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The research sets out to inquire into Paul's initial thoughts on the Holy Spirit. Paul's convictions, that he was called to be an apostle to the Gentiles and that God has given the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Torah obedience, are foundational for any enquiry on the subject. The key questions are: Did Paul expect a bestowal of the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Torah obedience when he went into Gentile mission? And, how can we account for Paul's conviction that God has poured out the Spirit upon the Gentiles?

Central to our argument is Paul's conviction that God has graciously endowed the gift of the Spirit upon his Gentile converts, an understanding that is rooted primarily in his own conversion/call experience and secondarily in his experience with and as a missionary of the Hellenistic community in Antioch. By investigating the range of expectations of the Spirit that were present in Hebrew scripture and in the wider Jewish literature, the study found that such a concept is rare, and that it is usually the covenant community to which the promise of the Spirit is given. Further, Paul's own pre-Christian convictions about the Spirit, which particularly evolved from his own self-perception as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church, display a continuity between his own thought patterns and those of Second Temple Judaism.

Paul's Damascus experience was an experience of the Spirit. His experience of the 'glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Cor.3.1-4.6) provided him with the belief that there is now a new relationship with God, which is possible through the sphere of the Spirit. In addition, Paul was influenced by the Hellenists, whose theological beliefs included a perception of the church as the eschatological Temple where the Spirit of God is the manifest presence of God. It is in these notions that one may trace the origins of Paul's thoughts on the Holy Spirit.
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1.1. Introduction

This research is an attempt to understand Paul’s early thinking (as a Christian) on the Holy Spirit, with an interest in clarifying the origins of Paul’s thought by setting it in the light of his Jewish background, experience and Gentile mission.

Of the New Testament writers Paul most deserves the title ‘the theologian of the Spirit’. This is not just because the term πνεῦμα has a prominence in Paul’s writings which far exceeds its place in both Old Testament literature\(^1\) and the rest of the New Testament,\(^2\) but also because of the profound theological implication that the term has in relation to Pauline theology and mission.

The theology of the Spirit in Pauline writings has been a matter of interest in recent New Testament scholarship.\(^3\) A major concern in the previous as well as the present climate of research has been to trace the origins and development of Pauline pneumatology. Although the question of the origins of Paul’s pneumatology is a

---

\(^1\) In relative numerical terms, πνημίᾳ refers to the Spirit of God an estimated 90 times in the MT, and πνεῦμα does so 100 times in LXX.


long-standing one, there is no consensus among scholars on the issue. Previous researchers investigated the issue in terms of the similarities and distinctive features that Paul draws from the understanding of the Spirit in Jewish-Hellenistic backgrounds. Especially, the uniqueness of Paul’s pneumatology is explained by the differences that he shows in comparison to the understandings of the Holy Spirit found in primitive Christianity (Urgemeinde), in the Old Testament, and in Jewish and Hellenistic backgrounds.

Part of the difficulty in the diversity of opinion among Pauline pneumatologists is that Paul did not write his letters as theological treatises. Each is rather his response to a particular situation that arose within the different Christian communities he worked with and situations in his missionary work. Further, compared with other New Testament writers, Paul creatively relates the Spirit to so many themes that it becomes more difficult to distinguish what is central from what is peripheral to his understanding of πνεῦμα.

However, concerning the origins of Paul’s thoughts on the Holy Spirit, the main difficulty in my opinion is that interpreters have actually lost touch with much of the early conceptual framework that undergirds Paul’s discussion. A significant factor in Paul’s early conceptual and convictional framework on the Holy Spirit is his call as ‘an apostle to the Gentiles’ (Gal. 1.15, 16; Rom. 1.5, 13; 15.16-19; cf. Acts 9.15; 22.21; 26.17) and the perception that God has poured out ‘His Spirit’ upon the Gentiles apart from the Law (1 Thess. 1.4-6, 9-10; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5 cf. 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 1 Cor. 6.11). Without understanding these initial thoughts and experience of Paul it is impossible to second-guess the origins or development of Paul’s pneumatology. In other words, the lack of a thorough investigation of Paul’s early thinking as a Christian on the Spirit is not merely an inadvertent omission of previous Pauline scholarship, but rather suggests that scholars assumed that Paul’s

---

4 Since B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des neuen Testaments* [Berlin: Hertz, 1873] 216
5 Horn, *Das Angeld*
9 Horn, *Das Angeld*, is an exception.
early pneumatology had only a peripheral significance for the understanding of his overall teaching on Πνεῦμα. This assumption of a merely peripheral significance is quite clear in the following review of scholarship.

1. 2. A Review of Scholarship

The following study is a historical survey of the current state of research, particularly concentrating on the studies that are important in relation to the questions on the origins/development of Pauline teaching on the Spirit. The scholars reviewed below have dealt with issues surrounding the origins of Pauline pneumatology in a variety of ways.

1.2.1. O. Pfleiderer

The modern investigation of the origins of Pauline Pneumatology began with the liberal consensus of the nineteenth century, that expounded the concept of the Spirit in terms of Hegelian categories of spirit/mind. It was Pfleiderer who set the theological agenda for the idealist view by explaining that the divine Spirit provides a new content and motivation for human spirits so that the conflict between man and God ceases for the Christian.

Pfleiderer's interpretation of Pauline pneumatology is representative of the 19th century tendency to view the New Testament, and Paul in particular, in the context of

10 See Horn, Das Angeld, 13-24; Vos, Traditions geschichtliche Untersuchungen, 1-25.
12 The interpreters of this school came to the view that the human spirit is the God-related principle of self-consciousness within man, which could be directed by the divine spirit towards moral activity in opposition to flesh. For example F.C. Baur, (Paul: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity [trans., A. Menzies; London: William & Norgate, 1866] 2:139) who read Paul's pneumatology from a christocentric basis argued that Christ, for Paul, is the one who unites all opposites in him. In Christ, those subjective spirits that have the mind of Christ are united to the objective spirit. Pneuma, 'spirit' as opposed to 'flesh', denotes the sphere of the eternal, the absolute as opposed to the finite. Christian self-knowledge, in so far, that is, as Christians have the mind of Christ in them (1 Cor. 2:16), is 'identical' with the spirit of God itself.
13 Pfleiderer, Paulinism, 1, 2.
the history of early Christianity, especially in its doctrinal development. Accordingly, Pfleiderer studied Paul to provide an answer to his central question, "How are we to conceive the genesis of the Pauline doctrine?" and the subsequent question "whence came this doctrinal system of the apostle Paul with its derivation from that of the more ancient type?"\textsuperscript{14}

In his answer to the first question, Pfleiderer developed a Pauline pneumatology within the framework of Paul's doctrine of salvation.\textsuperscript{15} By logically thinking out the Jewish idea of atoning death, Paul was led, according to Pfleiderer, to the anti-Jewish conclusion that redemption is for all mankind, and that the law is consequently invalidated.\textsuperscript{16} Pfleiderer argues that redemption consists in the influence exercised by the Holy Spirit upon the 'fleshly creatureliness,' in consequence of which sin and death are abolished.\textsuperscript{17} The beginning of this process, according to Pfleiderer, is to be sought in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.\textsuperscript{18} Through his resurrection, Christ has entered into the sphere of pure spirit (2 Cor. 3.18) and also has become a life giving principle (1 Cor. 15.45) to those who unite themselves with Christ.\textsuperscript{19} In accordance with the belief of primitive Christianity, Paul conceived that Christians received πνεῦμα at the time of baptism.\textsuperscript{20} Further, Pfleiderer probes into the question on the effect of the Spirit upon Christians. It was described in idealistic terms as the "religious moral content"\textsuperscript{21} that provides direction to a human's spirit. Thus Paul, according to Pfleiderer, made his doctrine of πνεῦμα the principle of an entirely new ethical system.\textsuperscript{22}

In response to his second question Pfleiderer sharply distinguished Paul's concept of the Spirit from that of the pre-Pauline community. The earliest community, Pfleiderer maintains, did not understand 'the Spirit' as conveying salvation, but viewed the Spirit as nothing essentially different from the Old Testament prophetic Spirit of revelation, which manifested itself as a purely supernatural force by

\textsuperscript{14} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 215.
\textsuperscript{15} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 201.
\textsuperscript{16} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 5.
\textsuperscript{17} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 193.
\textsuperscript{18} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 17.
\textsuperscript{19} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 209.
\textsuperscript{20} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 203.
\textsuperscript{21} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 206.
\textsuperscript{22} Pfleiderer, \textit{Paulinism}, 22.
extraordinary miracles – and thus a *donum superadditum*.\(^{23}\) It was Paul who first expounded the Spirit’s work as the inner principle of new creation life.\(^{24}\)

Pfleiderer placed the above development of Pauline pneumatology within a duality, which could be described as both ‘Christianised Pharisaism’\(^{25}\) and as ‘Christianised Hellenism’.\(^{26}\) This duality in Paul’s thought resulted from the psychological process of his conversion creating, as it were, a void in his Jewish consciousness.\(^{27}\)

Given the fundamental conception of Pfleiderer’s presentation of Pauline pneumatology within the doctrine of salvation and the duality of thought pattern, we should not be surprised to learn that Pfleiderer took little notice of Paul’s early thoughts on the Spirit.

First, by placing the doctrine of Spirit within the hierarchy of early Christian doctrinal developments Pfleiderer has limited any possibility that was available for him to understand the origins of Paul’s thoughts on the Spirit.

Second, the duality on which Pfleiderer worked seems to raise certain doubts about his understanding of Paul. Pfleiderer is not sure whether Paul was influenced directly from Greek or Jewish source. Pfleiderer is doubtless to be understood in the sense that both possibilities have to be taken into account, separately and in combination. He conceives the psychological process within Paul as determined from without, which made Paul to think Judaically with one-half of his mind and Hellenistically with the other, a process that, nevertheless is supposed to be capable of being conceived within a single integral personality.

---

\(^{23}\) Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, 200.

\(^{24}\) Pfleiderer, *Paulinism*, 203ff.

\(^{25}\) According to Pfleiderer (*Primitive Christianity: Its Writings and Teaching in their Historical Connections*, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1887), Paul takes over from Pharisaism the belief in the sleep of the dead and their resurrection, coupled as it was with the belief that after judgement there will be a transformation of his world ‘freeing it from enslavement to transitoriness’ (p.299).

\(^{26}\) Pfleiderer (*Primitive Christianity*, 175) claims that the Wisdom of Solomon must be recognised as one of the main sources of Paul’s theology. Pfleiderer claims that, “We can confidently say that Paul’s theology would not have been what it is, if he had not drawn deeply on Greek wisdom as this was made available to him through the Hellenised Judaism of Alexandria.” Pfleiderer several times advances the suggestion that Apollos, the Alexandrian may have introduced the Apostle to the Alexandrian Platonism (p.170).

\(^{27}\) According to Pfleiderer, (*Paulinism*, 21) the thought forms, which he has hitherto used, prove incapable of dealing satisfactorily with the implications of his new faith. So the Apostle is driven to have recourse to another system of ideas. He no longer remains indifferent to the ideas that stream in upon him from Jewish Hellenism and Greek thought. In this way there arises a remarkable duality in his thought. Pharisaic and Hellenistic trains of idea form two streams “which in Paulinism meet in one bed without really coalescing.”
Third, such an approach of duality has the greatest weakness of ignoring the context to which he wrote the epistles. The issues that resulted from his Gentile mission, particularly the issue of Gentile admission, become irrelevant for Pfleiderer.

Pfleiderer’s presuppositions as well as the idealist consensus that had dominated New Testament studies since Baur, were strongly challenged by the study of Gunkel, who from a phenomenological perspective discovered that the Spirit in the early church was understood as a divine wonder working power, which expresses itself in ecstatic experiences.

1.2.2. H. Gunkel

H. Gunkel’s first scholarly work, *The Influence of the Holy Spirit*, laid the groundwork for a new approach to Paul. Gunkel made a radical attempt to explain Paul’s understanding of the Spirit by discerning the ways in which he adopted the popular view of his day. Gunkel asserted that Paul shares “the popular view of the New Testament age,” according to which men thought of themselves “in the ‘Spirit’… the supernatural power of God which works in man and through man.” 28 Unlike Pfleiderer, Gunkel’s task was not to produce a New Testament doctrine of the Spirit but rather to describe the specific experience of the pneumatic, i.e., “to ascertain the symptoms by which an ‘effect’ of the Spirit is recognised”. 29

Consequently, in tracing the pre-Pauline pneumatology Gunkel asks, “what according to the popular view were the marks of individual activities of the Spirit?” Gunkel’s answer was glossolalia. 30 Along with glossolalia the primitive Christians traced certain types of experience to the Spirit, namely, wisdom (Acts 6.3; 1 Cor. 12.8), prophecy (Acts 11.28; Rom. 11.25-26), and faith (Mk. 13.11; Matt. 10.19; Lk. 12.11,12). 31 A second popular view was that it was through the mediation of the exalted Lord that Christians receive the Spirit from God (Acts 10.38; 2.33; Titus 3.6; Jn. 20.22; Rev. 1.1). 32 All Christians were assumed to be filled with the Spirit, a very different view from ancient Israel as well as Judaism, which recognised possession of the Spirit only on the part of individuals and hoped for a general outpouring. 33

According to Gunkel, the eschatological framework of the early church must be read against a background of the Jewish doctrine that the Spirit had been withdrawn

---

until the eschaton.\textsuperscript{34} These manifestations were indications of the in-breaking of the Kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{35}

Gunkel placed Pauline pneumatology within these popular notions of the Spirit. He believed that Paul was aware of the ideas concerning \( \pi\nu\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha \) which were prevalent in the churches.

