological people".[3] Turner prefers the term "Israel of fulfilment"[4] as a description of the church and this is because he develops a commencement theology that regards the church as "the locus of the fulfilment of hopes for Israel's restoration".[5] Pao asserts, "Israel's foundation story provides grounds for a claim by the early Christian community to be the true people of God in the face of competing voices".[6] Jervell states that through the Spirit „...die Gemeinde zeigt sich als das wahre Israel".[7]

2) A second "commencement" motif compares the giving of the Spirit to the giving of the Law. The gift of the Spirit is the engine that drives forward the preaching of the Word, and this is the basis upon which the body is created.

---

[1] *Baptism*, 49.
[2] *Acts*, xx.
[3] *Acts*, 132.
[4] *Power*, 311, n.121.
[5] *Power*, 308.
[6] *New Exodus*, 5; see also 78-84, 127, and Pao's interpretation of Luke 4:16-30 as illustrating the "reconstitution of the people of God" (78).
[7] "...the community shows itself as the true Israel", *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 132.

Thus O'Reilly argues that the typology of Pentecost consists in "the affinities between the giving of the Spirit at Pentecost and the giving of the Law at Sinai",[8] and that "it would appear, therefore, that the story of Pentecost in Acts 2 represents not so much the establishment of a new Covenant as the promulgation of the new Law, i.e. the outpouring of the Spirit and the word of God".[9] Jervell makes a similar observation about the giving of the Spirit and the giving of the Law and states, ...Gesetz und Geist gehören für Lukas eng zusammen, denn die Erfüllung und Beobachtung des Gesetzes geschieht eben durch den Geist".[10]

3) The third "commencement" motif is that of the New Covenant. Here the argument is that the giving of the Spirit is an analogous event to the establishment of the covenant with Israel. As such, a new body is constituted by the giving of the Spirit; a basis of association is established through an *initiation* in a shared experience of the Spirit. Dunn argues this case on the basis of allusions in the Pentecost narrative to Sinai.[11] Brawley reflects this view when he states, "at this stage [Pentecost] the issue is the reconstitution of the people of Israel in affiliation with the twelve".[12] Turner puts forward a modification and affirms that Pentecost represents *covenant renewal*: "the parallels do suggest Pentecost is viewed as part of the fulfilment and renewal of Israel's covenant".[13]

4) The fourth "commencement" motif is that of a new age. Brawley says that "the events of Pentecost mark a new era of history for Luke-Acts—not the end of time, but the time of the end, the last period of history".[14] Many

---

[8] *Word and Sign*, 52.
[9] *Word and Sign*, 21; see also W. Neil, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1973), 54.
[10] "...Law and Spirit are, for Luke, strongly connected, for the fulfilment and observance of the Law happens through the Spirit", *Die Apostelgeschichte*. 132.
[11] *Baptism*, 47-49.
[12] *Text to Text*, 82.
[13] *Power*, 289, or again, "the Spirit is in some way 'the Spirit of New (or, better, 'Renewed') Covenant life'... ", 279.
[14] *Text to Text*, 80.

scholars make a similar point. Thus, Johnson states that, "the gift of the Spirit is eschatological in that it inaugurates the new age":[15] and Witherington says that "the working of the Spirit is seen as the sign that the eschatological age has begun".[16] R. Stronstad states that "the events that occurred on the day of Pentecost are held to be the pattern for centuries to come".[17] Dunn says that, "the last days did not begin for the disciples till Pentecost. Only then did they enter the distinctively Christian dispensation".[18] He further elaborates that "the baptism in Spirit-and-fire is the tribulation through which all must pass before the kingdom can be established and before the penitent can share in the blessings of the kingdom—the purifying transition from the old aeon to the new".[19] But for Jesus, his anointing with the Spirit "is in fact the event which begins the new covenant for Jesus—it initiates the messianic age and initiates Jesus into the messianic age".[20]

3.1.1 Identifying Commencement Typology

Historical generalizations of commencement are evidently applicable to Luke's narrative. Exactly what narrative features comprise a commencement typology is a matter of judging intertextual links and then forming a description in the history of ideas.

1) An important "commencement" theme is that of a "new people". Luke evidently writes a story about a new body of people, and they display independence in attitude, belief and ritual.

---

[15] *Acts*, 50.
[16] *Acts*, 140.
[17] *Charismatic Theology*, 5.
[18] *Baptism*, 47. This idea of a person "entering" an age is counter-intuitive. It seems to belie the obvious point that an "age" is societal and historical. embracing people, events and circumstances; it is not something your "enter", but something of which you are a part.
[19] *Baptism*, 14. Here Dunn expands his notion of baptism in the holy Spirit and fire to embrace "tribulation", but he does not elaborate on how this relates to Pentecost.
[20] *Baptism*, 25.

Eschatology and ecclesiology are intricately related, and the main problem in the space shared between these two areas is the relation between the church and Israel. Does the work of the Spirit establish the church as an "integral", "parallel" or "replacement" [21] body in respect of Israel within the providence of God? C. F. Evans observes that the replacement/parallel issue is "one of the most vexed in NT study".[22] Turner has observed that "the main interpretative problem of Luke-Acts" is "the puzzle of the relationship of Christianity to Israel and her hopes".[23]

Scholarship is extensive[24] but our restricted interest is in the contribution that Pentecost makes to the question. The textual resources in the Pentecost account (or Acts for that matter) cannot bear the weight of a dispensational scheme catering for the subsequent existence of Israel and the church as two unrelated bodies over an extended period of time; this is a broader subject in Church Dogmatics. The task for NT scholars has been rather to detail the significance of the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost for the question of the identity of the church in respect of Israel.

The eschatological framework of Joel is Jewish, and the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost is partly given a Jewish missiological expression. The typical connections with which Luke embeds Joel in his narrative strongly suggest that the "new people" he sees being "brought together" are a remnant of Israel. As Weiser comments, „Mit Pfingsten beginnt die nachösterliche Sammlung Israels um die den Auferstandenen bezeugende Jüngergemeinde".[25]

---

[21] This is not the notion of a "temporary" replacement such that it is held God will once again take up the cause of Israel; such a view asserts that the church is a *parallel* body to Israel and God has shifted the centre of his work for a period of time.

[22] *Luke*, 89.

[23] *Power*, 307.

[24] For a review see Maddox, *Purpose*, ch. 2.

[25] "With Pentecost there starts Israel's post-paschal gathering around the congregation of disciples witnessing the Resurrected One". *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1:97.

The universal compass of the gift of the Spirit is signalled by Acts 2:38-39 and worked out in the later chapters of Acts. The church becomes the predicted eschatological grouping of faithful Israelites and concomitant Gentiles.[26] The national hopes of Israel remain the focus of God's purpose and Gentiles are offered salvation within that compass.

Luke maintains the separate identities of Jews and Gentiles throughout Acts, and it would appear that he is *not* concerned with integrating them and forming a new identity for a new body. As N. Dahl puts it, "Gentiles are saved as Gentiles".[27] Ethnic identity is not eliminated, and while issues of harmony between Jew and Gentile are dealt with, Luke is not arguing for an undifferentiated unity between Jew and Gentile. Luke is not therefore presenting the church as the constitution or reconstitution of a new "androgynous" body;[28] the church throughout Acts remains the remnant of Israel with converted Gentiles.

Luke's innovation upon his scriptural texts is to extend the bestowal of the Spirit to the Gentiles.[29] The parochial focus of Malachi 3 and 4, Isaiah 32 and Joel 2 does not anticipate this extension. However, Luke's Isaianic theme of the "light to the Gentiles" is a reasonable basis for such an extension if Luke is reading Isaianic oracles in a harmonic way. Hence, Luke can deploy a motif of "taking out of the Gentiles a people for his name"

---

[26] For this view see N. A. Dahl, "A People for His Name" *NTS* 4 (1957): 319-327.

[27] Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts", 151. The typology of the "mixed multitude" (Exod 12:38) would support Dahl. The outreach to the Gentiles described in Isaiah is also one of inclusion, and if Luke has a new exodus program, it would seem inconsistent for such a program for him to narrate a "move to the Gentiles" that excludes Jews, see Pao, *New Exodus*, 88-89, 98.

[28] *Contra* Pao, *New Exodus*, 78-84, 98-100, and ch. 4, who argues that Acts presents a "reconstitution" of a new body of "Jew and Gentile".

[29] Jervell's argument, *People of God*, 44, that the mission in Acts is mainly confined to Diaspora Jews and existing Jewish proselytes is unbalanced. Luke's numerical summaries include existing proselytes (Acts 13:43; 14:1; 17:4) and Gentiles generally (Acts 11:21, 24; 18:8); and his ideological declarations have a wider scope (Acts 13:46-47; 18:6; 26:23; 28:28).

(Acts 15:14, cf. 18:10), which alludes to exodus' traditions (Num 22:5; Deut 28:9; Jer 13:11; Ezek 36:28; Zech 2:11).[30]

Luke's account of the Day of Pentecost presents the spirit-led proclamation as a "calling out" of a body (Acts 2:39). The debate over whether Luke sees the church as a parallel or replacement body for Israel revolves around the topic of the "rejection of the Jews". Whether Acts *as a whole*[31] portrays a replacement ecclesiology, the detail of the Pentecost account can at most only serve to reflect a *parallel ecclesiology*, because Luke locates the nascent community "continuing daily with one accord in the temple" *as well as* breaking bread in their houses (Acts 2:46). The symbolism of this arrangement illustrates both continuity and distinctiveness within Israel and is of a piece with Luke's use of eschatological oracles to legitimate the emergence of the Christian community through the gift of the Spirit.

Some scholars have argued that Luke presents the Jews as rejecting the Gospel and being rejected as a consequence.[32] Thus, it is affirmed that Luke narrates the completion of the mission to the Jews and its partial success,[33] but he shows that the church now has a mission to the Gentiles, and that God has finished with the Jews. Other scholars have argued that Luke presents the church as still open to the Jews, and retains a place for the future fulfilment of Jewish eschatological hopes in relation to the Jewish people. The church is the "true Israel" in the sense that it represents the true faith of the Jews, but God continues to work with the Jews with the goal that they will come into the church, and in the *eschaton* participate in

---

[30] Dahl reviews the Palestinian Targumic evidence and concludes that "a people for his name" was a standard idiom for "a people for the Lord" in the MT. This is evidence that Luke's expression is similarly idiomatic; see "A People for His Name", 320-322.

[31] This is an important qualification. Acts may change its ecclesiology as its narrative time moves forward; thus, the watershed of Acts 13-14 and the citation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46-47 may signal a changing ecclesiology.

[32] Examples of scholars to present this position include E. Haenchen, "Acts as Source Material" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1968), 258-278 (266, 278), and Maddox, *Purpose*, 106-108.

[33] See Conzelmann, *Theology*, 145-148, and Jervell, *People of God*, 64, 68.

the fulfilment of their national hopes; in this sense there are two parallel bodies "under God".[34] The setting here of Jews and Gentiles in parallel corresponds to the refrain in Acts whereby the two groups are mentioned separately (Acts 9:15; 11:15-20; 14:1; 15:9, 16-18; 18:4; 19:10, 17; 26:18, 23).

If Luke considers the church to be a remnant of Israel with incorporated Gentiles, then he retains a Jewish eschatological framework. As long as God continues to call people (Jew and Gentile), the church, Israel, and "the nations" are parallel bodies in Luke's salvation-historical scheme. Such a tripartite division would reflect Isaiah insofar as its oracles include notions of Israel, a remnant, and the nations. If, however, Luke considers the church to be a replacement body for Israel, then this makes the Jewish eschatological framework redundant; their last days are truly their last.[35]

Our study has implications for this debate in Lucan scholarship over the status of the Jews.[36] However, these are not in the area of character and narrative plot. Whether Luke develops a plot in which there is "increasing Jewish hostility and opposition to the gospel"[37] and an evolving ecclesiology in which the Jews have by the end "excluded themselves from the Christian community"[38]—this issue is not addressed by the results of our study. Rather, our study implies that Luke could not have coherently held a replacement ecclesiology alongside his carefully drawn application of Jewish

---

[34] Examples of scholars presenting this view include Pao, *New Exodus*, 98-101, and Ravens, *Restoration of Israel*, 250. R. C. Tannehill, in "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story" *JBL* 104 (1985): 69-85 (83, 85), offers a good overview.

[35] If this was this case, Luke would be radically revising reasonable *Jewish* expectations engendered by Isaiah, Joel, and Malachi, in the direction of an exclusive Christian application. On this question of "revision" see Brawley's approach to the Pentecost account in *Text to Text*, ch. 6 (79).

[36] For an overview of the debate see J. B. Tyson, ed., *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1988).

[37] J. T. Sanders, "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts" in *Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed., J. B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1988), 51-75 (71). Sanders develops his thesis in greater detail in *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1987).

[38] Sanders, "The Jewish People in Luke Acts", 74.

eschatological texts. Embedding the birth of the church within a framework of oracles of deliverance and restoration requires an integral and parallel ecclesiology. One road out of our topic-area would be to investigate Luke's narrative plot for its treatment of the Jews. Further research into Luke's Isaianic material would also be profitable. Comparing Luke's idea of the church with oracles of the remnant in Isaiah, including notions such as the "seed" and the "survivors" (Isaiah 64-66), would be another way in which to move this interaction of eschatology and ecclesiology forward.

2) The bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus is the foundation upon which Jesus preaches the good news in the land; this is continued in the bestowal of the Spirit at Pentecost. If Luke has a notion of "new teaching", he sees this in the teaching of Jesus (Luke 5:36, 38), which is then continued through the disciples in Acts ("all that Jesus began to do and teach", Acts 1:1). The typology of a "new Law" emphasized by O'Reilly is suggestive but we have argued that Sinai is not the typological framework for Pentecost; the same point could be made for Jesus' Jordan experience and Nazareth commentary. Haenchen's observation is decisive, "he [Luke] says nothing of a new law and the Spirit is represented as an individual gift to each Christian".[39]

Luke's intertexts for Pentecost do include themes of reformation and renewal from Malachi 2 and 3. Luke includes these themes by focusing his narrative around the priesthood in the contrasting person of John the Baptist (Luke 3) and then the disciples' outreach in the temple and the conversion of many priests (Acts 2-4). Accordingly, while the gospel does go forth from Jerusalem, this is not presented by Luke as the typological equivalent of the law going forth in Isa 2:2-5. Luke's use of Joel 3:1-5 sets the bestowal of the Spirit in a deliverance context that is logically prior to the restored nation of Isa 2:2-5 and the consequent promulgation of a new Law.

---

[39] Haenchen, *Acts*, 174; hence, he states that "not the slightest trace of any 'new Torah' tradition is to be found in Luke's text [of Pentecost]", 172.

3) Covenant initiation and/or renewal (Dunn and Turner) are commencement ecclesiologies derived from Sinai typology and the calendrical co-incidence of Pentecost. If Pentecost does not betray a Sinai typology, then the commencement motif of covenant initiation and renewal should be primarily located elsewhere in Luke's account.

Our study has argued that Pentecost does not encode a Sinai typology and this casts doubt on any primary location of covenant initiation or renewal in the Pentecost event. Structurally, Jewish traditions indicate that covenant initiation follows deliverance (Noah/Flood, Abraham/Babel, Israel/Egypt, David/Enemies). We have argued that Luke's use of Joel brings a deliverance perspective to Pentecost: a primary function of the Spirit is to facilitate the proclamation of the coming judgment and bring out a remnant.

Accordingly, the commencement of the new covenant is better placed in another narrative episode. Dunn argues that the "new covenant" of Jer 31:31 (LXX Jer 38:31, διαθήκην καινήν) is alluded to by Luke in ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη of Luke 22:20. This covenant would be written in the hearts of the people (Jer 31:33), an effect ascribed to the Spirit in Ezek 36:27. Dunn concludes therefore that "the Spirit is the agent of the new covenant".[40] Accordingly, Dunn ascribes the significance of covenant initiation to Pentecost.

Had Luke intended a comparison or contrast with a covenant and the giving of the Spirit, he could have used Ezek 36:26-27 or Jer 31:33 in the Pentecost speech (cf. Paul in 2 Cor 3:3); the absence is telling. Luke links ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη to the death of Jesus, and he is careful to include the detail that this "Passover" (πάσχα) is to be "fulfilled" (πληρόω) in the kingdom of God, when Jesus will once again eat and drink (Luke 22:15-20). This detail reflects Jewish traditions that associate sacrifice and eating with covenant-making

---

[40] *Baptism*, 48.

(e.g. Gen 8:20; 9:9; 15:18; Exod 24:7-8), although Luke does not use the concept of "sacrifice" in connection with the death of Jesus.

If any episode in Luke-Acts has the significance of *covenant initiation* (as per Dunn), then it is likely to be the Passover meal: it has the necessary transactional offer and acceptance. The "bread and wine" of the meal and the Passover setting suggests that the Lucan Jesus is re-configuring the Jewish Passover (Luke 22:15) for the "new covenant". While such a covenant is "new", this does not exclude the category of a "renewal" of covenant arrangements (as per Turner).

Although there is a case to be made for seeing the Last Supper as the *making* of the new covenant comparable to the event of the exodus, there are echoes of covenant in Acts 2. Dunn suggests that Luke's use of ἐπαγγελία in relation to the Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33, 39) reflects his usage of the term in relation to the Abrahamic covenant (Acts 7:17; 13:23, 32). He further suggests that "the promise is to you and your children" (Acts 2:39) recalls "the terms of the Abrahamic covenant"[41] in Gen 17:7-10, "you and your descendants". On this basis, Dunn states, "the gift of the Spirit is now the means whereby men enter into the blessing of Abraham".[42]

If we accept this echo with the Abrahamic traditions, it does not amount to the *making* of a new covenant; it only shows an "entering" into the blessing of Abraham. The Abrahamic covenant was *already* made and therefore available through the Spirit.[43]

This issue requires further discussion. One issue that could be profitably pursued further would be how to specify the *criteria* for the application of any typology of covenant initiation and/or renewal to a narrative episode.

---

[41] *Baptism*, 47.
[42] *Baptism*, 47.
[43] Here Luke would share Paul's view of the common identity of the gospel and the Abrahamic covenant (Gal 3:7-9); see R. B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 166-177.

What narrative details would be necessary to constitute the *making* of a covenant, or a *renewal*, or an *entry/admission* into a covenant? Is there only an individual dimension to the covenant theology, or is there a corporate aspect comparable to Sinai?

4) Scholars have often argued that the Pentecost bestowal of the Spirit signals the beginning of a new age—"the age of the church".[44] The significance of "the church" within the compass of a "new age" can be broader than any role assigned to it in a period characterized as the "last days" of a Jewish state. Once the theological construct of a "new age" is identified in Luke's thought, it then becomes more likely[45] that Luke assigns soteriological effects to the Spirit such as the ongoing *initiation* and *maintenance* of the Christian life in that new age, in addition to any missiological purpose.

The role of the Spirit *within* the new age has not been a focus of our study. We have not investigated each of the episodes in Acts in which the Spirit is mentioned in order to defend a view of the *nature* of the gift of the Spirit. Whether and how in Acts (or Luke) the Spirit is shown to be soteriologically necessary or a *donum superadditum* has not been our argument. This has been a major part of the work that has been carried out by Dunn, Turner and Menzies. Nevertheless, our study has at least three implications for this area of Lucan studies.