Gunkel contends that Paul agrees with the popular view that sees the evidences for the presence of the kingdom of God in the reception of the divine Spirit and all his activities. For Paul, just as for the primitive Christian community, the understanding of the spiritual gifts as a guarantee of the truth of the gospel has an eschatological apex.\textsuperscript{36} Paul merely asserts that the Holy Spirit now given to Christians is the content of that promise God once gave Abraham (Gal. 3.14). For Paul the present possession of the Spirit and the future possession of the kingdom are so mutually interrelated that they can be interchanged.

However, Gunkel insisted that there were significant differences in Paul’s perspective. First, for Paul the supreme sign of the gift of the Spirit was not limited to mysterious and powerful effects. It entailed the divine purpose of the gift — the edification of the Christian community.\textsuperscript{37} For this reason Paul, in contrast to the primitive church, held glossolalia in relatively low esteem (1 Cor. 12.8).\textsuperscript{38} In this regard Paul was the first to emphasise the ethical dimension of the gift of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{39} He introduces an ethical judgment and valuation of spiritual gifts, which was new to the Christian community.

Second, Paul worked out his pneumatology in contrast to the primitive Christian view, which sharply draws the limits of supernatural and natural. For Paul, however, the miraculous gifts are only a special activity of the same Spirit who is also miraculously at work in all Christians. Paul viewed the Spirit also as the source of Christian life in its totality.\textsuperscript{40} With this idea Paul is farthest removed from the soil from which he sprang, where the Spirit was merely the power that works specific miracles and guarantees even greater ones; for Paul the present possession of the Spirit, \( \tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma\kappaappa\omicron\varsigma\zeta\omega\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma\varsigma \) is everything the Christian has for time and eternity.

\textsuperscript{34} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 70.
\textsuperscript{35} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 71-72.
\textsuperscript{36} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 81.
\textsuperscript{37} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 84.
\textsuperscript{38} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 82.
\textsuperscript{39} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 87.
\textsuperscript{40} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 96.
Thus for Paul, the Christian life in its entirety was a sign of the presence of the eschatological Kingdom.\textsuperscript{41}

Gunkel attempts to identify Paul's unique presentation of the Spirit. Gunkel asserted that Paul had neither taken from the Old Testament\textsuperscript{42} nor was influenced by the literature of Hellenistic Judaism, particularly Wisdom.\textsuperscript{43} Gunkel then asks, "What is the reason for the difference?" He insists that the source of Paul's unique insight into the working of the Spirit was his own personal experience and maintains an essential originality of Paul's teaching. Paul found ready-made the concept of the πνεῦμα as a wonder-working power, but on the basis of his experience, by which the Christian himself appeared to be the greatest miracle, he described the Christian life as an activity of the πνεῦμα in a completely original way.\textsuperscript{44}

Gunkel's contribution has been remarkable. For Gunkel Pauline pneumatology emerged from the popular view that was prevalent in the Old Testament, Judaism and primitive Christianity. At the same time he separated the pneumatology of Paul from that of Judaism and the early Christians. He had unquestionably established the importance of the supernatural and experiential dimension in the early Christian pneumatology. Unlike his predecessors Gunkel looks into the influence of the Holy Spirit as conceived by the popular view of the Apostolic age and according to the doctrine of Paul, and is obliged to come to the conclusion that a Greek element in Paul's thought is not to be assumed.

In spite of his remarkable achievements, it should be observed that Gunkel took little notice of Paul's early experience of the Spirit, or of his call and ministry as an apostle among the Gentiles. Essentially, Gunkel proceeded as though Paul developed his understanding from the primitive church's experience of the Holy Spirit.

One needs to be conscious about Gunkel's overemphasis on the popular view of the primitive community. There is a lack of clarity in his usage of the term Urgemeinde. What constitutes the Urgemeinde? By considering the primitive church as monolithic entity\textsuperscript{45} Gunkel has ignored the diverse strands of understanding concerning the Spirit that were prevalent in the early church. An example would be

\textsuperscript{41} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 96.
\textsuperscript{42} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 92-99.
\textsuperscript{43} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 100-101.
\textsuperscript{44} Gunkel, \textit{Influence}, 102.
\textsuperscript{45} For example, see R.E. Brown and J.P. Meier (\textit{Antioch and Rome; New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity} [New York: Paulist Press, 1983]) who argue for diverse theological strands that were prevalent in the early church.
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on the question of the anticipation of the Spirit upon the Gentiles (Acts 10.45; 11.15, 18).

For Gunkel, the gifts of the Spirit mentioned in the Pauline letters are for the edification of the community (and not limited to the mysterious power effects). The Spirit as the source of Christian life in its totality does not depend on Old Testament or Hellenistic Jewish influence on Paul, rather on his own personal experience. However, Gunkel is not clear about what exactly is Paul’s personal experience. Is it the experience that Paul had while interacting with the churches he ministered to or is it the experience of the Spirit at the time of his conversion (2 Cor. 3.16) or his later pneumatic experiences (1 Cor. 12-14; 2 Cor. 12.1 ff.)?

Key to Gunkel’s argument is that the theological significance of the claim of the early church to have the Spirit, must be read against a background of the Jewish doctrine that the Spirit had been withdrawn until the eschaton. Recent studies have questioned such alleged absence of the Holy Spirit during the New Testament era, which may provide new insights into Paul’s own understanding of the Spirit than what Gunkel perceived.

Finally, that the gift of the Spirit was given also to Gentiles was one of the popular views that was recorded by the earliest traditions of the New Testament. This was recognised among the first Christians and acknowledged as the sure indication of God’s acceptance (Gal. 3.2-5; 4.6; 5.5; see also Rom. 8.9, 14; Acts 10.44-48; 11.15-18). Gunkel overlooks this important factor in his study of both primitive and Pauline pneumatology.

1.2.3. E. Schweizer

Eduard Schweizer’s remarkable discussion on New Testament pneumatology stands clearly in the tradition of Religionsgeschichte, which views Paul and early Christianity as significantly influenced by contemporary religious movements and myths.

Schweizer’s attempt to understand Pauline pneumatology begins with the notions of the Spirit in primitive Christianity. According to Schweizer, Matthew and Mark understood the Spirit largely in the OT terms as the power of God, a source of

---

supernatural power for the performance of miracles. Schweizer points out that Luke is unique in presenting the Holy Spirit in Old Testament and Judaisitic terms. Unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke presents Jesus not as an object of the Spirit, but as the Lord of the Spirit. Luke always portrayed the Spirit as the source of inspired speech, such as glossolalia or preaching. A further development in Luke is his emphasis on the bestowal of the Spirit. Luke however, understands that a new age has dawned; the Spirit had been given to all of God’s people.

Schweizer offers a new dimension to the discussion on Pauline pneumatology. He distinguishes sharply Paul’s pneumatology from that of the primitive church. The key to Schweizer’s argument is that he distinguishes two different strands of influence on Paul’s understanding of the Holy Spirit – the Jewish and Hellenistic strands. According to Schweizer, Paul’s pneumatology was largely the result of the Hellenistic context in which Paul found himself, while he tried to get away from this. For this reason Schweizer finds it difficult to disentangle Paul from the above two strands.

For Schweizer the primitive Christian community failed to answer the question of how the imparting of the Spirit was connected with the coming, the life, the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus. The real problem for the early church was the relationship between the message of the Spirit and that of the crucified, risen and coming Lord.

According to Schweizer, the Hellenistic community gave a radical answer to this problem. The possibility of this interpretation arose from the fact that a Hellenist could think of power only in the form of a substance. Therefore, in the Hellenistic community which understood the Spirit as a heavenly substance, Jesus was the bearer of this heavenly substance, and has brought to man the heavenly world in union with the divine substance. With the possession of the Spirit comes salvation, and possession of the heavenly world. The cross has no place in this conception; and,

---

49 Schweizer, ‘The Spirit of Power’, 260-264; idem, TDNT 6:397, 400-404; idem, Holy Spirit, 46 ff. The only difference that Schweizer sees in Matthew and Mark in relation to OT perspective were their emphasis on the presence of the Spirit in Jesus – a unique eschatological figure in whom God himself encounters his community eschatologically.
50 Schweizer, ‘Spirit of Power’, 265; idem, TDNT 6: 404.
53 Schweizer, TDNT 6: 415.
54 Schweizer, TDNT 6: 415.
55 Schweizer, TDNT 6: 415.
56 Schweizer, TDNT 6: 415.
57 Schweizer, TDNT 6: 416.
indeed, the whole incarnation can be understood merely as deception of hostile powers. 58

Paul is said to have borrowed a good part of these Gnostic concepts in preparing the grounds for his pneumatology. Both the Gnostic and Paul understood the Spirit to be the means by which one is transferred from the earthly world to the heavenly (Rom. 1.3; 2 Cor. 3.17). 59

But in contrast to the Gnostic, who viewed the Spirit as a heavenly substance inherent in every human being which could be rekindled by the redeemer, Paul maintained that the Spirit is not to be understood as something that belonged to human beings. But it is the presence of the Lord who remains ever the sovereign, and so over against human beings, and ever the Coming One whom humans cannot yet have in their own possession (1 Cor. 15.35-50). 60 Thus according to Schweizer the matter in Paul is Jewish, but his vocabulary is Hellenist. According to Schweizer Paul adopted the Hellenistic line because for the first time there was presented an opportunity to interpret πνεῦμα as the new existence, and this new existence as relationship to the Redeemer. 61 But Paul corrected all the naturalistic statements and also adopted the line controlled by Old Testament thought. Paul also distinguished himself from Gnostic thought by focusing on the historical necessity of the cross and resurrection and fusing these events together with the bestowal of the Spirit. The cross is central to Paul’s pneumatology (1 Cor. 2.6-16). 62 The cross is seen to be the already accomplished fact, which divides the new creation from the old. 63 Thus, with the Gnostic Paul says that it is the Spirit who transfers us out of the old aeon into the new, from the earthly to the heavenly, not through some heavenly substance, but through the recognition of God’s saving act on the Cross. 64 To the early church, Paul says that this Spirit is something entirely apart from man, in no way his property nor something placed at his disposal. This is because in his very essence he points man away from himself to that which has been done for him by God at the cross of Jesus Christ. 65

60 Schweizer, *TDNT* 6: 419ff.
62 Schweizer; *TDNT* 6: 425.
64 Schweizer, ‘Spirit of Power’, 71.
Schweizer showed how Paul appropriated the Hellenistic conception that reception of the Spirit was equal to salvation itself, and how Paul clarified and corrected this popular view by connecting the Spirit to Christ and balancing it with the Old Testament view of the Spirit as eschatological gift. Schweizer shifted the focus in his treatment of Paul’s pneumatology purely from the ethical dimension to the dimension of faith. Thus, the uniqueness of Paul’s pneumatology is not to be found in the ethical dimension he added, but rather in his understanding of the Spirit as the power that generates belief.

Schweizer believes that the impetus for Paul to develop an original pneumatology came from his concern to connect to each other the disparate messages of the Spirit and of the crucified, risen and coming $\kappa\varphi\mu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ - a correction that was needed for primitive Christianity. A few weaknesses need to be noted.

First, in his attempt to make Paul correct the failure of primitive Christianity’s and Hellenistic Judaism’s mistakes, Schweizer develops a Pauline pneumatology that is built on prior Christological and soteriological conclusions which he thought were the theological assumptions of Hellenistic Judaism and Gnosticism. Such reconstruction of Pauline pneumatology limits any possibilities to discuss Paul’s own pneumatic experience or the experiences of the congregation with whom he was interacting. Thus what determines Pauline pneumatology is his interactions with primitive church, Hellenistic Judaism and Gnosticism and not his own convictions about an experience of the Spirit.

Second, in the above mentioned methodological interest Schweizer was more cautious of the general religious environment in which Paul wrote his letters and has ignored a major problem which could have been the key to Paul’s interpretation of pneumatology, i.e., the Gentile mission and admission.

According to Schweizer, Paul’s pneumatology began as a solution to the problem of bringing the event of the cross and the event of the imparting of the Spirit into connection with each another. For Schweizer, the solution to this problem was found by drawing on a gnostic understanding. By anachronistically attributing features exhibited in second-century gnostic material to the Hellenistic world and to the Pauline churches of the first century, Schweizer’s edifice of Pauline pneumatology stands debatable.

1.2.4. R.P. Menzies
1.2.4. R.P. Menzies


In his quest for the development of early Christian pneumatology, he argues that both Diaspora and Palestinian Judaism before the New Testament always thought of the Spirit as the power of revelation or of inspired speech or as esoteric wisdom.67 The gift of the Spirit was thus a *donum superadditum*, not a gift required to live in right relationship with God and attain eternal life.68

According to Menzies, Jesus and the earliest church before Luke broadened the functions traditionally ascribed to the Spirit in first-century Judaism and thus presented the Spirit as the power of his preaching and of his mighty works, while for the disciples after Jesus' resurrection, it was the Spirit of prophecy and power given to Christians by which they gave testimony to Jesus. Nowhere in the pre-Pauline tradition does anyone conceive of the Spirit in terms of soteriological necessity.69

Similarly, in accordance with the Jewish perspective, Luke consistently portrays the gift of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment which enables its recipient to fulfill a particular task within the community of salvation. According to Menzies Luke not only fails to refer to soteriological aspects of the Spirit's work, but his narrative presupposes a pneumatology which excludes this dimension. Thus according to Menzies the 'charismatic' pneumatology of the primitive church is otherwise essentially the same as the 'prophetic' pneumatology of Luke.

According to Menzies, it was Paul's interaction with the teaching in Wisdom of Solomon 9.9-18 that precipitated a change/development – from a 'prophetic' Spirit to a 'soteriological' Spirit.’ In order to prove his case, Menzies tries to establish the conceptual parallels that unite Wis. 9.9-18 with 1 Cor. 2.6-16 and Gal. 4.4-6.70 According to Menzies in 1 Cor. 2.6-16, Paul's perspective can be summarised in three categories.71 The first is anthropology (vv.6-10a; 11-12) i.e., man by nature is

---

68 Menzies, *Development*, 76.
69 Menzies, *Development*, 303ff.
70 Menzies, *Development*, 303 ff.
71 Menzies, *Development*, 304.
utterly incapable of understanding the wisdom of God. On Menzies’ understanding, this represents a sector of Judaism which has become profoundly pessimistic about the possibility of humankind understanding God’s will in Torah and so of being able to live by it. However, Wisdom of Solomon, according to Menzies, brought Paul to recognise that human beings could not understand God’s saving wisdom in Christ without the gift of the Spirit. But without such an understanding they are doomed, and so the gift of the Spirit becomes soteriologically necessary.

The second is pneumatology (vv, 7; 10b-13). The idea is that only by receiving the gift of the Spirit can man comprehend the wisdom of God. According to Menzies’ understanding, the author of Wisdom associates sapiential achievement with the revelation of the Spirit. God must give to each the Spirit who enables such an understanding if they are to be saved at all (Wis. 9.17-18). The author of Wisdom and Paul portray the Spirit as the functional equivalent of wisdom and of Christ respectively (Rom. 8.3; 1 Cor. 1.24; 30; 8.6). Thus Wisdom provided the conceptual background for the close connection between Christ and Spirit envisioned by Paul.

The third is soteriology (v.7) where the gift of the Spirit as the transmitter of God’s wisdom is redemptive. Menzies bases his argument on the term σωτηρίον, which appears in Wis. 9.18, and which may refer principally to physical preservation. He also attributes an eschatological dimension to wisdom’s redemptive power as it is given prominence, immortality (6.18), authority over nations (3.7-9), and is a promise to the righteous (3.1-9; 5.1-23). Therefore by presenting the Spirit as the functional equivalent of Wisdom, the author of Wisdom of Solomon affirms with Paul the soteriological necessity of the pneumatic gift (Wis. 9.17-18, 1 Cor. 2.7). Menzies’ treatment of the relation between Gal. 4.4-6 and Wisdom 9.9-18 however, is minimal.

---

72 Menzies, Development, 305.
74 Menzies, Development, 308.
75 Menzies, Development, 308.
76 Menzies, Development, 309.
77 Menzies, Development, 309.
78 Menzies, Development, 309.
79 Menzies, Development, 310.
80 Menzies, Development, 310.
81 Menzies, Development, 310.
82 Menzies, Development, 314.
According to Menzies a further implication of these findings is that this original
element of Paul's pneumatology did not influence wider (non-Pauline) sectors of the

Menzies concludes that Paul's unique insight into the work of the Spirit was
undoubtedly stimulated by his experience on the Damascus road. But it is the
wisdom traditions from the Hellenistic Jewish milieu which provided the conceptual
framework for his distinctive pneumatology. Reflecting upon his own experience in
the light of these traditions, Paul came to the realisation that Christ, the embodiment
of divine wisdom, is experienced in and through the Spirit. Thus Paul associated
Christ with the Spirit as no other Christian before him, and came to view the Spirit as
a soteriological agent.

A major problem with Menzies' approach is that he has used what is
'characteristic' of the Spirit to provide a 'rigid' concept of the 'Spirit of prophecy',
which allows him to exclude from the domain of the Spirit activities which were
earlier regularly attributed to the Spirit in the biblical tradition, such as works of
power and religious/ethical renewal. By claiming Paul's dependency exclusively on
the Wisdom of Solomon for his soteriological pneumatology, Menzies underestimates
the influence of the biblical Spirit traditions on Paul's thought (for example, Ezek.
11.19; 36.26, 27).

Menzies' treatment of Paul's pneumatology and his alleged dependence on
Wisdom of Solomon for a 'soteriological understanding of the Spirit' is a weakness in
his argument. Gordon Fee has pointed out quite rightly that the relation is minimal,
particularly its literal and conceptual dependency. While defending the Jewish faith
to those that are in danger of apostasy, Pseudo-Solomon encourages his audience to
seek the pneumatic-wisdom that is the revelatory presence of God in physical and
moral life. However for Paul, in 1 Corinthians 2 the Spirit brings comprehension of
God's apocalyptic wisdom revealed at the cross and is influenced by Jewish
apocalyptic strand.

According to Menzies, there is only one passage that contains pre-Pauline
tradition (Rom. 1.3-4) which is related to Paul's soteriological pneumatology.

---

83 Menzies, Development, 282-283.
84 See Turner, (Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts, 111) who rightly argues that Menzies' antithesis
between the Spirit of Prophecy and the 'soteriological Spirit' is a false one.
85 Fee, Empowering Presence, 912. Fee argues that the linguistic ties of 1 Cor. 2.6.16 are not so much
with the Jewish speculative wisdom as with Jewish apocalyptic.
86 Fee, Empowering Presence, 913.
However, he discounts it as the redaction of Paul and not to be linked with the primitive church tradition. Recently, Horn highlighted the importance of pneumatological affirmations such as "God has given us the Spirit" (Rom. 5.5; 11.8; 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; 1 Thess. 4.8), "You have received the Spirit" (Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.12; 2 Cor. 11.4; Gal. 3.2, 14) and "the Spirit of God dwells in you" (1 Cor. 3.16; 6.19; Rom. 8.9, 11) probably coming from the pre-Pauline and non-Pauline tradition. Horn’s proposal undermines Menzies’ basic thesis at two levels: (i) The dynamics of the Spirit understanding of the nascent Christianity is more diverse than Menzies thought (ii) and soteriological pneumatology probably even antedate Paul.  

Finally, Menzies restricts the anthropological and pneumatological perspectives of pre-Christian Judaism to Wisdom of Solomon. He argues that Paul’s conviction (1 Cor. 2.6-16) about humanity’s inability to comprehend the wisdom of God, the role of the gift of the Spirit in the comprehension of the wisdom of God and its redemptive significance is only seen in Wisdom of Solomon and is rarely found in pre-Christian Judaism. The problem here is that Menzies does not consider passages like Jub. 1.22-23 in his discussion. According to the author of Jubilees, Israel received the covenant but had failed to obey its stipulations (Jub. 23.16, 19; 15.33-34). As a result great difficulties beset the apostate nation. For the author anticipated that God will create the Holy Spirit within people which will purify Israel and as a consequence, in the ideal future Israel will live up to the covenant by obeying all commandments. The human inability to live up to the demand of God’s commandment and the soteriological necessity of the Spirit in the book of Jubilees proves that the notion was more widely prevalent in pre-Christian Judaism than Menzies assumed.

1.2.5. F.W. Horn

F.W. Horn marks a significant milestone in the discussion of the development of early Christian and Pauline pneumatology. His book Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie provides an example of an approach which looks at Paul’s theology in terms of an unfolding and contextualised development of his earlier ideas on the Spirit.

---

87 Turner, Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts, 110.
88 Menzies, Development, 304.
89 See discussion on pages 75-77.
90 Horn, Das Angeld. 1992; idem, ‘Holy Spirit’ in ABD 3: 260-280 is the summary of his position.
Horn recognises a tension between Palestinian Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism in their perception about the Spirit. According to him, in Palestinian Judaism the function of the Spirit of God is understood as *Befähigung endzeitlichen Verhaltens*, whereas Hellenistic Judaism understood the Spirit primarily as *die Substanz des neuen Seins*. Central to his approach is the question how these two different lines of pneumatological statements within Judaism were received in the New Testament. He maintains that both in early Christianity and in Paul we find these strands.

Horn traces the development of Paul's thinking about the Spirit from his pre-Christian days. The author traces the roots of primitive Christian pneumatology in the Hellenists and the Hellenistic communities. By tracing the theology of the Hellenists (Acts 6-7) Horn identifies the combination of motifs, wisdom/spirit/working of miracles (Acts 2.22, 43; 7.36), as expressing the Hellenistic ideal of the Christian pneumatic. According to Horn, Pauline theology is rooted primarily in the Hellenistic community of Antioch (Gal. 1.21; Acts 11.19-20, 13.1).

Horn develops the pneumatology of pre-Pauline and non-Pauline communities by looking into the primary sources of Antiochian pneumatology which are formulae and formulaic statements in the letters of Paul. For Horn the social settings of these formulae and statements are either the context of proclamation or baptismal catechesis.

In contrast to earlier studies Horn makes further distinctions with the primitive community's theology of the Spirit - the Palestinian Jewish Christian pneumatology and the Hellenistic Jewish Christian pneumatology. The function of spirit for the Hellenistic Christian community was primarily missiological, especially, mission to
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91 Horn, *Das Angeld*, 40.
93 Horn, *Das Angeld*, 54-59.
94 Horn, *Das Angeld*, 60.
95 Horn, *ABD* 3: 268-69.
96 They are: “God had given us the spirit” (Acts 5.32; 15.8; Rom. 5.5; 11.8; 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; 1 Thes. 4.8; 2 Tim. 1.7; 1 Jn. 3.24; 4.13). Since Paul uses this in a secondary way Horn assumes that this is pre-Pauline. The main features are, a) the author of the gift is always God, b) the gift is always used in aorist tense (except 1 Thes. 4.8, 1 Jn. 4.13) c) the gift of *pneuma* is described with minimal grammatical variation, d) the object is predominantly ‘us’. “You have received the spirit” (Jn. 20.22; Acts 2.33; 38; 8.15, 17, 19; 10.47; 19.2; Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.12; 2 Cor. 11.4; Gal. 3.2, 14; 1 Jn. 2.27), “The spirit of God dwells within you” (1 Cor. 3.16; 6.19; Rom. 8.9; 11; Eph. 2.21; 1 Peter. 2.5) and “you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God” (1 Cor. 6.11). See Horn, *Das Angeld*, 62-65; idem *ABD* 3: 268.
97 Horn, *Das Angeld*, 63.
the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{99} Along with this understanding they believed in the universal spirit endowment.\textsuperscript{100} That is, Hellenists were particularly open to perceive the paranormal phenomena as spirit caused, whereas Palestinian Jewish Christianity was more reluctant to see the states of enthusiasm as manifestation of the spirit. The Judaising Christians sought to establish a position of authority over the universal community, which undermined its charismatic character. Horn points out that the reasons for this situation are Christological.

For Horn, Paul did not have a fully formed pneumatology when he launched into the mission. Paul's theology of the Spirit is an expansion of the above-mentioned primitive doctrine. Horn argues that Paul's unique understanding of Spirit can be traced in three neat schemata of developments from an early stage to that of a later Paul.

Quite different from other studies on Pauline pneumatology, Horn distinguishes the pneumatology of 1 Thessalonians from that of the later Paul. Horn argues that in this first stage Paul had the fundamental conviction that the endowment of the spirit was an eschatological gift.\textsuperscript{101} In this stage the Spirit is understood as enabling believers for eschatological conduct; empowering, preaching, producing joy in affliction, and given for the goal of sanctification.\textsuperscript{102} For Horn, the concept of spirit in 1 Thessalonians shows strong Old Testament and Jewish influence.