First, our analysis of the Jewish background has supported Turner's broader approach,[46] although we have argued for a use of the concept of "the Spirit" rather than "the Spirit of prophecy" in analysis. The early chapters of Luke illustrate revelation and prophetic proclamation, invasive charismatic praise, and Pentecost offers a similar beginning. Luke's

---

[44] Krodel is typical, "[Pentecost] was the miracle of the church's birth and of the beginning of the age of the Spirit", "Functions", 32.
[45] This does not imply that without the construct of a "new age", Luke could not have connected the Spirit to the requirements of the Christian life.
[46] See Turner's summary in *Power*, 431-433.

temptation and Nazareth pericope associate the Spirit with power and healing. This bestowal of the Spirit in Luke 1-3 bears comparison with Pentecost as part of the same "last days" happening, and as such, it argues strongly against a subsequence view of the gift of the Spirit, given the lack of relevance the notion of subsequence has in an analysis of Luke 1-3.

Second, Luke's use of Isaianic restoration material brings a co-text in which the bringing about of "righteousness" is an important motif. Luke's use of Isaiah 58 and 61 brings this motif directly to his story (Isa 58:8: 61:3), but other intertexts of Luke's chosen material can be reasonably used to support this perspective. We cannot exclude a dimension of ethical renewal from Luke's pneumatology if we take seriously his Isaianic background.

Finally, the bestowal of the Spirit within an eschatological framework with salvific and restoration intent imparts a soteriological necessity to the bestowal.[47] This observation impacts upon the issue of whether the gift of the Spirit is a *donum superadditum*. In a real sense the gift of the Spirit is not optional or complementary to salvation but integral to the salvation being enacted in Luke's story. And, as Wenk observes, "only if it can be supported that the primary concern is the restoration of Israel does an ethical influence become a real possibility".[48]

3.2 Closure Eschatology

Alongside commencement eschatology Luke has closure eschatology. In the same way as scholars have discussed realized and futurist eschatology and identified elements in the Gospel narratives that correspond to both

---

[47] Scholars have shown that Luke has a concept of necessity in relation to the plan of God in his use of δεῖ and βουλῇ. For a discussion of δεῖ see C. K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History* (WUNT 2/175: Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 189-208; for a discussion of βουλῇ see D. P. Moessner, "The 'Script' of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's Plan (βουλῇ) for the World for the 'Release of Sins'" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 218-250.

[48] *Community-Forming Power*, 236.

perspectives, so too there are components of closure eschatology. The spectrum of eschatological typology is tri-polar: closure—realized—futurist.

The Jewish historical traditions of the "last days" suggest typologies for the bestowal of the Spirit based around missiological motifs of warning and deliverance/salvation. While the people are in the land and subject to occupation, the people now face a new scattering and dispersion (Luke 21:24). The people are challenged by the apostolic message, and those who respond positively are called out. Those who do not respond are destined to suffer the coming wrath. The remnant thus "saved" is ready for the return of the messiah and the further work of restoration.

Closure eschatology in Luke-Acts is set out principally in Luke 17 and 21. However, the scriptural texts that Luke uses to validate Jordan and Pentecost do not have a "closure" aspect. Malachi 2 and 3 anticipates reformation and renewal in the ongoing life of the nation; Isaiah 32 locates the bestowal of the Spirit as the turning point from devastation towards restoration; Isaiah 61 sets the bestowal of the Spirit in the aftermath of subjection giving effect (among other things) to a message of liberation for the cities of Judah; and Joel 3 makes the bestowal of the Spirit the driving force of proclamation to escape and find deliverance in Jerusalem.

None of these contexts give Luke an over-arching template for his story. Isaiah 61 offers a good fit for Jesus' ministry in the land, and Joel 3 offers a good fit with its association of the Spirit with different social groups. Each text offers a different framework and their combination creates some dissonance in reading. Luke is therefore adapting his material to his story. He ties his story to the scriptural material about Israel (Acts 7), and his historical schema is supplied by earlier traditions. The bestowal of the Spirit is one event of those expectations, but not the only event; there are also events such as the advent of the messiah (e.g. Gen 49:1, 10), a conflagration (e.g. Ezek 38:16; Dan 12:1), the establishment of the messianic kingdom at the conclusion of the "last days" (e.g. Isa 2:2-5; Mic 4:1-5), the

restoration of the Davidic monarchy (Amos 9:11), *and so on*.[49] Given the number of events expected in and around the *eschaton*, Luke has presented an *order* in which the bestowal of the Spirit assumes a pivotal stage.

A closure perspective upon the bestowal of the Spirit brings different associations. Thus, in the "last days" of the Northern kingdom, Amos and Hosea were active; during the 8c. Assyrian crisis, Isaiah of Jerusalem and Micah were active; Zephaniah was active during the Josianic crisis; prior to the Babylonian captivity and the "last days" of Judah, Jeremiah was active: Minor Prophets can also be dated to times of crisis. Such a pattern is also seen in the "prophetic revolution" of the Elijah-Elisha cycle, in which the existence of the religion of Yahweh in the Northern Kingdom is threatened by the religious policies of Ahab and Jezebel. Israelite traditions therefore encode a pattern in which prophets are "sent" at times of crisis during which the existence of the theocratic nation-state is threatened. This pattern exists over and above the continuing presence of prophets in the cult and at court.

Luke ties expectation of the Parousia to the condition of repentance on the part of the Jewish people. In doing this, he is following a common pattern in the Jewish prophets. In the absence of repentance, the wrath of God is visited upon the people, and only a remnant escape. It is likely that Luke presumes such a reading inference on the part of the reader, viz. that an increase in prophecy presages an impending crisis for the nation.

3.2.1 The Restoration of Israel

The recognition of closure eschatology in Luke-Acts requires a qualification to Luke's notion of "restoration". Commencement eschatologies of reformation and renewal (Malachi 2 and 3); restoration of good government (Isaiah 32); liberation (Isaiah 61) imply that a reader should see the story of Acts in respect of restoration in the nation. However, Luke's apocalyptic

---

[49] The identification of scriptural texts relevant to the "last days" and texts relevant to messianic expectations is complex. Our argument here is illustrative, noting uncontroversial texts.

closure eschatology casts a question mark over this reading and invites the reader to reconfigure Luke's source materials.

We argued that Luke's notion of restoration was land-focused and hence a Jubilee restoration. The nomination of this motif as the archetype makes Isaiah 61 the controlling oracle. Given that this oracle is set within other restoration oracles, Luke's notion of restoration is properly conceived as Isaianic.

Malachi 2 and 3 and Isaiah 32 are complementary oracles of restoration, but Joel 3 positions the bestowal of the Spirit in relation to the requirement of deliverance. It therefore offers a different typology and one that locates the bestowal before any national restoration. Isaiah 32 is consistent with this perspective as it positions the bestowal of the Spirit at the turning point in the fortunes of the nation. Isaiah 32 and Joel 3 do not link the effects of the Spirit with the reconstructive work of restoration. Nevertheless, unless Luke expected his readers to read his Jewish scriptures in a vacuum, the work of reconstruction of the nation surrounds the oracle units he cites.

As we have noted, Luke has a definite notion of "the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Acts 3:21). This offers the reader a way to handle the dissonance that exists between Luke's story and his source scriptures. What is not fulfilled in Luke's narrative may be fulfilled at the Second Advent.

There is tension between commencement and closure eschatology. It can be argued that with some restoration elements fulfilled in Luke's story, there has been an inauguration of the restoration of Israel. If this generalization is offered, then our study has argued that bestowal of the Spirit upon the prophets of Luke 1 and 2 marks the *inauguration* of this "turning" of the people rather than Jordan or Pentecost. If on the other hand, the elements of restoration that are unrepresented in Luke's story are given priority, the notion of inauguration can be reserved for the Second Advent in Luke's

scheme; we have also suggested this latter option. Further discussion of this area is necessary so that scholars might more finely discriminate exactly what is being inaugurated and what is being restored.

3.3 Questions

Unexplored questions and further work are raised in any study and only a selection can be raised by way of conclusion. The metaphor of inauguration as a theological motif requires more detailed examination. What *model* of inauguration is appropriate? Is it one revolving round the anointing of a king, or perhaps the installation of the king upon the throne? Is it one that centres on the defining of a new age through laws or socio-economic reforms? Is it one based upon the gathering of a new movement that marks a new era by its message and its vision? Or is it one focused on the reconstruction of devastated infrastructure? Any or all of these models are possible, but the *criteria* for the application of models of inauguration need to be formulated and then applied to Luke's narrative.

There are many elements of restoration in the Prophets (as well as Second Temple Judaisms) that are absent in Luke-Acts. Is the absence a reflection of an anticipated Second Advent? Or is it the case that Luke has spiritualized the restoration of Israel?[50] Insofar as our study has emphasized a distribution of fulfilment across the two advents, further research into Luke's other eschatological material is needed to determine the extent of this distribution.

There are limits to Luke's story and his theology is cast by the horizon of the Jewish and Gentile missions. The bestowal of the Spirit is part of a mission to deliver a remnant in the "last days" of a Jewish commonwealth and

---

[50] As H. J. Cadbury formulated the question, "The Book of Acts does not spiritualize away the concrete eschatological hopes of Christianity nor on the other hand does it emphasize their imminence and urgency with vivid details of apocalyptic", "Acts and Eschatology" in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (eds., W. D. Davies and D. Daube; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 300-321 (315). See also Fuller, *Restoration*, 203, for recognition of this question.

incorporate Gentiles within the church. This is the story that Luke narrates but does not complete since the messiah does not return and the fuller restoration of the nation does not occur. This establishes the problematic for considering the "age of the church". How does the notion of "Christian dispensation" receive a grounding in Luke-Acts? P. S. Minear states of Luke-Acts that, "from the first to the last chapters of the corpus, it is the 'hope of Israel' which is at stake",[51] while Turner affirms that, "Luke 1-Acts 1 is Israel's story more than our story".[52] The question for further study is how Acts 2-28 becomes "our story".

It may be anachronistic to attribute recognition of a "delay" in the Parousia to Luke; certainly, Pentecost is full of promise.[53] Instead, it is probably better to work with a weaker concept of the "non-happening" of the Parousia in Luke's story rather than a "delay".[54] A direction of research is suggested at this point by our study in that we can ask to what extent Luke's eschatology is *bound* to have expressed expectations that went *unfulfilled*. One way to pursue this line of enquiry would be to compare the unfulfilled elements of pronouncements and parables in Luke-Acts with the pattern of unfulfilled expectation expressed within the Prophets. The record appears similar to Luke-Acts in having an imminent quality and an unrealized expectation.

Following on from this issue, and finally, our study raises the question of the plot of Luke-Acts. While it may be conventional to read this in terms of

---

[51] "Birth Stories", 116.
[52] *Power*, 435.
[53] B. R. Gaventa usefully notes that the early chapters of Acts (1-3) are full of eschatological promise and lay the foundation for what follows: the paucity of eschatological material in later chapters does not reflect Luke's abandonment of imminent expectation, see "The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited" *Encounter* 43 (1982): 27-42. Carroll argues that "an apparent soft-pedalling of imminent future hope is exactly what we should expect to find in Acts", *Response*, 122.
[54] An example of how delay was handled explicitly can be seen in 1QpHab VI, 9 as well as early Christian writings (e.g. 2 Pet 3:4, 8). Acts does not have comparable "delay" pericope but Luke's gospel includes "delay" parables (e.g. Luke 12:45).

the flow of the narrative, and consider the movement of the plot as directed towards Rome, Luke offers an eschatological story framework in Luke 17 and 21. The question this raises concerns the extent to which it should control our reading of Luke-Acts. Can Rome be anything more than a sub-plot of Luke's broader perspective?

4. Conclusion

Generally speaking, scholars have seen in the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit the commencement of the Christian church and the Christian dispensation. In this study, we have sought to balance this perspective with a discussion how the bestowal relates also to the closure of the Jewish commonwealth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Texts

1.1 Classical Texts

Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (trans., D. Hicks; Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1925).

Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* (trans., E. Cary; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937).

Josephus (trans., H. St. J. Thackeray et al; 10 vols; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965).

Philo (trans., F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker; 10 vols; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962).

Plutarch, *Moralia* (trans., P. A. Clement and H. B. Hoffleit; Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969).

Polybius, *The Histories* (trans., W. R. Paton; Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1925).

Thucydides (trans., C. F. Smith; Loeb Classical Library; London: Heinemann, 1919).

1.2 Pseudepigrapha

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (ed., J. H. Charlesworth; 2 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985).

1.3 Dead Sea Scrolls

The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition (eds., Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated (ed., Florentino García Martínez, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).

The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English (ed., G. Vermes: London: Penguin, 2004).

1.4 Rabbinical Texts

Babylonian Talmud (ed., I. Epstein *et al.*; London: Soncino Press, 1948).

Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael (ed., J. Z. Lauterbach; 3 vols; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1933).

Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Analytical Translation (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Midrash Rabbah (ed., I. Epstein *et al.*; London: Soncino Press, 1951).

Midrash Tanhuma (trans. J. T. Townsend; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1989).

The Mishnah (trans., H. Danby; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964).

The Mishnah: A New Translation (trans. J. Neusner; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

Pesikta Rabbati (ed., W. G. Braude; 2 vols; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968).

Pĕsiḳta dĕ-Rab Kahána (trans. J. T. Townsend; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1975).

Pirḳê de Rabbi Eliezer (trans. G. Friedlander; London: Kegan Paul, 1916).

Pseudo-Rabad: Commentary to Sifre Deuteronomy (ed., H. W. Basser, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).

Pseudo-Rabad: Commentary to Sifre Numbers, (ed., H. W. Basser, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

Sifra: An Analytical Translation (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Sifre to Deuteronomy: An Analytical Translation (ed., J. Neusner; 2 vols; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

Song of Songs: An Analytical Translation (ed., J. Neusner; 3 vols; Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1989).

Tosefta: The Third Division, Nashim (ed., J. Neusner; New York: Ktav Publishing, 1979).

1.5 Targums

Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis (ed., M. McNamara; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992).

The Targum Onqelos to Genesis (ed., B. Grossfeld: Edinburgh: T&T Clark. 1988).

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis (ed., M. J. Maher: Edinburgh. T&T Clark, 1992).

The Targum Onqelos to Exodus (ed., B. Grossfeld; Edinburgh: T&T Clark. 1988).

The Targum Onqelos to Leviticus and the Targum Onkelos to Numbers (ed., B. Grossfeld; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988)

The Targum Onqelos to Deuteronomy (ed., B. Grossfeld: Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988).

The Fragment Targums of the Pentateuch (ed., M. L. Klein: 2 vols: Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1980).

Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets (eds., Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

The Isaiah Targum (ed., B. D. Chilton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

The Targum of Jeremiah (ed., R. D. Hayward, Edinburgh: T&T Clark. 1987).

The Targum of Ezekiel (ed., S. H. Levey; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1994).

The Targum of the Minor Prophets (eds., R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

1.6 Scriptural Texts

Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia (eds., K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; 4th ed.: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990).

Novum Testamentum Graece (ed., K. Aland *et al.*; 27th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).

Septuaginta (ed., A. Rahlfs; 2 vols; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. 1979).

2. Encyclopaedias, Grammars and Dictionaries

Abbot-Smith, G., *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (3rd ed.: Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1937).

Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

Blass, F., A. Debrunner and F. W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

Brown, F., S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1907).

Buttrick, G. A., ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (4 vols: Nashville: Abingdon, 1962).

Coggins, R. J. and J. L. Houlden, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London: SCM Press, 1990)

Freedman, D. N., *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1992).

Gelb, I. J., *et. al.*, *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* (21 vols; Chicago: University of Chicago, 1956-).

Kittel, G. and Gerhard Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; 10 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976).

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889).

Louw, J. E. and E. Nida *et al*, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1988-1989).

Metzger, Bruce, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Society, 1971).

Moule, C. F. D., *An Idiom Book of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

Moulton, J. H., W. F. Howard, and N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, (4 vols; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963-1976).

Roth, C. *et al.*, eds. *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1971).

Van der Toorn, K., R. Becking and P. W. van der Horst, eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).

3. Secondary Literature

Abelson, J., *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1912).

Alexander, L. C. A., "The Preface to Acts and the Historians" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, (ed., B. Witherington III: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 73-103.

— *The Preface to Luke's Gospel* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

— *Acts in its Ancient Literary Context* (LNTS 298; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005).

Alexander, P. S., "Jewish Aramaic Translations" in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed., M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 217-253.

— "Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament" *ZNW* 74, (1983): 237-246.

Allen L. C., *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

Allison, D. C., "Matt. 23:39 = Lk. 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy" *JSNT* 18 (1983): 75-84

— *The End of the Ages Has Come* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

Alter, R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

Anderson, B. W. and W. Harrelson, eds., *Israel's Prophetic Heritage* (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Andinach, P. B., "The Locusts in the Message of Joel" *VT* 52 (1992): 433-441.

Anscombe, G. E. M., *Intention* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

Arnold, B. T. and J. H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Arnold, B. T., "Luke's characterizing use of the Old Testament in the Book of Acts" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*, (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 300-323.

Ashton, J., ed., *The Interpretation of John* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997).

Attridge, H. W., "Jewish Historiography" in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (eds., R. A. Kraft and G. W. Nickelsburg: Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 311-346.

Aune, D. E., *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987).

— ed., *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

— "Greco-Roman Biography" *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (ed., D. E. Aune; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 107-126.

— "Luke 1.1-4: Historical or Scientific *Prooimion*?" in *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World* (eds., A. Christopherson *et al.*; JSNTSS 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 138-148.

Austin, J. L., *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Balch, D. L., "The Genre of Luke-Acts: Individual Biography, Adventure Novel or Political History?" *SwJT* 40 (1990): 5-19.

Barr, J., *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

— "The Synchronic, the Diachronic and the Historical" in *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (ed., J. C. De Moor; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 1-14.

— "Hypostatization of Linguistic Phenomena in Modern Theological Interpretation" *JJS* 7 (1962): 85-92.

Barrett, C. K., *The Holy Spirit and Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947).

— *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* (London: Epworth, 1961).

— "Luke/Acts" in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (eds., D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 231-244.

— *The Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, 1998).

Barstad, H., *A Way in the Wilderness* (*JSS* Monographs 12; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1989).

— *The Babylonian Captivity of the Book of Isaiah: 'Exilic' Judah and the Provenance of Isaiah 40-55* (Oslo: Novus Forlag, 1997).

Bartholomew, C. G., J. B. Green and A. C. Thiselton, eds., *Reading Luke* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005).

Barton, J., *Oracles of God* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986).

— *Joel and Obadiah* (Louisville: WJK Press, 2001).

— *Isaiah 1-39* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2003).

Barton-Payne, J., "Eighth Century Israelitish Background of Isaiah 40-66" *WTJ* 29 (1966): 179-190.

— "Eighth Century Israelitish Background of Isaiah 40-66: Part II" *WTJ* 30 (1968): 50-58.

— "Eighth Century Israelitish Background of Isaiah 40-66: Part III" *WTJ* 30 (1968): 185-203.

Bauckham, R., "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts" in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed., J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), 435-487.

— ed., *The Gospels for All Christians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

— "James and the Gentiles" in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 154-184.

Beal, T. K., "Ideology and Intertextuality: Surplus of Meaning and Controlling the Means of Production" in *Reading between the Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (ed., D. N. Fewell; Louisville: WJK Press, 1992), 27-30.

Beale, G. K., *The Temple and the Church's Mission* (NSBT 17; Leicester: Apollos, 2004).