Paul was compelled to rethink his position at each stage in the light of the church situation and the presence of those with whom he disagreed.\textsuperscript{103} Thus a second stage of Pauline pneumatological development came when Paul went to Corinth and encountered a pneumatic enthusiasm where a section of the community (\textit{pneumatikoi}), who spoke in tongues, the language of heaven, saw the Spirit as a gift able to produce magical effects, and related the Spirit to the sacraments.\textsuperscript{104} In this phase the Corinthians maintain that they already belong primarily to the heavenly/Spirit world (1 Cor. 4.8), rather than to the world of flesh and blood, through their reception of the Spirit in baptism (1 Cor. 6.11; 12.13).\textsuperscript{105} As Gentiles or Hellenists they inevitably understand this gift of the indwelling Spirit as a powerful

\textsuperscript{99} Horn, \textit{ABD} 3: 268 ff.
\textsuperscript{100} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 89-115.
\textsuperscript{101} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 119.
\textsuperscript{102} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 131-33.
\textsuperscript{103} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 160-301.
\textsuperscript{104} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 160ff., 201-219.
\textsuperscript{105} Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 201.
divine substance, a very part of the heavenly world, and so already the full arrival of salvation itself.¹⁰⁶

Against these understandings Paul continued to adhere to his functional view of the Spirit operating through charismata to build up the church.¹⁰⁷ But he also took over in part the view of the enthusiasts in that he accepted baptism as the point of departure for the work of the Spirit in believers; baptism both incorporated them into the church and mediated the Spirit.¹⁰⁸ However, he still adhered to an eschatological view of the Spirit in which it was an *arrabon* or guarantee of what was yet to come.¹⁰⁹ According to Horn, Paul takes over their baptismal theology, but refutes their over-realised eschatology.¹¹⁰ He insists that they are not yet ‘spiritual bodies’ belonging to the heavenly sphere and he sharply relativises glossolalia in terms of gifts which ‘build up’ the historical community on earth (1 Cor. 12-14).¹¹¹ Paul argues that until they become spiritual bodies in the resurrection, it is especially in the physical body that the spiritual life issuing from the baptismal gift is to be manifest. Nor is this baptismal charism to be separated from the Christ-event. Thus Spirit is no mere heavenly substance, but Christ, the life giving Spirit (1 Cor. 15.45) that is received.¹¹² And so to receive the Spirit is to come under Christ’s lordship and power. Thus baptism is the occasion of the bestowal of the Spirit and of the incorporation into the salvific sphere (in Christ). Horn adds that the correlation of Christ and Spirit first occurred in the context of pneumatic enthusiasm.

Horn argues that his third stage consists of 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and Romans. This is regarded as the most important theological period for Paul’s pneumatology, because controversy fires him to make his most distinctive contributions.¹¹³ The opponents Paul met in Galatia and Philippi forced him to think beyond this point with the result that he began to look on the Spirit as a hypostasis who testified to believers of their salvation in Christ, made present the love of God, bore witness to their sonship and came to their help in their weakness.

Over against Judaising Christians, in 2 Corinthians Paul claims the Spirit is the Spirit of the New Covenant, which displaces the Mosaic covenant.¹¹⁴ Life-giving

¹⁰⁹ Horn, *Das Angeld*, 262, 301.
¹¹⁰ Horn, *ABD* 3: 270.
¹¹² Horn, *ABD* 3: 270.
Spirit is thus set in antithesis to death-dealing Torah (2 Cor. 3.6). Thus Paul came to accept the view of the Spirit as ‘substance’, alongside his previous functional view; this accounts for the variations in his statements about the Spirit. Simultaneously, with the above point Horn argues that in Gal. 5.13-6.10 and Rom. 7-8, Paul develops his second great distinctive antithesis between the powers of ‘flesh’ and ‘Spirit’. The Law is hereby portrayed as essentially irrelevant. The Law is powerless to overcome the ‘sin-flesh’ alliance (Rom. 7.13-25). The Spirit can accomplish this (Gal. 5.16, 17, 19-25; 6.8, 9; Rom. 8.1-13) – and so reception of the Spirit becomes both the necessary and the sufficient condition for salvation.\footnote{Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 364; idem, \textit{ABD} 3: 273.}

Horn points out that Paul’s conviction that an endowment of the spirit had taken place remained unchanged in all three phases. (1) The proclamation of the gospel is wrought by the Spirit; (2) The gift of the Spirit causes prophecy and (3) the gift of the Spirit causes and demands sanctification.\footnote{Horn, \textit{ABD} 3: 273.}

Horn concludes that the best way to capture Paul’s pneumatology is by understanding his concept of down payment (\(\alpha\rho\rho\alpha\beta\omega\nu\) 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; Rom. 8.23). The terminology contains both the future and the present aspect of Paul’s Pneumatology and eschatology as the Spirit is not the end-time gift itself but the power that conveys the right of eternal life. This concept brings together the notions of Spirit as function and Spirit as substance; because \(\alpha\rho\rho\alpha\beta\omega\nu\) is transferred sacramentally (2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5) it provides a material basis for the resurrection body.\footnote{Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 365-89; idem \textit{ABD} 3: 275.}

Horn argues that it is impossible to overlook the specific \textit{Das Wirken des Geistes}. For Horn, in the late Pauline theology, especially Romans, the Spirit does not merely functionally initiate individual expression of church life or act substantially as the baptismal gift to the church; rather, the Spirit appears as a hypostatic entity that attests and appropriates to the believer salvation in Christ, God’s love and the status of sonship. The Spirit intercedes for the believers before God, helps them in weakness and transforms them towards glory.\footnote{Horn, \textit{Das Angeld}, 385-404.}
Horn has put forth a carefully argued thesis which moves significantly beyond the previous positions and adds new impetus to the discussion. However Horn's case has not been without weakness.\textsuperscript{120}

There are significant aspects that are missing in his treatment of early Pauline pneumatology. In Horn's presentation, he seems to undermine the primitive Christian experience as not necessarily real experience but rather as literary inventions of a late communal theology. The importance of the Spirit activities that are evident in early Christian communities' experience, particularly their perception of God's imminence during worship, in the working of miracles and the inspiration of prophecy should be taken seriously as the interpretative framework for Pauline pneumatology. These experiences for the early Christians were evidences of the Spirit present and acting. A much more serious omission is the experience of the first Gentile Christians who received the gifts of the Spirit in relation to their membership in Christian community.

Moreover, he has placed the starting point of Pauline pneumatology in the primitive churches' expectation of the eschatological Spirit and Paul's development on the subject of the contextual conflicts that he faced with his opponents. Horn has treated the development in terms of contextual development. That means the specific issues of his context determined the developments in his pneumatological understanding. What is completely missing is Paul's initial own convictions and conceptual background about the eschatological coming of the Spirit.

While analysing primitive Christian pneumatology, Horn admits that there are no primary sources and that his tradition analysis of the letters is controversial, so there can be no far reaching hypotheses regarding the theology of the pre-Pauline Hellenistic Jewish Christian community. Horn reconstructs primitive Christian pneumatology from the formulae and formulaic statements within Pauline letters. What Horn has done is a reconstruction based on isolated fragments and catchwords from Paul's letters. He considers the social setting of these as proclamation or catechesis. Such a presupposition may not help us in understanding Pauline pneumatology and its relation to early communities. Moreover, it does not leave much space for further inquiry into the socio-ecclesial context(s) of Pauline communities.

\textsuperscript{120} See Volker Rabens ('The Development of Pauline Pneumatology, A Response to F.W. Horn', \textit{BZ} [1999] 2:161-179) and Max Turner (\textit{Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts}) for further criticism.
In sum, Horn's contribution to the question of the development of Pauline pneumatology is remarkable, but he failed to recognise significant factors like Paul's experience and the Gentile mission in his discussion.

1.2.6. G.D. Fee

Gordon Fee has without any question exerted a significant influence on recent discussions concerning the pneumatology of Pauline epistles. Fee's major work *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*, attempts to analyse and synthesise what Paul says about the Spirit both as a person and as experienced reality within the life of the believers and the believing community. Fee basically ignores the question of development or origins of Pauline pneumatology; rather he harmonises Paul's teachings on the Holy Spirit.

Fee believes that Spirit lies at the centre of things for Paul especially as part of the fundamental core of his understanding of the gospel and his entry point into Christian faith. For Paul the reason for that stems from the eschatological framework of his Jewish roots, with its eager waiting for the Spirit as part of the realisation of the messianic age.

The first fundamental aspect of Pauline pneumatology is that of Spirit as an eschatological fulfillment. According to Fee, the Spirit had played a leading role in Paul's expectation about the end times. He traces two strands of expectation from the Old Testament. First, the circumcision of the heart in Deut. 30.6, which is promised in Jer. 31.31-34 and God's gift of his Spirit in Ezek. 36.26-27 which provides the key to Paul's understanding of the Spirit. The second is the renewal of the prophetic gift among God's people, when the outpoured Spirit will, in effect, turn all of God's people into potential prophets (Joel 2.28-29). Based on the above position Fee distinguishes Paul's eschatological perspectives. On the one hand, the coming of the Spirit fulfilled these Old Testament promises as the sure evidence that the future had already been set in motion. All of God's people now prophesy (1 Cor.
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123 Fee, 'Paul's Conversion as Key to His Understanding of the Spirit', in R.N. Longenecker (ed.), *The Road from Damascus, the Impact of Paul's Conversion on His Life, Thought and Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 168.
127 Fee, 'Paul's Conversion', 168.
128 Fee, 'Paul's Conversion', 168.
Likewise, the Spirit has fulfilled the promised new covenant through “circumcision of the heart” (Rom. 2.29; 2 Cor. 3.3) thereby giving life to his people (2 Cor. 3.6; Gal. 5.25). On the other hand, since the final consummation of God’s kingdom had not yet taken place, the “eschatological” Spirit also serves as the sure guarantee of the final glory. Paul’s primary metaphors for the Spirit are down payment (2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; Eph. 1.14), first fruits (Rom. 8.23) and seal (2 Cor. 1.22; Eph. 1.13; 4.30).

The second distinctive for Paul according to Fee is the Spirit as God’s personal presence. For Paul, the experience of the promised Spirit meant the return of God’s own personal presence to dwell in and among his people. The Spirit marks off God’s people individually and corporately as God’s temple, the place of his personal dwelling on earth. Fee brings together here in terms of fulfillment 1) the theme of the presence of God, which had been expressed in Old Testament times in the tabernacle and the temple; 2) the presence further understood in terms of the Spirit of the Lord (Isa. 63.9-14; Ps. 106.33) and 3) the promised new covenant of the Spirit from Jeremiah and Ezekiel, wherein the Spirit would indwell God’s people and cause them to live and to follow in his ways.

According to Fee, Paul, who sees these themes as fulfilled by the gift of the Spirit, also understands the Spirit as God’s personal presence. The Spirit is therefore “the Holy Spirit of God” and the “Spirit of Jesus Christ” – the way in which God is present with the people. Conceptually, Fee points out that the Spirit was not for Paul some invisible force or power.

For Paul, the Trinity is foundational for the comprehension of the Holy Spirit. According to Fee there are four foundational realities: a) that God is one and personal; b) that the Spirit is both the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, and therefore personal; c) that the Spirit and Christ are fully divine; and d) that the Spirit is as distinct from Christ and the Father as they are from each other. These aspects of Paul’s understanding of one God lies behind much that makes his treatment of salvation dynamic and effective. There is no salvation in Christ that is not fully Trinitarian in this sense. Thus Fee advocates a soteriological Trinitarianism that
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136 Fee, Empowering Presence, 841.
seems to be anachronistic in its emphasis. Paul's understanding of the soteriological dimension of the Spirit is based in this Trinitarian framework. Salvation is God's activity, from beginning to end: God the Father initiated it, in that it belongs to God's eternal purpose (1 Cor. 2.6-9); it has its origin in God and God as its ultimate goal (1 Cor. 8.6); and it was set in motion by God's having sent both the Son and the Spirit (Gal. 4.4-7).

For Fee Paul's statements about the role of the Spirit in salvation are primarily experiential. There are, according to him, several components that make up the complex of Christian conversion. They include hearing of the gospel, faith, various metaphors for conversion like adoption, washing/rebirth/life-giving, sanctification, the gift of the Spirit, and baptism in water.\(^{137}\) The Spirit plays a crucial role in most of the processes - except for baptism in water. Conversion by the Spirit involves a commitment to a life of walking in the Spirit. At the individual level, the life of the Spirit includes "praying in the Spirit" as well as with the mind.

In the final point, Fee argues that for Paul the relationship between the Spirit and the People of God is important.\(^{138}\) The goal of God's eschatological salvation is to create a people of His name, who comprise the old covenant people of God, and they are now newly constituted through the death and resurrection of Christ and the gift of the eschatological Spirit. The newly constituted people of God are an eschatological people, who are formed by the Spirit, and live the life of the future in the present as they await the consummation.