Beaton, R., "Isaiah in Matthew's Gospel" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 63-78.

Beattie, D. R. G. and M. J. McNamara, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

Berlin, A., *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (BLS 9; Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983).

Bernstein, M., Florentino García Martínez and J. Kampen, eds., *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

Best, E., "The Use and Non-Use of *Pneuma* by Josephus" *NovT* 3 (1959): 218-225.

— "Spirit-Baptism" *NovT* 4 (1960): 236-43.

Beuken, W. A. M., "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55" in *The Book of Isaiah* (ed., J. Vermeylen; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 411-42.

Black, M., *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson, 1961).

— ed., *The Scrolls and Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1969).

Blenkinsopp, J., *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1996).

— *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

Boccaccini, G., ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

Bock, D. L., *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).

— "Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 280-307.

— *Luke* (ECNT 3a/3b; 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994-1996).

Booth, W., *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (2nd ed.; London: Penguin Books, 1983).

Borgen, P., *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).

Bousset, W. D. and H. Gressman, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1966).

Bovon, F., *Luke the Theologian: Thirty Three-Years of Research 1950-1983* (Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1987).

— *Studies in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 2003).

— *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. C. M. Thompson; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

Bowker, J., *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Brawley, R. L., *Centering on God: Method and Message in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1990).

— *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

Briggs, C. A., "The Use of *Ruach* in the Old Testament" *JBL* 19 (1900): 132-45.

Briggs, R. S., *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001).

Brinkman, J. A., "The Literary Background of the Catalogue of Nations" *CBQ* 25 (1963): 418-427.

Brodie, T. L., "Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24" *NTS* 32 (1986): 247-267.

— "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Sources" in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed., C. H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1984), 17-46.

— "Towards Tracing the Gospels Literary Indebtedness to the Epistles" in *Mimesis and Intertextuality* (ed., D. R. Macdonald; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2001), 104-116.

Brooke, G. J., ed., *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994).

— "Isa 40:3 and the Wilderness Community" in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (ed., G. J. Brooke; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 117-132.

— *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 2005).

Bruce, F. F., *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1952).

— *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (2nd ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1972).

— "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts" *ALUOS* 6 (1966/68): 292-309.

— "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles" *Int* 27 (1973): 166-183.

— *The Book of the Acts* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).

— "The Significance of the Speeches for Interpreting Acts" *SwJT* 40 (1990): 20-28.

Brunner, F. D., *A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and the New Testament Witness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1970).

Büchsel, Friedrich, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926).

Bultmann, Rudolph, *The Theology of the New Testament* (trans. Kendrick Grobel; 2 vols; London: SCM Press, 1952).

— *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963).

Cadbury, H. J., *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968).

— "The Greek and Jewish Traditions of Writing History" in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (eds., F. J. Foakes and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols; London: Macmillan, 1920-1933), 2:7-29.

Caird, G. B., *Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth. 1980).

Carroll, R. P., *When Prophecy Failed* (London: SCM Press, 1979).

Carroll, R. T., *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

Carson, D. A. and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Carson, D. A., P. T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (2 vols; WUNT 2/140-141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001-2004).

Chance, J. B., *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988).

Charlesworth, J. H., ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (3 vols; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006).

Chatman, S., *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978).

Childs, B. S., "The Enemy from the North and the Chaos Tradition" *JBL* 78 (1959): 187-198.

— *Isaiah and the Assyrian Crisis* (London: SCM Press, 1967).

— *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London: SCM Press. 1979).

— *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville: WJK Press, 2001).

Chilton, B. D., *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOTSup 23: Sheffield: JSOT Press. 1983).

— "Introduction" in *The Kingdom of God* (ed., B. D. Chilton: London: SPCK. 1984), 1-26.

— "Reference to the Targumim in the Exegesis of the New Testament", *The Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (Chico: Scholars Press. 1995): 77-81.

— "Introduction" in *The Isaiah Targum* (ed., B. D. Chilton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), xiii-xxxv.

— "Announcement in *Nazara*: An Analysis of Luke 4:16-21" in *Gospel Perspectives* (eds., R. T. France, D. Wenham and C. Blomberg: 6 vols; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 2:147-172.

Cho, Y., *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2005).

Churgin, P., *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927).

Christopherson, A. *et al.*, eds., *Paul, Luke and the Graeco-Roman World* (JSNTSS 217; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

Clarke, W. K. L., "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts" in *The Beginnings of Christianity* (eds., F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols; London: Macmillan, 1920-33), 2:66-105.

Clements, R. E., "Patterns in the Prophetic Canon" in *Canon and Authority* (eds., G. W. Cook and R. O. Long; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 42-55.

— *Isaiah 1-39* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).

Coggins, R. J., "Do we still need Deutero-Isaiah?" *JSOT* 80 (1998): 77-92.

Collins, J. J., *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997).

— "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds., C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74-90.

— *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997).

— and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006).

Combrink, H. J. B., "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16-30" *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973): 27-47.

Conrad, E. W., *Reading Isaiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

Conzelmann, H., *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; London: SCM Press, 1982).

— *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

Cook, E. M., "A New Perspective on the Language of Onqelos and Jonathan" in *The Aramaic Bible* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 142-156.

Cook, G. W. and R. O. Long, eds., *Canon and Authority* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977).

Crenshaw, J. L., *Joel* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

Crossan, J. D., *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (New York: Harper Collins, 1992).

Culler, J., *Structuralist Poetics* (London: RKP, 1975).

— *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981).

— *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

Cullmann, O., *Christ and Time* (trans. Floyd V. Filson; London: SCM Press, 1951).

Dahl, N. A., "The Johannine Church and History" in *The Interpretation of John* (ed., J. Ashton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 147-167.

— "A People for His Name" *NTS* 4 (1957): 319-327.

— "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1976), 139-158.

Darr, J., *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1992).

Daube, D., *The Sudden in the Scriptures* (Leiden: E J Brill, 1964).

— "On Acts 23: Sadducees and Angels" *JBL* 109 (1990): 493-497.

Davies, J., G. Harvey, and W. G. E. Watson, eds., *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed* (JSOTSup 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Davies, P. R., "God of Cyrus, God of Israel: Some Religio-Historical Reflections on Isaiah 40-55" in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed* (eds., J. Davies, G. Harvey, and W. G. E. Watson. JSOTSup 195: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 207-225.

Davies, W. D., "Paul on Flesh and Spirit" in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed., K. Stendahl; New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1992), 157-182.

— *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Mifflintown: Sigler Press, 1998).

— *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (London: SPCK, 1984).

— "Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion" in *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (ed., W. D. Davies; London: SPCK, 1984), 72-83.

Davis S. L., *Jesus the Healer* (London: SCM Press, 1995).

Day, J., *Psalms* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

De Moor, J. C., ed., *Synchronic or Diachronic? A Debate on Method in Old Testament Exegesis* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).

— and W. Van der Meer, eds., *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

Denova, R. I., *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

Dibelius, M., *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed., H. Greeven; trans., M. Ling; London: SCM Press, 1956).

— "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography" in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (ed., H. Greeven; trans., M. Ling; London: SCM Press, 1956), 138-185.

Diez, M. A., "The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the other Targums" *VTSup* 7 (1959): 222-45.

Douglas, M., *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Downing, F. G., "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (I)" *JSNT* 8 (1980): 40-65.

— "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (II)" *JSNT* 9 (1980): 29-48.

Driver, S. R., *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (9th ed.: Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1913).

Dunn, J. D. G., *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM. 1969).

— *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975).

— *Christology in the Making: An Enquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM Press, 1980).

— *The Acts of the Apostles* (Epworth Commentaries: Peterborough: Epworth, 1996).

— *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Enquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London: SCM Press, 1997).

— *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

— "John the Baptist's Use of Scripture" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 118-129.

— "Baptism in the Spirit: A Response to Pentecostal Scholarship on Luke-Acts (1993)" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 222-242.

— "Spirit and Holy Spirit in the New Testament" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 3-21.

— "Rediscovering the Spirit (1)" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 43-61.

— "Δωρεά as the Gift of the Holy Spirit" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 207-209.

— "The Birth of a Metaphor—Baptized in Spirit" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 103-117.

— "Spirit and Fire Baptism" in J. D. G. Dunn, *The Christ and the Spirit, Volume 2: Pneumatology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 93-102.

Eichrodt, W., *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J. Baker; 2 vols: London: SCM Press, 1961-67).

Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (trans. P. Ackroyd: Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965).

Elliott, M. A., *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

Ellis, E. E., *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, Oliver & Boyd, 1957).

— *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; London: Nelson, 1966).

— "How the New Testament uses the Old" in *New Testament Interpretation* (ed., I. H. Marshall; Exeter: Paternoster, 1979), 199-219.

Elman, Y., *Authority and Tradition: Toseftan Baraitot in Talmudic Babylonia* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1994).

Emmerson, G., *Isaiah 56-66* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

Esler, P. F., *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

— "Rome in Apocalyptic and Rabbinic Literature" in *The Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context* (ed., J. Riches and D. C. Sim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 9-33.

Ethridge, J. W. "Introduction" in *The Targums: Genesis and Exodus* (ed., J. W. Ethridge; London: Longman, 1862), 1-34.

Evans, C. A. and W. F. Stinespring, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

Evans, C. A. and J. A. Sanders, eds., *Luke and Scripture* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

Evans, C. A. and W. R. Stegner, eds., *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

Evans, C. A. and S. E. Porter, eds., *New Testament Backgrounds* (The Biblical Seminar 43; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997).

Evans, C. A. and P. W. Flint, eds., *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

Evans, C. A. ed., *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

— "The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 212-224.

— "The Baptism of John in a Typological Context" in *Dimensions of Baptism* (eds., S. E. Porter and A. R. Cross; JSNTSup 234; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 45-71.

— "The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24-30" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 154-170.

— "Luke 16:1-18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 121-139.

— "The Pharisee and the Publican: Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 342-355.

Evans, C. F., *Saint Luke* (London: SCM Press, 1990).

— "The Central Section of Luke's Gospel" in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed., D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 37-53.

Fee, G. D., *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994).

Fewell, D. N., ed., *Reading between the Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1992).

— "Introduction: Writing, Reading and Relating" in *Reading between the Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (ed., D. N. Fewell; Louisville: WJK Press, 1992), 11-20.

Finkel, A., "Jesus' Preaching in the Synagogue on the Sabbath (Luke 4:16-28)" in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 325-341.

Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

Fitzmyer, J. A., *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

— *Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998).

— *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (2nd ed.; AB 28; New York: Doubleday, 1983).

— "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts" in J. A. Fitzmyer, *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 295-313.

— "The Ascension of Christ and Pentecost" in J. A. Fitzmyer. *To Advance the Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 265-294.

Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T., *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

Foakes Jackson, F. J. and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1* (5 vols; London: Macmillan, 1920-33).

Forbes, C., "Early Christian Inspired Speech and Hellenistic Popular Religion" *NovT* 28 (1986): 257-268.

Forster, E. M., *Aspects of the Novel* (London: Penguin, 1962).

Fowler, A., *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982).

Fowler, R. M., "Who is 'The Reader' in Reader-Response Criticism" *Semeia* 31 (1985): 5-21.

France, R. T., D. Wenham and C. Blomberg, eds., *Gospel Perspectives* (6 vols; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).

France, R. T., "Jewish Historiography" in *Gospel Perspectives* (eds., R. T. France, D. Wenham and C. Blomberg; 6 vols; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 3:99-127.

Frein, B. C., "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfilment" *NTS* 40 (1994): 22-37.

Frey, J., "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library" in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (eds., M. Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and J. Kampen; Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 275-335.

Fröhlich, I., *Time and Times and Half a Time: Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996).

Fuller, R. H., *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1954).

Fuller, M. E., *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-Gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (BZNW 138; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003).

Gasque, W. W., *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989).

Gaventa, B. R., "The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited" *Encounter* 43 (1982): 27-42.

— *Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003).

Giblin, C. H., "Complementarity of Symbolic Event and Discourse in Acts 2:1-40" *Studia Evangelica* 6 (1973): 186-96.

Gibson, A., *Biblical Semantic Logic* (2nd ed.; Sheffield: Continuum, 2001).

Glatzer, N. N., *Essays in Jewish Thought* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1978).

— "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy" in N. N. Glatzer, *Essays in Jewish Thought* (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1978), 15-35.

Glazier-McDonald, B., *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

Goldingay, J., *The Message of Isaiah 40-55* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005).

Goppelt, L., *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. D. H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

Gordon, R. P. and K. J. Cathcart, "Introduction" in *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (eds., R. P. Gordon and K. J. Cathcart; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-25.

Goulder, M. D., *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964).

Green, J. B. and M. M. B. Turner, eds., *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994).

Green, J. B., *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

— *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

Green, W. S., ed., *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).

Griffith-Thomas, W. H., *The Holy Spirit of God* (London: Church Book Room Press, 1972).

Grimm, W., "Eschatologischer Saul wider eschatologischen David. Eine Deutung von Lc xiii 31ff" *NovT* 15 (1973): 114-133.

Grossfeld, B., "Introduction" in *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (ed., B. Grossfeld; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 1-39.

Guijarro, S., "The Politics of Exorcism" in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels* (eds., W. Stegemann, B. J. Malina and G. Theissen: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 117-133.

Gunkel, H., *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888).

— *The Influence of the Holy Spirit: the Popular View of the Apostolic Age and the Teaching of the Apostle Paul* (trans. R. A. Harrisville and P. A. Quanbeck II; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

Hacking, K. J., *Signs and Wonders: Then and Now* (Nottingham: Apollos, 2006).

Haenchen, E., *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971).

— "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1976), 258-278.

Hannah, D. D., "Isaiah within Second Temple Judaism" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 7-33.

Harman, A., *Isaiah* (Fearn: Christian Focus Publications, 2005).

Harnack, A., *Acts of the Apostles* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1909).

Harrington, D. J. and Anthony J. Saldarini, "Introduction" in *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets* (eds., Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 1-15.

Hauser, A. J. and D. F. Watson, eds., *A History of Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

Hawthorn, J., *Studying the Novel* (London: Arnold Publishing, 2001).

Hay, D., *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973).

Hayes, J. H. and S. A. Irvine, *Isaiah: The Eighth Century Prophet* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987).

Hays, R. B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

— *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

— "The Liberation of Israel in Luke-Acts: Intertextual Narration as Countercultural Practice" (Unpublished paper presented at *Die Bibel im Dialog der Schriften: Konzepte intertextueller Bibellelektüre*. Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main. November 2004).

Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2003).

Henze, M., "The Apocalypse of Weeks and the Architecture of the End of Time" in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed., G. Boccaccini: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 207-209.

Herr, M. D. "Midrash", *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (ed., C. Roth *et al*: Jerusalem: Keter Publishing, 1971), 1507-1514.

Hill, D., *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967).

— "The Spirit and the Church's Witness: Observations on Acts 1:6-8" *IBS* 6 (1984): 16-26.

Hollenbach, P. W., "Jesus, Demoniacs, and Public Authorities: A Socio-Historical Study" *JAAR* 49 (1981): 567-588.

Holtz, T., *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentkichen Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akadamie-Verlag, 1968).

Horsley, R. A., "Popular Prophetic Movements" in *New Testament Backgrounds* (eds., C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter; The Biblical Seminar 43; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 124-148.

— *Jesus and Empire* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).

Hovenden, G., *Speaking in Tongues: The New Testament Evidence in Context* (JPTSup 22; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

Hull, J. H. E., *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Lutterworth, 1967).

Hull, J. M., *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1974).

Hur, J., *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

Isaacs, M. E., *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament* (London: Heythrop, 1976).

Jacobsen, T., *The Treasures of Darkness* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).

Jellicoe, S., ed., *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1974).

— "Prolegomenon" in *Studies in the Septuagint* (ed., S. Jellicoe: New York: Ktav Publishing, 1974), xiii-liv.

Jenkins, K., *Re-thinking History* (London: Routledge, 2003).

Jervell, J., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

— *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

— *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1972).

Jobes, K. H. and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000).

Johnson, L. T., *Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991).

— *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992).

— "Literary Criticism of Luke-Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?" *JSNT* 28 (2005): 159-162.

Juel, D. J., *Luke-Acts* (London: SCM Press, 1983).

— *Messianic Exegesis* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1992).

Kadushin, Max, *A Conceptual Approach to the Mekilta* (New York: Jonathan David Publishers, 1969).

Kapelrud, A. S., "The Spirit and the Word in the Prophets" *ASTI* 11 (1977-78): 40-47.

Karris, R. J., review of W. H. Shepherd *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts JBL* 115 (1996): 744-745.

— "Poor and Rich: The Lukan Sitz im Leben" in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed., C. H. Talbert; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978), 112-125.

Kaufman, S. A., "Dating the Language of the Palestinian Targums and their Use in the Study of First Century C.E. Texts" in *The Aramaic Bible* (eds., D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara; JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 117-141.

— "On Methodology in the Study of the Targums and their Chronology" *JSNT* 23 (1985): 117-124.

Keck, L. E. and J. L. Martyn, eds., *Studies in Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968).

Keck, L. E., "The Spirit and the Dove" *NTS* 17 (1970-71): 41-67.

Keener, C. S., *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997).

Kenny, A., *The Metaphysics of Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Kermode, F., *The Genesis of Secrecy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979).

Kimball, C. A., *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

Kissane, E. J., *The Book of Isaiah* (2 vols; Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1943).

Kloppenborg, J. S., J. M. Robinson, and P. Hoffmann, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

Knibb, M. A., *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Knight, J., *Luke's Gospel* (London: RKP, 1998).

Koet, Bart J., "Isaiah in Luke-Acts" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 79-100.

Kraft, R. A. and G. W. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

Krodel, G., "The Functions of the Spirit in the Old Testament, the Synoptic Tradition, and the Book of Acts" in *The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church*. (ed., P. D. Opsahl; Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1978), 10-46.

Kuiper, G. J., *The Pseudo-Jonathan Targum and its Relationship to Targum Onqelos* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum, 1972).

Kurz, W. S., "Luke-Acts and Historiography in the Greek Bible", *SBLSP* 19 (1980): 283-300.

— *Reading Luke-Acts* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1993).

Lampe, G. W. H. and K. J. Woollcombe, eds., *Essays on Typology* (London: SCM Press, 1957).

Lampe, G. W. H., *The Seal of the Spirit* (2nd ed.: London: SPCK. 1967).

— "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke" in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed., D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 159-200.

— *God as Spirit* (London: SCM, 1976).

— "The Reasonableness of Typology" in *Essays on Typology* (eds., G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woollcombe; London: SCM Press, 1957), 9-38.

Leaney, A. R. C., *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM Press, 1966).

Le Déaut, R., "Targumic Literature and NT Interpretation" *BTB* 4 (1974): 243-289.

— *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982).

Leisegang, H., *Der Heilige Geist* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1919).

Levinsohn, S. H., "Anarthrous References to the Holy Spirit: Another Factor" *The Bible Translator* 44 (1993): 138-144.

Levison, J. R., "The Debut of the Divine Spirit in Josephus' Antiquities" *HTR* 87 (1994): 123-38.

— "Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy" *Studia Philonica Annual* 6 (1994): 83-89.

— "The Angelic Spirit in Early Judaism", *The Society of Biblical Literature 1995 Seminar Papers* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1995), 464-493.

— "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus" *JSJ* 3 (1995-96): 271-323.