In Fee's view, for Paul, the major role of the Spirit is in his being the absolutely essential element of the whole of the Christian life, from beginning to end.\(^{139}\) The Spirit empowers ethical living in all of its dimensions - whether individually, within the community, or to the world. Believers in Christ, who are "Spirit people" are variously described as living by the Spirit, walking in the Spirit, being led by the Spirit, bearing the fruit of the Spirit and sowing by the Spirit.\(^{140}\) Life in the Spirit also includes a believer's present end-time existence - including being empowered by the Spirit to abound in hope, to live in joy, to pray without ceasing, to exercise self-control, to experience a robust conscience, to have insight into God's will and purpose, and to endure in every kind of present hardship and suffering.\(^{141}\) At the

\(^{137}\) Fee, Empowering Presence, 854.
\(^{138}\) Fee, Empowering Presence, 870.
\(^{139}\) Fee, Empowering Presence, 872.
\(^{140}\) Fee, Empowering Presence, 876.
\(^{141}\) Fee, Empowering Presence, 876.
same time the Spirit’s presence, including his charismata, helps to build up the believing community as its members gather together to worship God.

In short, Fee’s central thrust in *God’s Empowering Presence*, was not to define the distinctive nature of the early and later Pauline pneumatology; rather Fee attempted to harmonise any such distinctions involved in the discussion.

Fee attempts to distinguish two strands viz, the eschatological renewal and universal Spirit endowment as key to Paul’s understanding of the Spirit. Fee assumes that Paul anticipated the Spirit upon Gentiles when he went to them in mission. But one of significant issues that the early church had to grapple with was the admission of Gentiles as people of God (Gal. 2.7-9; 3.1-5; cf. Acts 11.15-18; 15.2, 5,8). Had the early church understood the universal anticipation of the Spirit upon Gentiles apart from the Law from the outset? Fee overlooks this issue in his elaboration of Pauline pneumatology.

The other issue is Fee’s presuppositions about Paul’s “soteriological (economic) Trinitarianism”. According to Fee this is evident as early as I Thessalonians. Even though one may recognise aspects of triadic conceptuality of God in Paul’s letters, does that justify imputing the full connotations of the doctrine of Trinity? ‘Trinity’ denotes a highly sophisticated way of conceptualising God which only achieved formulation three centuries later. Did Paul already think in such categories?

1.2.7. Conclusion

A review of the significant contributions of a century of research on Paul’s understanding of the Holy Spirit indicates that there is obviously a lacuna in past scholarship in its attempt to understand Pauline pneumatology. The origins and development of Pauline pneumatology have been traced to various sources, particularly to the Hellenistic, Jewish and early Christian traditions. Almost all studies focused on the uniqueness of Paul’s pneumatology in comparison to other understandings of the Spirit that were available to Paul among the early Christian communities. What is surprisingly missing in the above studies is the lack of interest in the perspective of Paul’s early conceptual framework. While perceiving the importance of the previous scholarly endeavours on the origins of Pauline pneumatology, the present study seeks to investigate two significant aspects, which are not sufficiently dealt with in previous attempts, namely, Paul’s conviction as an apostle to the Gentiles and that God has poured out the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from the Law. It is to this that we turn our attention.
1.3. The Quest for the Origins of Paul’s Pneumatology

The quest for the origins of Pauline pneumatology begins by locating Paul’s primary convictions, which include his commissioning to preach to the Gentiles and that God has given the Spirit to the Gentiles.

1.3.1. Paul - Apostle to the Gentiles

Anyone who is interested in Pauline pneumatology encounters Paul’s deep-rooted conviction that he is called to be the apostle to the Gentiles. In his autobiographical reference to the Damascus Christophany, Paul refers to his vocation as being “called (καλέω)... to preach (ἐκκαθελειζωματ) him (God’s Son) among the Gentiles” (Gal. 1.15-16). For him the very purpose of God’s revelation of Christ is that he should proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles. Thus Paul was - “sent to preach” (πετειλευ...ἐναγγελειςθαι 1 Cor. 1.17) and “entrusted with a stewardship” (πεπίστευμαι, 1 Cor. 9.17 cf.; 1 Thess. 2.4; Col. 1.25) of the gospel to the Gentiles (Rom. 11.13; cf. 1.5, 13; 15.16-19). Lukan narratives too confirm Paul’s emphasis that he saw himself as having a major role in the Gentile mission (Acts 9.15; 22.6,11, 14; 26.13). The significance of such a conviction so deeply rooted in the beginning of Paul’s Christian career is relevant for any attempt to understand the origins of Paul’s pneumatology.

1.3.2. Paul and Gentile reception of the Spirit

What is much more important for our discussion is Paul’s recognition that Gentiles have received the Spirit. That the Spirit is freely given to the Gentiles is an equally deep-rooted conviction that is found in all his writings (1 Thess. 1.5; Gal. 3.1, 5, 14; 1 Cor. 1.4-9; 6.9-11; 12.13; 2 Cor. 1.21; 3.3, 17; Rom. 5.5; 6.1; 7.6; 8.2, 9, 14, 15). On the one hand Paul gives prominence in his letters to his own experience of the Spirit during his mission and the experience of his Gentile converts’ reception of the Spirit. Paul was convinced that the Spirit was key to his own preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles and the proof of Gentiles being accepted as God’s people. Thus in his earliest letters, Paul indicates, especially in his ministry to the Gentiles that the gospel came to them “...in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full
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143 Gunkel, Influence, 82; Dunn, (Jesus and the Spirit, 201; idem, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 103-172; idem, Theology of Paul the Apostle (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) 426-434.
conviction” (πληρωμή 1 Thess. 1.5); they received the gospel (δείκτης) “with joy of the Holy Spirit” (1.6). Paul recalls the Galatians to their Christian beginnings by saying, “how did you receive the Spirit?” The gift of the Spirit came together “with the working of miracles” (Gal. 3.5). 144 Paul explains the promise of the Holy Spirit (3.14) as the “blessing of Abraham” into which they as Gentiles had already entered (cf. 3.29).

On the other hand, the gift of the Spirit to Gentiles was both recognised among the first Christians, and acknowledged as the sure indication of God’s acceptance (Gal. 3.2-5; 4.6, 29; 5.5; Rom. 8.9, 14). Thus, “God sent the Spirit of his Son into our hearts” (Gal. 4.6); the “Holy Spirit has been given to us” (Rom. 5.5); God has “given us the down payment of his Spirit” (2 Cor. 1.22; cf. 5.5); and “we have received the Spirit” (Gal. 3.14; cf. 1 Cor. 2.12) all point towards the idea of Paul’s deep seated awareness of God’s gift of the Spirit upon non-Israelites.

Thus even from his earliest extent of letters 145 it is evident that Paul’s initial thoughts which undergird his discussion of the Holy Spirit included his dual

144 Cf. Rom. 15.19, ‘by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of God’s Spirit.

convictions that he was called to be an apostle to the Gentiles and that God has given his Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from them first becoming the members of the covenant community. The latter aspect lies at the heart of Pauline pneumatology - a conviction that God has graciously endowed the gift of the Spirit upon his Gentile converts.

1.3.3. Thesis

Our thesis is: Paul's early Christian thinking on the Holy Spirit is built on the belief that God has bestowed the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Torah observance. This conviction in turn is rooted primarily in his own Damascus experience and secondarily in his experience with and as a missionary of the Hellenistic community in Antioch.

Such a consideration, which arises out of an inquiry into the initial thoughts of Paul on the Holy Spirit, suggests that the whole question of the origins of Pauline pneumatology deserves a more thorough and separate investigation. This brings us to specific aims of the present study.

The main aim of the study is to investigate Paul's conviction about the bestowal of the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Torah obedience. The more specific objectives are: (i) To identify the nature and extent of such a conviction by raising following questions. Did Paul anticipate an outpouring of the Spirit without the Law? Did Paul expect the Gentiles to receive the Spirit when he went to them in mission? Was he surprised that the Spirit fell on the Gentiles apart from them becoming proselytes? (ii) To provide a plausible rationale for Paul's conviction by addressing the following: How can we account for Paul's conviction that God has poured out the Spirit upon the Gentiles? To what extent did Paul's own self-understanding and his own experience of the Spirit and his interactions with the early Christian communities contribute to his initial thinking on theology of Spirit?

In order to achieve these objectives, the present study will survey, first, the range of expectations of the Spirit upon people that were present in both Hebrew scripture as well as in the Jewish literature which stands as a conceptual background where Paul experienced his call to the Gentiles. Second it will also evaluate Paul's pre-Christian convictions about the Spirit, as they evolved from his own self-perception as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church. And finally, we shall elucidate Paul's own experience, particularly his 'conversion/call' experience and his initial years with the church in Antioch will be discussed.
1. 4. Method and procedure

The study will approach the issue from a historical perspective, and will therefore employ insights from application of the historical-critical method. The historical-critical inquiry will not only enable us to uncover and elucidate the meanings of the relevant texts in discussion but also will assist us with historical inquiries wherever needed.

The research will consist of four parts, including this introduction. Part two (chapters two and three) will be devoted to an analysis of pertinent texts that anticipate the outpouring of the Spirit upon people in both Hebrew Scripture and Jewish literature. In chapter two we will examine passages from the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly, passages from the exilic and post-exilic period (Ezekiel, Isaiah and Joel). Chapter three is dedicated to an analysis of various interpretative traditions in the post-biblical literature concerning the anticipation of the Spirit in the age to come, particularly upon Gentiles (The Book of Jubilees, 4 Ezra, Psalms of Solomon, Wisdom of Solomon, Dead Sea Scrolls, Philonic and Rabbinic literature). Part 3 (chapters four and five) investigates Paul’s own pre-Christian convictions about the Spirit particularly evolving from his own self-perception as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church. In part four (chapters six and seven) we shall argue that Paul’s own experience of the Spirit was a major creative factor in his own understanding of the Spirit, particularly the Damascus experience and his early experiences among the Gentile communities, particularly the Hellenists and the church in Antioch. Finally, in chapter eight we shall summarise our findings and draw out the implications for our understanding of Pauline pneumatology.

In order to keep the amount of pertinent literature within reasonable limits, we will confine the arguments to the key issues that are under discussion. Since our knowledge of Paul is limited primarily to a handful of occasional letters, any attempt to investigate his understanding about the Spirit upon Gentiles needs to proceed with
care and deliberation. The seven letters commonly considered as authentic provide us with evidence concerning our thesis. However, the book of Acts will also be used only after critical judgment has been exercised as to the relation of each instance to Paul’s earlier writings.

Finally, such a study of Pauline pneumatology has its place in the mass of pneumatological literature that has been produced over the century. It is hoped that this present study will provide fresh insights on the origins of Paul’s pneumatology as well as raise some issues for consideration in the continued effort of understanding and interpreting the rise and development of nascent Christianity.
PART 2

THE CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND FOR
THE ESCHATOLOGICAL BESTOWAL OF THE SPIRIT

Introduction to Part 2

The main objective of part 2 is to survey the range of expectations of the Spirit coming upon 'all' people that were present in the Jewish world of meaning in which Paul socialised, and in which he experienced his call as 'an apostle to the Gentiles'. The reason for this investigation is to discover the extent to which the Jewish expectation of the Spirit upon 'all' prepares for and possibly explains Paul's conviction that God has given his Spirit to the Gentiles apart from the Law. Paul's initial thoughts on the Holy Spirit may be best understood against the background of the expectation that in the age to come there would be fresh manifestations of the Spirit upon 'all'; and this idea is particularly seen as an emerging trend in the exilic and post-exilic prophetic literature.

There are numerous passages in the Hebrew Scriptures that are generally considered as referring to a future outpouring of the Spirit. Two strands of thought are predominant — 1) the idea that in the age to come the gift of the Spirit will be bestowed upon a messianic figure (Isa. 11.2; 42.1; 61.1). The post-biblical literature (1 Enoch 49.2–3; 61.11–12; 62.2; Pss. 17.37; 18.7; 11QMel. 2.18; CD 2.11–13; 1QSb.5.24; cf. 4Qplsa\(^4\) 3.10–19) continue to affirm the gift of the Spirit to (a) messiah/anointed figure (s) during the end-time.\(^1\) 2) in the future age the community/nation will be endowed with the gift of the Spirit (Isa. 28.5–6; 32.15; 44.3; 59.21; Ezek. 36.23–31; 37.1–14; 39.29; Joel 3.1–5; Zech. 12.10). However, references to the Spirit in the Second Temple Judaism are diverse and both postulate
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\(^{1}\) Scholars do recognise that before the NT period, both strands were transmitted independently of each other and only in the late NT writings are they combined to state that a spirit-endowed messiah will transmit the Spirit upon the people. See J. Becker, *Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen* (JSHRZ 3; Gutersloh: Mohn, 1980) 76; Horn, *ABD* 3:265. Among the post-biblical literature only T. Levi. 18.11; T. Jud. 24.3 refers to the agency of the messiah with the eschatological gift of the Spirit. Since both texts were generally understood as a Christian interpolation we will not be taking this line of thought any further in our discussion. See discussions in Becker (*Die Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*), H.W. Hollander and M.de Jonge (*The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* [Leiden: Brill, 1985]); H. Ulrichsen (*Die Grundskrift der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen: Eine Untersuchung zu Umfang, Inhalt und Eigenart der ursprünglichen Schrift* [Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1991]). However, E.R. Stuckenbruck ('The Spirit at Pentecost', in C.R. Wetzel (ed.), *Essays of New Testament Christianity* [Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard Publishing, 1978] 90–102) provides valuable discussion on the influence of Joel on the passage.
a future anticipation (*Jub.* 1.22-23; cf. *4 Ezra* 6.26) and acknowledge the Spirit's present availability (*IQS* 3.6-12; 9.3-5; *IQH* 8.19-2; 16.11b-12; *Wis.* 1.4-7; 722-25; 9.17-18; Philo *Leg.* 1.31-38; *Her.* 259; *Vir.* 212-219).