— "Josephus' Interpretation of the Divine Spirit" *JJS* 47 (1996): 234-255.

— "The Prophetic Spirit as an Angel according to Philo" *HTR* 88 (1995): 189-207.

— "Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data" *NTS* 43 (1997): 35-57.

— *The Spirit in First Century Judaism* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

Litwak, K. D., *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005).

Lim, T. H., ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000).

Lindars, B., *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM Press. 1973).

Lofthouse, W. F., "The Holy Spirit in the Acts and the Fourth Gospel" *ExpTim* 52 (1940-41): 334-336.

Lohse, E., "πεντηκοστή" in *TDNT* 6:48-50.

Longenecker, R. N., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

Lössl J., "When is a Locust Just a Locust?" *JTS* 55/2 (2004): 575-599.

Lund, Øystein, *Way Metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55* (FAT 2.28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

Luomanen, P., ed., *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprechet, 1991).

Ma, Wonsuk and R. P. Menzies, eds., *The Spirit and Spirituality* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

Ma, Wonsuk, *Until the Spirit Comes* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

— "The Empowerment of the Spirit of God in Luke-Acts: An Old Testament Perspective" in *The Spirit and Spirituality* (eds., Wonsuk Ma and R. P. Menzies; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 28-40.

Maccoby, H., *Early Rabbinic Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Macdonald, D. R., ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2001).

Maddox, R., *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982).

Maher, M. J., "Introduction" to *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (ed., M. J. Maher; Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1992), 1-14.

Malina, B. J. and J. H. Neyrey, "First Century Personality: Dyadic, not Individualistic" in *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (ed., J. H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 67-96.

Mánek, J., "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke" *NovT* 2 (1958): 8-23.

Marguerat, D., *The First Christian Historian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Marmorstein, A., "The Holy Spirit in Rabbinic Legend" in *Studies in Jewish Theology* (eds., J. Rabbinowitz and M. S. Lew; London: Oxford University Press, 1950), 122-144.

Marshall, I. H., "Slippery Words: I Eschatology" *ExpTim* 89 (1977-78): 264-69.

— "The Significance of Pentecost" *SJT* 30 (1977): 347-369.

— *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978).

— ed., *New Testament Interpretation* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1979).

— *The Acts of the Apostles* (Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980).

— and D. Peterson, eds., *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998).

Mattill, A. J., *Luke and the Last Things* (Dillsboro: North Carolina Press, 1979).

McCann Jr., J. C., *Psalms* (NIB 4; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996).

McCasland, S. V., "The Way" *JBL* 78 (1958): 220-230.

MacDonald, D. R., ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001).

McKenzie, J. L., *Second Isaiah* (New York: Doubleday, 1968).

McLay, R. T., *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

McNamara, M. J., *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).

— *Targum and Testament* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1972).

— "Interpretation of Scripture in the Targumim" in *A History of Biblical Interpretation* (eds., A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 167-197.

— "Introduction" in *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (ed. M. J. McNamara: Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992), 1-45.

— "Some Targum Themes" in *Justification and Variegated Nomism* (eds., D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien and M. A. Seifrid; 2 vols; WUNT 2/140-141: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001-2004), 1:305-356.

McQueen, L. R., *Joel and the Spirit: The Cry of a Prophetic Hermeneutic* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Menzies, R. P., *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

— *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 6: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

— "John's Place in the Development of Early Christian Pneumatology" in *The Spirit and Spirituality* (eds., Wonsuk Ma and R. P. Menzies: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 41-52.

Milikowsky, C. J., *Seder Olam: A Rabbinic Chronography* (Ph.D. Diss., Yale University, 1981).

Minear, P., "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories" in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1976), 111-130.

Mittlestadt, M. W., *The Spirit and Suffering in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004).

Moessner, D. P., "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy" *JBL* 102 (1983): 575-605.

— "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus—Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts" *NovT* 28 (1986): 220-256.

— *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lucan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

— "The 'Script' of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's Plan (βουλῇ) for the World for the 'Release of Sins'" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 218-250.

— ed., *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999).

Moore, G. F., "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology" *HTR* 15 (1922): 41-85.

— *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era* (3 vols: Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927).

Morgan, R., "History of Religions School" *DBI*, 291-292.

Motyer, J. A., *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993).

Mowinckel, S., *He That Cometh* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

— *The Spirit and the Word* (ed., K. C. Hanson: Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

Moyise, S. and M. J. J. Menken, eds., *Isaiah in the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005).

Moyise S., "Isaiah in 1 Peter" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 175-188.

Mulder, M. J., ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

Müller, M., *The First Bible of the Church* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996).

Munck J., *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1967).

Neil, William, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1973).

Neirynck, F., ed., *L'Evangile de Luc—The Gospel of Luke: Revised and Enlarged Edition of L'Evangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989).

Neusner, J., *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Introduction to Judaism's First Scriptural Encyclopaedia* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

— "The Use of Rabbinic Sources for the Study of Ancient Judaism" in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* (ed., W. S. Green; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 1-17.

— "What 'The Rabbis' Thought" in *Pursuing the Text* (eds., J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 303-320.

— and B. D. Chilton, eds., *Judaism in the New Testament* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Neyrey, J. H., ed., *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991).

Newman, C. C., ed., *Jesus and the Restoration of Israel* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1999).

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and Mishnah* (2nd Edition; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

Nineham, D. E., ed., *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955).

Nolland, J. L., *Luke 1-9:20* (WBC 35A; Dallas: Word Books. 1989).

— *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas: Word Books. 1993).

— *Luke 18:35-24:53* (WBC 35C; Dallas: Word Books. 1993).

North, C. R., *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1948).

Oegema, G. S., *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 1998).

Oepke, A., "ἀποκαθίστημι" *TDNT* 1:388.

Ogden, G. S., "Joel 4 and Prophetic Responses to National Laments" *JSOT* 26 (1983): 97-106.

Öhler, Markus, "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God" *JBL* 118 (1999): 461-476.

Opsahl, P. D., ed., *The Holy Spirit in the Life of the Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1978).

Orr, M., *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 2003).

O'Reilly, L., *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1987).

Oswalt J. N., *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-39* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1986).

— *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 40-66* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998).

Ottley, R. R., *Isaiah according to the Septuagint* (2 vols; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906).

O'Toole, R. F., "The Parallels between Jesus and Moses" *BTB* 20 (1990): 22-29.

— "Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost" *JBL* 102 (1983): 245-58.

Palmoni Y., "Locust", *IDB* 3:144-8.

Pao, D. W., *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002).

Parson, M. C., "The Place of Jerusalem on the Lucan Landscape: An Exercise in Symbolic Cartography" in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds., R. P. Thompson and T. E. Phillips: Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 155-171.

— and M. M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003).

Parson, M. C., *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007).

Pate, C. M., *Communities of the Last Days* (Leicester: Apollos, 2000).

Paxson, J. L., *The Poetics of Personification* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

Perelmuter, H. G., *Siblings: Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity at Their Beginnings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989).

Perrin, N., *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1963).

Pervo, R. I., "Direct Speech in Acts and the Question of Genre" *JSNT* 28 (2006): 285-307.

Pesch, R., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (EKKNT 5; 2 vols; Zurich: Benziger, 1986).

Peterson, D. L., *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1977).

Pfleiderer, O., *Der Paulinismus* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1873).

Philip, F., *The Origins of Pauline Pneumatology* (WUNT 2/194; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

Pitt-Francis, D., "The Holy Spirit: A Statistical Inquiry" *ExpTim* 96 (1985): 136-137.

Plümacher, E., *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*, (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

Plummer, A., *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1901).

Porter, S. E. and C. A. Evans, eds., *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

— and A. R. Cross, eds., *Dimensions of Baptism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003).

Porter, S. E., *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).

— "Scripture Justifies Mission: The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts" in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed., S. E. Porter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 104-126.

Powell, M. A., *What Are They Saying about Luke?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1989).

— *What Are They Saying about Acts?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991).

— *What is Narrative Criticism?* (London: SPCK, 1993).

Prinsloo, W. S., *The Theology of the Book of Joel* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985).

Prior, M., *Jesus the Liberator: Nazareth Liberation Theology (Luke 4:16-30)* (The Biblical Seminar 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Pryke, J., "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts" *RevQ* 5 (1965): 345-60.

Rabbinowitz, J. and M. S. Lew, eds., *Studies in Jewish Theology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1950).

Rackham, R. B., *The Acts of the Apostles* (6th ed.; WC; London: Methuen, 1912).

Räisänen, H., "The Redemption of Israel" in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives* (ed., P. Luomanen; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprechet, 1991), 94-114.

Ravens, D., *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Redditt, P. L., "The Book of Joel and Peripheral Prophecy" *CBQ* 48 (1986): 225-240.

Reeves, J. C. and J. Kampen, eds., *Pursuing the Text* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

Rese, M., *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gutersloh: Gutersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969).

Reventlow, H. G., ed., *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

— "The Eschatologization of the Prophetic Books" in *Eschatology in the Bible and in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed., H. G. Reventlow; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 169-188.

Richard, E., *New Views on Luke and Acts* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990).

— "Pentecost as a Recurrent Theme in Luke-Acts" in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed., E. Richard; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 133-149.

Riches, J. and D. C. Sim, eds., *The Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005).

Robinson, A., "God, the Refiner of Silver" *CBQ* 11 (1949): 188-190.

Robinson, J. A. T., *Twelve New Testament Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1962).

— *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976).

Robinson, J. M., P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

Rofé, A., "Isaiah 59:19 and Trito-Isaiah's Vision of Redemption" in *The Book of Isaiah* (ed., J. Vermeylen; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 407-410.

Roloff J., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).

Rooker, M. F., "Dating Isaiah 40-66: What Does the Linguistic Evidence Say?" *WTJ* 58 (1996): 303-312.