Since our interest is limited to the *corporate* anticipation of the Spirit, the enquiry will be directed toward understanding as fully as possible the significance of the anticipation of the Spirit upon 'all', from the exilic era through to contemporary Judaism. Within this line of thought, the task of this section will be to identify and to elaborate relevant data on the corporate anticipation of the Spirit from the extant literature. As a corollary to the above enquiry, Gentiles receiving the Spirit apart from becoming a member of God's community will be of some interest. This precision has ramifications for how the anticipation of the Spirit upon Gentiles during the period under discussion might be construed in relation to Paul's convictions about the Spirit poured out upon Gentiles.
Chapter 2

The Eschatological Bestowal of the Spirit upon People in the Hebrew Scriptures

2.1. Introduction

Past scholarly contributions have been significant for the understanding of the concept of the Spirit in Old Testament, but only a few scholars have discussed in detail the eschatological anticipation of the Spirit.

While approaching the subject of our interest, one comes across a diversity of opinions over in the identification of passages in the Old Testament where we find the expectation of the Spirit in the age to come. For example, Neve, considers passages like Isa. 32.15; 44.3; Ezek. 36.26–27; 39.29; Joel 2.28–29 as indicative of renewal and transformation of YHWH's people in the future, while Montague's interests in the growth of the Spirit tradition classifies the relevant passages into various historical periods, viz pre–Exilic prophetic texts (Isa. 28.5–6; 32.15), exile and return (Ezek. 36.23–31; 37.1–14; Isa. 44.3; 59.21) and apocalyptic texts (Joel 3.1–5; Zech. 12.10).


2 R.T. Koch, Geist und Messias (Freiburg: Herder, 1950); idem, Der Geist Gottes im Alten Testament (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991).

3 See Neve, Spirit of God, Chp.4. See other like W.H. Schmidt ('Geist', TRE 12 [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984] 170–73) classify the anticipation of the eschatological Spirit in terms of 'Wende und Neuschöpfung durch den Geist' (Ezek. 11.19; 18.31; 33.10; 36.26; 37.11; Isa. 29.24; 44.3). Bieder, ('τοίχωμα', TDNT 6:370) includes Isa. 32.15; Isa. 44.3; Ezek. 11.19; 36.26; Joel 2.28; Zech. 12.10, as eschatological texts.

4 See Montague, Holy Spirit, 39–40, 45–60, 85–88. However, for Hildebrandt (An Old Testament Theology of the Spirit of God, 91–103) the passages falls under one classification i.e., restoration of God’s people (Isa. 32.15; 44.3; Ezek. 36.27; 37.1–14; 39.29; Joel 2.28–29; Hag. 2.5; Zec. 4.6; 6.8).
Among the contemporary scholars on the Spirit in the Old Testament, Koch's work is specifically directed to the concept of 'messiah' and the eschatological role of the Spirit upon YHWH's community. While maintaining a development in the Spirit tradition, Koch makes a distinction between the effects of the Spirit in der messianischen Heilsgemeinschaft (Isa. 4.2–6; 28.5; 32.15.20; 44.1–5; 59.21; Ezek. 37.1–14) and in den Mitgliedern der messianischen Heilszeit (Joel 3.1–5; Ezek. 36.16–38; Jer. 31.31–34). For him the former passages are exilic in origin and refer to the Spirit endowment given to the whole community, whereas the latter texts, especially from the postexilic times, have the gift of the Spirit shifting from the messianic community to its individual members.5

Although such classifications are helpful in throwing more light on the text, our primary concern in this chapter is to provide a detailed examination of key texts emerging from the exilic and postexilic periods of Israelite history that deal with the anticipation of the Spirit in the age to come on the whole community, with a specific interest in the extent of Gentile inclusion. Two passages are crucial for our examination — Isa. 44.1–5 and Joel 3.1–5. However, passages like Isa. 32.15–20; Ezek. 36.26–27; 37.1–14; 39.296 will also be examined to provide an understanding of the broader context of the prophetic promise of the Spirit.

As a cautionary note while examining the texts, the term 'eschatology' will be used in a general sense.7 The prophetic literature does not offer systematic descriptions of the writers' views of the future, which took a variety of forms. On the one hand, the expectation of the gift of the Spirit is linked to the nationalistic model of eschatology centred on the deliverance and glorification of the nation, while on the other the Spirit is anticipated upon the people of God in the final age. The difficulty is that the prophetic literature tends to discuss individual events or only limited parts of the final

---

5 Koch, Der Geist Gottes, 109–137.
6 Since our focus is on passages possibly pointing to the anticipation of Spirit upon Gentiles, we will not be discussing Isa. 28.5–6; 59.21; and Zech. 12.10.
7 See discussions in G. Wanke, 'Eschatologie im Alten Testament', in H.D. Preuss (ed.) Eschatologie im Alten Testament (Wege der Forschung; Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978). The outpouring of the Spirit in the age to come is generally considered as eschatological phenomena. In its broadest sense, 'eschatological' includes all the events that refer to the age to come. But in its restricted form, the term also refers to future anticipations, particularly to when the events anticipated form part of the historical process. F.F. Bruce's ('Eschatology', in W.A. Elwell [ed.], Evangelical Dictionary of Theology [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984] 362) clarification of the term 'eschatology' is helpful. According to him, 'Eschatology' may denote the consummation of God's purpose whether it coincides with the end of the world (or of history) or not, whether the consummation is totally final or marks a stage in the unfolding pattern of his purpose. For further discussion see J.P. van der Ploeg, 'Eschatology in the Old Testament' in M.A. Beek (ed.), Witness of Tradition (Leiden: Brill, 1978) 89–99; J. Lindblom (Prophecy in Ancient Israel [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1962] 316).
age, and the chronological sequence between events is frequently not clear.

The task, then, in this chapter is (i) to elucidate the nature of expectations of the Spirit in the key passages; (ii) to identify the recipients of the promise and the Israelite hopes of the outpouring of the Spirit in relation to the Gentiles; and (iii) to explain in the light of the above observations the extent which expectation of the Spirit is used in the subsequent Jewish traditions. Such an investigation will help us to discover the extent to which the Old Testament expectation of the Spirit upon ‘all’ offers clues to explain Paul’s convictions regarding the Spirit.

2.2. The Book of Ezekiel

Among the pre-exilic and exilic canonical prophets, the writer of the book of Ezekiel stands out for his perceptible usage of the term נִשְׁפָּתָא, particularly where נִשְׁפָּתָא designates the Spirit of God. Of the various senses in which the word is used, the most relevant to our inquiry is the usage in which Ezekiel’s eschatological visions foresee a time when יהוה will give (נִשְׁפָּתָא Ezek. 36.26–27; 37.14) or pour out (נִשְׁפָּתָא Ezek. 39.29) יהוה’s נִשְׁפָּתָא upon the whole people.

2.2.1. Ezek. 36.26–27

In Ezek. 36.26–27, the theme of the promise of the Spirit upon the נִשְׁפָּתָא derives from יהוה’s concern for his reputation. Israel’s defiling conduct caused

---

8 Of the 151 references to נִשְׁפָּתָא in the later prophets Ezekiel has to his credit about one-third. There are 52 references to נִשְׁפָּתָא in the book of Ezekiel, in comparison to 28 in Isaiah, 9 in Deutero-Isaiah and 18 in Jeremiah. The importance of Ezekiel’s pneumatology is not to be confined to numerical terms alone; rather, his significance emerges from the creative use of נִשְׁפָּתָא at a time when his pre-exilic and exilic contemporaries conspicuously evaded its usage. Scholars have long since noted that reference to נִשְׁפָּתָא is comparatively rare in pre-exilic prophetic literature. Amos, Zephaniah, Nahum and Jeremiah never mention נִשְׁפָּתָא or link their work with its operation, and neither does Isaiah connect the Spirit with his prophetic activity. Only in Hosea and Micah and possibly Habakkuk are there traces of such a connection. See W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Chapters 25–48 (trans. J.D. Martin, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983) 42; K.W. Carley, Ezekiel among the Prophets, A Study of Ezekiel’s Place in Prophetic Tradition (London: SCM Press, 1975) 24.

9 Ezekiel employs the term נִשְׁפָּתָא in a wide range of senses throughout the book, with notable concentrations in chs.1–24 and in chs.33–48. The prophet refers to נִשְׁפָּתָא as wind (1.4; 5.2; 10.12; 12.14; 13.3,11,13; 17.10,21; 19.12; 21.26), as breath (Ezek. 37.9, 10), and as a medium of both the seat of cognition and feeling (Ezek. 3.14; 11.5; 13.3; 38.10). See Block, ‘Use of RWH in the book of Ezekiel’, JETS 32 (1989) 29.

10 Since detailed study on the use of נִשְׁפָּתָא as the Spirit of God is available elsewhere, it will not be rehearsed again here. W. Zimmerli, נִשְׁפָּתָא in the Book of Ezekiel in Ezekiel 2, 566–568; Block, ‘Use of RWH’, 27–49.


12 P. Joyce, Divine Initiative and Human Response in Ezekiel (JSOTSS 51; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 103; Zimmerli’s (Ezekiel 2, 247–48).
their expulsion from their land and dispersion among the nations (vv.17–19). The הָלַךְ interpret the fate of Israel as evidence of the weakness of יהוה, whose name is thereby profaned (vv.20–21). As a result, יהוה was concerned for his צְדָקָה declaring, ‘It is not for your sake, O house of Israel, that I am about to act, but for the sake of my holy name’ (v.22). 13 יהוה promises that he will gather (נָגָר) the exiles back to their land (v.24); sprinkle (צִבָּה) them with clean water to purify them from impurities (v.25); 14 place (יָבָא) a new heart and a new spirit in them (v.26) and put (יִשְׁתַּחַר) יהוה’s Spirit within them causing (כָּלַשׁ) obedience to the law (vv.26–27) which is necessary for their permanent dwelling in the land.

2.2.1.1 The Expectation of תורתו

Two expressions that are important in relation to the promise — ‘a new spirit (דְּוֹרָח) I will put within you’ (v.26) and ‘I will put my spirit (דִּווֵר) within you’ (v.27) — require further elaboration.

The reference to דוֹרָח with an adjective דוֹרַח in v.26 (cf. 11.19, 18.31) is unique to the book of Ezekiel. 15 Such a feature has created considerable discussions among scholarly circles on the nature and function of the דוֹרָח, as to whether דוֹרָח is theological or anthropological in its meaning. The majority of scholars argue for an anthropological interpretation. 16 Although disagreements exist concerning the distinctions between functions of ‘heart’ and ‘spirit’, 17 recent discussions on תורתו indicate a common consensus to treat דוֹרָח as synonymous with בֵּית. 18

13 The phrase also occurs in Ezek. 20.9; 14, 22 & 44; cf. Deut. 30.6; Jer. 31.33. See Greenberg (Ezekiel 21–48, 737–738) for further discussion.
14 The first way in which יהוה would display his holiness would be by sprinkling clean water upon the regathered people; as a result they would be יָדָה (clean) from their נֱפְלָת בָּא (defilement) and נָלַךְ (idolatry v.25). For Ezekiel the issue is not simply an external ceremonial cleansing accompanying the internal renewal described in vv.26–27, but a wholesale cleansing from sin performed by יהוה, a necessary precondition to normalising the spiritual relationship between יהוה and his people. There is a possible link to Num. 11.18 which refers to ‘consecration’ as a prior action to the coming of the רוח.
15 In the whole of Hebrew Scriptures it occurs only in Ezekiel 11.19; 18.31 and 36.26. The closest parallel would be דוֹרָח נַפְלָת בָּא בְּכָרְבִּי (Ps. 51.12).
17 See H.W. Wolff (Anthropology of the Old Testament [trans. Margaret Kohl, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974] 38); Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 2: 134 ff. While Block (‘Use of RHW’, 38–39; idem, Ezekiel 25–48, 356) raises an objection to the anthropological view, in particular the synonymous interpretation of תורתו and בֵּית, and considers תורתו as יהוה’s spirit. His position rests on the difference in the use of prepositions associated with the verbs לָכַה — a new heart is given (לַכָּה) to you) the house of Israel and the new spirit is placed within her (לָכַה). For Block, (Ezekiel 25–48, 356) this distinction is elaborated in vv.26b–27 where the provision of the new heart involves a removal of the petrified organ and its replacement with a heart of flesh, the source of which is unspecified. While the new spirit is יהוה’s Spirit, which is the source that animates and vivifies its recipients it is probably...
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The usage of the verb give (תָּנוּ) stands out in vv.26–27. לֶחֶם is often used in the Heilsorakel to refer to YHWH’s promise of ‘offspring’ and ‘land’. But when juxtaposed with body parts, especially with לב, it always has YHWH as its subject and describes what YHWH provides for a person’s inner being, whether it be plans to carry out (Neh. 2.12; 7.5) or to a wisdom and ability (Exod. 35.34; 36.2; 2 Chr. 9.23). P. Joyce, whilst correctly noting that the Hebrew noun לב is employed in a wide range of senses, defines it in the present passage as “the locus of the moral will.”

unwise to attempt to argue for a theological interpretation for the mention of the internal body organ, ‘within your inward part’ (For example, Gen. 25.22; 41.21; 1 Sam. 25.27) or as seat of thought and emotion (See 1 Kgs. 3.28; Isa. 16.11; 49.12; Jer. 4.14; 9.7; Ps. 39.4; 51.12; 55.5; 109.22; Lam. 1.20.). LXX translates לְבֵנִי as εἰς ἑαυτὸν, which almost all English translations follow “put within you” AV, NRSV etc. But the Ezekiel Targum considers לְבֵנִי in a more anthropological way: “deep inside you” or “in your intestines” thus as a human organ and parallel to the use of ‘heart’ to represent the locus of moral will. S.H. Levey, The Targum of Ezekiel, Translated with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987) 41, 102. (2) The diversity in use of preposition might have resulted from the complexity of Ezekiel’s presentation. See discussions in Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 245; Allen, Ezekiel 20–48, 176; Joyce, Divine Initiative, 117. (3) Similar usages לְבֵנִי and לְבֵנִי are not however uncommon in the Hebrew Scriptures (See Num. 11.20; 14.42; Deut. 1.42; Josh. 4.6; 18.7; Jer. 29.8). (4) In addition, similar inconsistencies are evident in the passage, especially in the use of verbs. For example, there is neither a parallel nor an analogous use to that of the verb רָשָׁה in vv.26–27. That is, an equivalent explanation for the ‘new heart’ as a transformation from a heart of stone to a heart of flesh is not attributed to YHWH. (5) More importantly, if understood theologically כֹּל נְבִיִּים synonymous with לְבֵנִי, an explanation is needed (which Block avoids) regarding the feminine adjective נְבִיָּה, which is attributed to לְבֵנִי. Does Ezekiel apprehend a ‘new Spirit that would be given to the people of YHWH in the future as different from a Spirit that is already operative in Israelite religion/experience?


For example in the patriarchal narratives, Gen. 17.8; 20; 26.4; 48.4 and in Deuteronomy, Deut. 11.14, 15; 18.18; in prophetic literature, Isa. 45.3; 46.13; 49.6; 56.5; 61.8; Jer. 24.7; Ezek. 37.6, 14, 39; 44.14; Joel 3.3.

References to other body parts include נֵפֶשׁ (shoulder Neh. 9.29; Zech. 7.11), נַפְלַט (neck – Exod. 23.27; 2 Sam. 22.41), נָפָץ (hand – Gen. 27.17; Deut. 24.1.3; Judg. 7.16), נֶחָשָׁן (face – Gen. 30.40; Dan. 9.3).

It is used of the physical organ (Jer. 4.19), in a metaphorical sense (I Sam.2.1; Isa. 40.2) and for the rational faculty (1 Kgs. 5.9).

Ezek. 6.9; 14.3; cf. 2.4, 3.7; 6.9; 14.3. The notion of the giving of a לֶחֶם has parallels elsewhere, particularly in the distinctive combination of the verb לָנוּ and the noun לֶחֶם. In Jeremiah the motif of heart is used as the place of moral response (Jer. 24.7; 31.33; 32.39; Deut. 6.4–5; 30.6, 10). The moral connotation of ‘heart’ in these passages is obvious when we see its use with the verbs יד (fear, 32.39) and יד (know, 24.7; 31.34). Jeremiah uses knowledge as its content of law and it is God’s future gift (Jer. 24.7; 31.34). See R.W. Klein, Israel in Exile, A Theological Interpretation (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979) 64–65. Likewise in Deuteronomy לֶחֶם is the centre of moral will (Deut. 4.29; 6.5; 10.12; 11.13; 13.4; 26.16; 30.2; 6, 10; Josh. 22.5; 23.14; 24.23; I Kgs.2.4; 8.48; 2 Kgs. 23.3, 25; Jer. 32.14). In Deuteronomy לֶחֶם is used in connection with obedience to YHWH and often with the verb לַעֲשׂ (to hear, to obey Deut. 30.2; cf. Deut. 11.13; 30.17). See Greenberg, Ezekiel 21–48, 737–38; E.W. Nicholson, Preaching to the Exiles: A Study
Along with such an observation, it is notable that the Old Testament’s assimilation of לֶב with anthropological terms, which derives from its juxtaposition with internal human organs, is a later phenomenon, particularly evident in the exilic and post-exilic literature. When לֶב is used with מִזְרוֹן, it means the centre of human volition, and the subsequent discussions typically consist of deliberate actions. In Ezek. 36.26, then, מִזְרוֹן is not used so much as a component, but as a new human capacity to respond to YHWH. Thus the expectation of a לֶב וּמִזְרוֹן both refer primarily to the YHWH’s gift of a renewed capacity to respond intensely to YHWH in obedience in the future.

Scholarly opinion is united in considering מִזְרוֹן in v.27 as theological — the Spirit of YHWH. But there are considerable differences as to the exact experience of YHWH’s Spirit coming upon the people in the future. Suggestions to its close relationship with Ps. 51.12–14, I Sam.10.6, or to the experience of מִזְרוֹן in Ezek.36.26–27 fall in line with Ezek. 1.5–14, 19–21, 1.28 and 37.1–14.

References to the first person singular usage — מִזְרוֹן — as YHWH’s Spirit predominantly occur in exilic and post-exilic literature, particularly in the restoration passages (Isa. 42.1; 44.3; 59.21; Ezek. 36.27; 37.14; 39.29; Joel 3.1,2; Hag. 2.5; Zech. 4.6; 6.8). The usage indicates that the only locus of this concept is YHWH’s own speech, specifically prophetic proclamations and descriptions of salvation.

The purpose for which the gift of the Spirit is given is defined in 36.26–27 (cf. 11.19–20) as, ‘I will cause you (׃וֹדְךָ) to walk (׃מֹשֵׁל) in my statutes and be careful (׃שָׁם)’

---

23 Albertz and Westermann, מִזְרוֹן, TLOT 3: 1208.
24 For example, the correlation of words occurs in Exod. 35.21; Deut. 2.30; Josh. 2.11; 5.1; Job 32.19; Isa. 65.14; Ps. 34.19; 51.9; 17; 78.8; 143.4; Pro.15.13; 17.22; Ezek. 11.19; 18.31; 36.36; Dan. 5.20.
25 In contrast to מִזְרָה, which from the outset relates to the person, מִזְרוֹן was not originally a component of the individual in the same manner as מִזְרָה, rather a power that can govern a person not only from inside but also from outside. See, Albertz and Westermann, TLOT 3:1209; Johnson, Vitality, 76.
26 Albertz and Westermann, TLOT 3: 1211.
27 מִזְרוֹן in v.27 is a Hapax Legomenon, the only one of its kind in MT. Greenberg (Ezekiel 21–37, 730) considers מִזְרוֹן as ‘animating impulse’.
28 Cooke (Ezekiel, 392) who attributes oracles of restoration to the redactor of the later exilic period, finds a close relationship in Ezekiel’s usage with that of Ps. 51.12–14.
29 See Zimmerli, (Ezekiel 2, 249) considers the effect of מִזְרוֹן in Ezek. 36.27 as some thing similar to that of 1 Sam. 10.6 where מִזְרוֹן comes upon the entire group and induces ecstasy. The experience related to Spirit expressed in 1 Sam. 10.6 and Ezek. 1.5–14, 19–21, 28 and 37.1–14 are quite different from that of Ezek. 36.27.
30 See Block (‘Use of RWH’, 35–38; idem, Ezekiel 25–48, 356.
31 Gen. 6:3 is an exception to this.
32 Albertz and Westermann, TLOT 3: 1213.
to observe (נשוע) my ordinances’. The emphasis here is that YHWH’s Spirit will cause (נשוע) the regathered and purified Israel to obey YHWH’s statutes. There are no similar passages in the rest of the Old Testament which express this precise expectation of the Spirit.

The experience of the Spirit in Ezekiel may probably be most closely likened to that in First Isaiah.\(^\text{34}\) In Isa. 11.2 it is the power through which God would lead the messianic figure, who is to guide the people into religious submission and moral obedience ( Isa. 11.2; cf. 42.1), and the power given to him in order to be permanently effective.

But in Ezekiel there are differences. Whereas in Isaiah the endowment of the Spirit is upon the messianic figure,\(^\text{35}\) in Ezekiel it is the regathered Israel\(^\text{36}\) who is endowed with the Spirit. Further, immediately after the promise of the Spirit comes the assurance that ‘you shall be my people, and I will be your God’ (Ezek. 36.28).\(^\text{37}\) In the new covenant, by the infusion of YHWH’s Spirit, the ingathered Israel will be enabled to walk in and observe the commandments of YHWH, and as a result the covenant relationship between God and his people will be restored.\(^\text{38}\)

One may also note the fact that Ezekiel’s promise of the Spirit has an exclusive nature, in that the gift is given to the covenant community of Israel, and the nations are thus excluded from the promise.\(^\text{39}\) The gift of YHWH’s Spirit upon the house of Israel

---

\(^{33}\) The theological usage of the term נשים indicates YHWH’s saving activity in Israel (Gen. 12.2; Exod. 14.13; 15.11; 1 Sam. 11.13). See J. Vollmer, נשים’, THAT 2: 359–369.

\(^{34}\) Ezekiel’s links with Isaiah have been observed by a number of scholars (E. Büchsel, Der Geist Gottes in Neuem Testament (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926) 23–24; Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 500).

\(^{35}\) It is interesting to note that though more than one-fourth of Ezekiel’s prophecies look forward to Israel’s glorious tomorrow, overt references to the messianic figure in the book are remarkably few (34.22–23; 37.22–25). Only by inference can the נשים of chs.40–48 be identified as Davidic, and his role is described in other than royal terms. Surprisingly one will not find a single reference that indicates that he would be endowed with the gift of the Spirit.

\(^{36}\) Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 500.

\(^{37}\) In the Old Testament, this formula frequently occurs in a covenant (_nvoba\) context (Exod. 6.7; Lev. 26.12; Deut. 29.6; Jer. 11.4; 31.33; 32.38). See von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2: 235. The covenantal basis for YHWH’s relationship with Israel is evident not only in the prophet’s designation of Israel as ‘my people’ which occurs more that 25 times, but also in numerous citations of and allusions to the covenant formula, “I will be your God and you will be my people” (Ezek. 11.20; 14.11; 34.24, 30–31; 36.28; 37.23).

\(^{38}\) What Jeremiah (31.33) attributes to the infusion of the divine Torah, Ezekiel ascribes to the infusion of the נשים. In both, the result is the renewal of the covenant relationship.

\(^{39}\) In this passage the term נשים is exclusively reserved for “Israel”, while נשים refers to the other nations. Hebrew has only two lexemes for people נשים and נשים. There are about 356 occurrences of נשים. The combination of נשים and its reformulation in "my/your people" appear typically in the contexts of deliverance and intercession (cf.Jug.5.11; 13; then in J: Exod. 3.7, 10; 5.1, 23; 7.16, 26; 8.16ff.; 9.1ff.; and 10.3f. The formulae are rather frequent within the prophetic corpus (152 occurrences). More than
needs to be understood in line with the prophet’s constant reference to צְבָאֹת (nations) deriding the ישראל (nations) (Ezek. 36.23). Every ‘passerby’ (םִהלֵם) v.34 = 5.14 and the surrounding יהוה will come to ‘know’ (תָּכַר) that יהוה has executed his promise. There are no overt references to indicate that the nations will join the reconstituted Israel; however, the nations are presented simply as the spectators of יהוה’s salvific activity.\(^{41}\)

2.2.2. Ezek. 37.1–14

A second passage\(^{42}\) where the prophet envisages a future coming of the Spirit upon יהוה’s people is the dramatic vision in 37.1–14.\(^{43}\) Central to the vision is יהוה’s promise, where כל־ה־בּוֹצֵא יִשְׂרָאֵל will receive the Spirit, which will enable them to rise from their lost hope to lead a new life in the land of Israel. The assurance of יהוה is directed towards the end that Israel might indeed know that ‘I am יהוה’.\(^{44}\)

---

\(^{40}\) See a parallel usage נִ죠ּ in Ezek. 5.8; 20.9, 22, 41; 22.16; 28.25.