Rothschild, C. K., *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History* (WUNT 2/175; Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

Rowe, K. C., "History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke-Acts" *JSNT* 28 (2005): 131-157.

— *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (BZNW 139; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006).

Rowland, C., *The Open Heaven* (London: SPCK, 1982).

Russell, D. S., *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM Press, 1964).

Ruthven, J. M., "Review of Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996)" *Pneuma* 23 (2001): 181-186.

Saldarini, A. J., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1975).

Sanders, E. P., *Judaism, Practice and Belief: 63BCE-66CE.* (London: SCM Press, 1994).

— *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM Press. 1977).

Sanders, J. A., "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4" in *Luke and Scripture* (eds. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press. 1993). 46-69.

Sanders, J. T., "The Prophetic Use of the Scriptures in Luke-Acts" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis* (eds., C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 191-198.

— "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts" in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed., J. B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg Press. 1988), 51-75.

Schäfer, P., *Die Vorstellung vom heilegen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1972).

— "Die Termini 'Heiliger Geist' und 'Geist der Prophetie' in den Targumim und das Verhältnis der Targumim zueinander" *VT* 20 (1970): 304-14.

Schmid, Konrad and Odil Hannes Steck, "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition" in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed., J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001), 41-81.

Schneider, G., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HTKNT 5; 2 vols; Freiburg: Herder, 1980).

Scholes, R. and R. Kellogg, *The Nature of Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966).

Schramm, Brooks, *The Opponents of Third Isaiah: Reconstructing the Cultic History of the Restoration* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

Schreck, C. J., "The Nazareth Pericope: Luke 4:16-30 in Recent Study" in *L'Evangile de Luc—The Gospel of Luke: Revised and Enlarged Edition of L'Evangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (ed., F. Neirynck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 399-471.

Schultz, R. L., *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1999).

Schürmann, H., *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKNT 3; 2 vols; Freiburg: Herder. 1969).

Schweizer, E., *The Holy Spirit* (trans. R. H. Fuller and I. Fuller; London: SCM Press, 1981).

— "The Spirit of Power: The Uniformity and Diversity of the Concept of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament" *Int* 6 (1952): 259-278.

— "πνεῦμα" in *TDNT* 6:396-451.

— *et al.*, *The Spirit of God* (trans. A. E. Harvey; London: A & C Black, 1960).

Scobie, C. H. H., *John the Baptist* (London: SCM Press, 1964).

— "John the Baptist" in *The Scrolls and Christianity* (ed., M. Black: London: SPCK, 1969), 58-69.

Scott, J. M., ed., *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (JSJSup 72; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001).

Seccombe, D. P., "Luke and Isaiah" *NTS* 27 (1981): 252-259.

Seitz, C., *Isaiah 1-39* (Interpretation; Louisville: WJK Press, 1993).

— *Zion's Final Destiny: the Development of the Book of Isaiah: a Reassessment of Isaiah 36-39* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

Sekki, A. E., *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

Shelton, J. B., *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991).

Shepherd, W. H., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit as a Character in Luke-Acts* (SBLDS 147; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994).

Sim, D. C., "Rome in Matthew's Eschatology" in *The Gospel of Matthew in its Roman Imperial Context* (eds., J. Riches and D. C Sim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 91-106.

Simonetti, M., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

Sklba, R. J., "Until the Spirit from on High is Poured out on Us" (Isa 32:15): Reflections on the Role of the Spirit in the Exile" *CBQ* 46 (1984): 1-17.

Smart, J. D., *History and Theology in Second Isaiah* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965).

Smith, B., "'Spirit of Holiness' as Eschatological Principle of Obedience" in *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds., J. J. Collins and C. A. Evans; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 75-99.

Smith, G. A., *The Book of Isaiah* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1927).

Smolar, L. and M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: Ktav Publishing, 1983).

Snodgrass, K. R., "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaptation in the New Testament" *JSNT* 8 (1980): 24-45.

Soards, M. L., *The Speeches in Acts* (Louisville: WJK Press, 1994).

Spencer, F. S., *Journeying through Acts: A Literary Cultural Reading* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004).

Stanton, G. N., B. W. Longenecker and S. C. Barton, eds., *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

Stauffer, E., *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1955).

Stegemann, W., B. J. Malina and G. Theissen, eds., *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

Stemberger, G., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (trans. M. Bockmuehl; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

— *Jewish Contemporaries of Jesus: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

Stendhal, K., ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1992).

Stephenson, F. R., "The Date of the Book of Joel" *VT* 19 (1969): 226-229.

Steudel, A., "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran" *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225-246.

Steyn, G. J., *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of Petrine and Pauline Speeches of Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995).

Stronstad, R., *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1984).

— *The Prophethood of All Believers* (JPTSup 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

Stroll, A., *Twentieth-Century Analytic Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

Stuckenbruck, L. T., "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls" in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed.. J. H. Charlesworth; 3 vols; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:101-130.

Swartley, W. M., *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994).

Swartz, S., "The Holy Spirit: Person and Power. The Greek Article and *Pneuma*" *The Bible Translator* 44 (1993): 124-138.

Sweeny M. A., *The Twelve Prophets* (Berit Olam; 2 vols: Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000).

Swete, H. B., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

Talbert, C. H., *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974).

— *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1982).

— *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1984).

— *Reading Acts* (New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1997).

— "The Acts of the Apostles: Monograph or 'Bios'?" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed., B. Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 58-72.

Tannehill, R. C., *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-1990).

— *The Shape of Luke's Story* (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2005).

— "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story" *JBL* 104 (1985): 69-85.

Tate, M. E., "The Book of Isaiah in Recent Study" in *Forming Prophetic Literature* (eds., J. W. Watts and P. R. House; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 22-56.

Thompson, R. P. and T. E. Phillips, eds., *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998).

Tiede, D. L., "Acts 2:1-47" *Int* 33 (1979): 62-67.

Torrey, C. C., *The Second Isaiah* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928).

Trebolle-Barrera, J., "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed., T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 89-106.

Treves, M., "The Date of Joel" *VT* 7 (1957): 149-156.

Tuckett, C. M., *Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004).

Turner, M. M. B., "The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Survey of Modern Scholarship" *TJ* 2 (1981): 131-58.

— "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective" *TynBul* 32 (1981): 3-42.

— and P. Cotterell, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1989).

Turner, M. M. B., *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts: Then and Now* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1996).

— *Power from on High: the Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

— "The 'Spirit of Prophecy' as the Power of Israel's Restoration and Witness" in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (eds., I. H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998), 327-348.

— "The Spirit and Salvation in Luke-Acts" in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins* (eds., G. N. Stanton, B. W. Longenecker and S. C. Barton; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 103-116.

— "'Trinitarian' Pneumatology in the New Testament?—Towards an Explanation of the Worship of Jesus" *The Asbury Theological Journal* 57/58 (2002/2003): 167-186.

— "Interpreting the Samaritans of Acts 8: The Waterloo of Pentecostal Soteriology and Pneumatology?" *Pneuma* 23 (2001): 265-286.

Turner N., *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965).

Tyson J. B., ed., *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1988).

— *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992).

Unger, M. F., "The Significance of Pentecost" *BSac* 122 (1965): 169-177.

Vanderkam, J. C., "The Festival of Weeks and the Story of Pentecost" in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed., C. A. Evans; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 185-205.

— *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998).

Van der Horst, P. W., "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2:1-47)" *JSNT* 25 (1985): 49-60.

Van der Meer, W., "Psalm 110: A Psalm of Rehabilitation?" in *The Structural Analysis of Biblical and Canaanite Poetry* (eds. J. C. de Moor and W. Van der Meer; JSOTSup 74; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 207-234.

Van Gemeren, W. A., "The Spirit of Restoration" *WTJ* (1988): 81-202.

Verhoef, P. A., *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

Vermeylen, J., ed., *The Book of Isaiah* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989).

Vermes, G., "Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis: Reflections on Methodology" *JJS* 33 (1982): 361-376.

Volz, P., *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließend Judentum* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1910).

Von Baer, H., *Der Heillige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926).

Von Rad, G., *From Genesis to Chronicles* (ed., K. C. Hanson; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

— *Old Testament Theology* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; 2 vols; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962-65).

— *The Message of the Prophets* (trans. D. M. G. Stalker; London: SCM Press, 1968).

Wade, G. W., *Isaiah* (London: Methuen, 1911).

Wagner, J. R., "Isaiah in Romans and Galatians" in *Isaiah in the New Testament* (eds., S. Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 117-132.

Watts J. W. and P. R. House, eds., *Forming Prophetic Literature* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

Webb, R. L., *John the Baptizer and Prophet* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

— "The Activity of John the Baptist's Expected Figure at the Threshing Floor (Matthew 3:12=Luke 3:17)" *JSNT* 43 (1991): 103-111.

Weinfeld, M., *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 2005).

Weiser, A., *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Oekumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 5; 2 vols; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1981).

Weiser, Artur, *Psalms* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1962).

Wenk, M., *Community-Forming Power: The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (JPTSup 19; London: T&T Clark, 2004).

Westermann, C., *Isaiah 40-66* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1969).

Whybray, R. N., *Reading the Psalms as a Book* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

— *The Second Isaiah* (T&T Clark Study Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2003).

Wildberger, H., *Isaiah 1-12* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).

Williamson, H. G. M., *The Book Called Isaiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Winter, B. W. and A. D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

Witherington III, B., ed., *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

— *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Wolterstorff, N., *Divine Discourse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Woods, E. J., *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 205; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

Wright, N. T., *The New Testament and the People of God* (London: SPCK, 1993).

Youngblood, R. F., *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd Ed., 1993).

York, A. D., "The Dating of the Targumic Literature" *JSJ* 5 (1974): 49-62.

Zehnle, R., *Peter's Pentecost Discourse* (SBLMS 15: Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971).

407