\(^{41}\) The difficulty here is that the text does not mention any concrete consequences that extend beyond this knowledge. See Ezek. 29.6; 36.23, 36; 38.16; 39.23. It is possible to argue that in the final analysis יהוה’s activity on Israel’s behalf has the purpose of other nations coming to know and acknowledge him as God (Preuss, Old Testament Theology 2).\(^{42}\)

\(^{42}\) The play on words, particularly, the eightfold clustering of the noun זכר (vv.5, 6, 8, 9 [x4], 10), fourfold recurrence of the verb זכר (vv.5, 6, 9, 10), the threefold use of בְּבָא and the sixfold reference to the noun בַּּוֹזֵא (vv.4 [x2], 5, [x3]) is recognised by previous scholarship. See, Cooke, Ezekiel, 399; Block, Ezekiel 25–48, 373; idem, ‘Use of RW/’.\(^{43}\)


2.2.2.1 The Expectation of נָשׁוֹן

The phrase “I will put a spirit within you” (v.6) occurs in Yahweh’s command to the prophet to prophesy נָשׁוֹן (breath of life) over the dry bones. This expectation of נָשׁוֹן in v.6 bears close affinity to the priestly thought in Genesis 2.7, and this is further evident from the use of נָשׁוֹן together with terms like נַפְסָיִם and נָפָיִם. In the Old Testament, נָשׁוֹן is usually used in parallel with the term נָפָיִם to denote the common life that is shared by man with other living creatures (Prov. 16.24; Ps. 35.10; Job 7.15).

What stands out in relation to both נָשׁוֹן and נַפְסָיִם is the verb נָשׁוֹן (x 3 in vv.5). Contrary to the usage of נָשׁוֹן as a gift given by Yahweh, the verb נָשׁוֹן indicates something external that is ‘caused to enter’ into the נַפְסָיִם or called out from the נָפָיִם (winds) in v.9. Yahweh will cause the people who think they are dead to live, and by the word of Ezekiel this will happen through the four winds (Ezek. 37.9).

The metaphor here is primarily of new creation or life for the nation of Israel. The people receive new life and they stand upon their feet as an exceedingly great host. The emphasis in v.11 that the bones are נָשׁוֹן indicates a possible link to vv.15–24, where Yahweh promises through the imagery of two sticks that he will make נָשׁוֹן (make) Judah and Israel one nation. The expectation of נָשׁוֹן is in reference to vv.5, 6.

---

45 The occurrence of a very similar phrase in v.6 “I will put נָשׁוֹן within you and you shall live” creates ambiguity in understanding the nature and function of נָשׁוֹן in the passage of our concern and thus requires explanation. The LXX makes a variation –καὶ δύσω πνεῦμα μου ἐξ ὕματι καὶ ζητοῦσα τὸ μου is most probably added under the influence of 36.27, particularly the use of the verb νήσον. Scholars are unanimous in their opinion of the nature of נָשׁוֹן in vv.5, 6 and 9. It is widely acknowledged that נָשׁוֹן referred to in v.6, (cf. 5, 9, 10) is the breath of life. See Eichrodt, Ezekiel 2, 508–9; Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 260–61; Fox, ‘Rhetoric of Ezekiel’s Vision of the Valley of Bones’, 1–15; Greenberg, Ezekiel 25–37, 743.

46 Eichrodt (Ezekiel, 508–9). While Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2, 260–61) considers that the usage is borrowed from the priestly thought. He also supports his argument from passages like Ps. 104.29f; Gen. 6.3, 17; 7.15, 22; Num. 16.22; 27.16; Job 10.12; 12.10; 17.1. For a similar position see, Fox, ‘Rhetoric of Ezekiel’s Vision of the Valley of Bones’, 1–15; Greenberg, Ezekiel 25–37, 743.


48 נָשׁוֹן is one of the most frequently used verbs in the Old Testament, occurring 2532 times. In the conquest passages, particularly in Deuteronomistic literature, נָשׁוֹן becomes a technical term for land inheritance. Faithfulness and obedience to the covenant stipulations are conditions for successful “entering” and “possessing” (B.T. Arnold, יָבֹא, NIDOTTE 1: 995ff). There are 188 references to נָשׁוֹן in Ezekiel. The verb is used in a wide variety of ways. Occasionally, it is used with נָשׁוֹן in relation to the experience of the prophet (Ezek. 3.24; 11.1; 43.5). It is also used in relation to the promise of returning to the land (Ezek. 11.16; 34.13; cf. 36.24; 37.21; 36.8). See H.D. Preuss, ‘ז רו’, TDOT 2: 20–49; E. Jenni, יָבֹא, TLOT 1: 201–204. But נָשׁוֹן is never used in relation to the expectation of the Spirit upon the people (C. Westermann, יָבֹא, TLOT 2: 743–759).

49 See Greenburg Ezekiel 20–48, 744, 748 for further discussion.

50 The verb used here is the most general expression for creation in the Old Testament. W. Foerster, ‘אַתִּיקוּן’, TDNT 3:1008. The specific verbs חֵק כְּרָב יָבֹא הַבְּרֵי never replaced the unspecific נָשׁוֹן during
9 as the breath of life, the life-force that is common to all creatures which will recreate לעבים ובריות כולם as one nation.

Thus the reference to הרוח entering into the עצם (bones) needs to be seen as restoration from death in the normal sense. The use of the verb הרוח (vv.5, 6, 10) suggests that Yahweh will restore the life of the 'house of Israel' by reconstituting them as one nation through the breath of life. 51

The second expression 'I will give/put (י lawy) my spirit (רוחתי) within you and you shall live v.14) is key to our investigation. Verse 14 occurs in the second part of the vision where the imagery shifts from the valley of dry bones to the graves. 52 The Heilswort comes as a response to the lament of the people, "Our bones are יבש (dried up), 53 and our hope is אבדה (lost); 54 we are CUT (clean cut off v.11). 55 YHWH proclaims afresh the truth of return to the land, and the gift of YHWH's Spirit which is further extended by the promise of the people's lasting settlement therein.

The reference to רוחתי in this passage is remarkably similar to that of 36.27. 56 In 37.14 we see that the promise of רוחתי is placed alongside two key phrases, namely, 'you shall live' (חיים) and 'I will place you (יבוש) in your own land'. Both expressions bear resemblance to the usage in Deuteronomy. In the wider Deuteronomistic literature יחיים (life) is associated with YHWH (Deut. 8.3; 32.47), and especially with doing YHWH's commandments (Deut. 4.1; 5.33; 8.1) and with YHWH's...
blessings (Deut. 30.15–20). A closer resemblance to the present passage can be found in Deut. 16.20, where וַיִּשְׁרֵיָה וַיִּרְשָׁהוּ (inherit the land) are associated with the precondition of עֲצָר (justice).

It is important to note that most instances of the notion appear in the exilic and postexilic literature. Interestingly, it is not found in any of the prophets except Ezekiel. Nevertheless, it is found in wisdom literature where וַיִּרְשָׁהוּ is used in reference to the instruction of the teacher; this has no parallels in the book of Ezekiel.

Further similarities to the Deuteronomistic notion are found in Ezek. 20.11, 13, 21; 33.15 (cf. 20.25) where the prophet links YHWH's commandments and וָרָדְתּו. But in deuteronomistic theology the gift of land and blessing is conditional upon Israel's repentance. What is significantly new in Ezekiel is the notion of וָרָדְתּו and its relation to וַיִּשְׁרֵיָהוּ. YHWH's וָרָדְתּו will enable Israel to וַיִּשְׁרֵיָּהוּ (settle) in their own land (v.29). Consistently with the earlier notion (36.27), and particularly by relating וָרָדְתּו to וַיִּשְׁרֵיָהוּ, the prophet continues to emphasise the consequence of the promise of the Spirit; which is to enable the regathered יִשְׁרָאֵל to follow YHWH's ordinances and statutes and thus bring about the renewed occupation of the land.

Here again it is the עֲצָר (37.12, 13), the covenant community (v.13) who are recipients of both וָרָדְתּו (v.6) and וַיִּשְׁרֵיָהוּ (v.14). The prophet anticipates that in the future the life-giving Spirit of YHWH will infuse life into יִשְׁרָאֵל (which includes both the scattered populations of the former northern kingdom of Israel and of Judah, and those who remain at Jerusalem — 11.15; 32.21f.)

57 See Deut. 4.1; 5.33; 6.2; 8.1, 3; 11.8f., 21; 16.20; 22.7; and 25.15.; cf. Lev. 18.5. See von Rad, 'Righteousness' and 'Life' in the Cultic language of the Psalms', in The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays (trans. E.W. Trueman Dicken; London: Oliver & Boyd, 1966) 243–266. See also Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1: 396ff.
58 Prov. 3.1f., 22, 4.4, 10, 13, 22f.; 6.23; 7.2; 8.35; 9.6, 11; 10.17 and 15.24. For a contrast see statements about the path to death in Prov. 2.19; 5.6; 8.36; 15.10 and 19.16.
59 Klein, Israel in Exile, 41 ff.
60 Barth, 'Ezechiel 37 als Einheit', 39–52.
61 The prophet recapitulates the entire range of Yhwh's restorative act (37.23–25) See reference to purging of Israel (= 36.25) and dwelling in their ancestral land (= 36.28).
62 Scholars have noted a redactional hand in 36.27 and 37.1–14; 27. See the 'virtual quotation' from 36.27 in v.14 and the parallel echo of 36.27b in 37.24b point to this factor. See Allen, 'Structure, Tradition and Redaction', 140.
63 Contra to Allen's position ('Structure, Tradition and Redaction', 140), which is that Yahweh would bring about the obedience of 36.27b, namely via a Davidic king who would impose order among God's people, uniting southern and northern elements with his royal staff or sceptre. Unlike the messianic figures who are endowed with the Spirit of God, there are no references indicating the Spirit endowment upon the future Davidic ruler Messiah (34.23–24; 37.15–15–28 cf.1722–24). In the present passage Yhwh's sovereignty is emphasised in the restoration process.
and reconstitute them as one nation. YHWH will also give them his Spirit, which will cause them to live (nu'ah) in the land permanently.

2.2.3. Ezekiel 39.29

The expectation of an end time outpouring of the Spirit is found again in Ezek. 39.29. Here YHWH promises that he will "restore the fortunes of Jacob" (v.25), this once again emerges from YHWH's concern for his own reputation (v.25), and its ultimate purpose is "they shall know (yada') I am YHWH" (v.28).

2.2.3.1 The Expectation of נאך

Unlike the earlier usage (Ezek. 36.27; 37.14), Ezek. 39.29 employs a different expression, נאך (to pour out) for the expectations of the נאך. Interestingly, the combination of the noun נאך and the verb נאך occurs once only in the book of Ezekiel.

A number of scholars have linked the expectation of the נאך in 39.29 with that of 36.27, while others have found 39.29 more consonant with Joel 3.1ff. and Isa. 44.1–5. Contextual considerations are significant for recognising the nature of the expectation of נאך in 39.29. Two expressions are important for our inquiry, namely, "I will pour out" (יָרה נאך) and "I will not hide (יָרה כָּל) my face (נָעֲרָמִי) any more."

---

64 Scholars tend to attribute the basic core to Ezekiel and the subsequent layers to his school (Allen, Ezekiel 1-20, 204). G. Fohrer (Studien zur Alttestamentliche Prophetie 1949–1965 (BZAW 99; Berlin: A. Topelmann, 1967, 204–17) does not deal with this text, and deletes vv.23–29 without discussion, considers it as a gloss, apparently from several hands (p.218). Block ('Gog and the Pouring Out of the Spirit: Reflections in Ezekiel XXXIX 21–29', VT 37 [1987] 266–70) argues that the final unit serves to integrate the Gog unit with the message of chap.33–37. We will be following Eichrodt, Ezekiel, 521; Zimmerli, Ezekiel, 289–9 who interpret vv.25–29 as the conclusion of chs.34–37.

65 See parallel usages in 16.28 (with reference to Israel) and 29.14 (with reference to Egypt). In this passage the reference is to the house of Israel.

66 There is a textual variation in the LXX. Instead of נאך נאך LXX has נאך נאך נאך (my wrath). J. Lust (Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986] 52–53) argues that MT represents a deliberate change in the text at a time when ch.39 was still followed by ch.37 (as in Papy. 967). Against Lust, Block (Ezekiel 25–48, 479) argues that LXX represents a harmonisation with Ezekiel's stereotypical phrase נאך נאך (to pour out wrath). See also Allen Ezekiel 20–48, 202. The Targum supports MT.

67 Cooke, Ezekiel, 423. Eichrodt (Ezekiel, 529, idem. Theology of the Old Testament 2, 57–60) and Zimmerli (Ezekiel 2, 320–321), while considering vv.25–29 as a retrospect to chs. 34–37, argue that the Spirit in 39.29 serves as a guarantee of Israel being continuing objects of divine favour and of the sealing of the future unbroken fellowship by the outpouring of the divine Spirit upon the house of Israel in the final irrevocable union of YHWH with his people. Such an argument is supported by Allen (Ezekiel 20–48, 208–209).


69 Block, 'Gog and the Pouring Out', 268.
In the Old Testament, the verb יָרַשׁ is used with various nuances. In the prophetic writings, though, the verb is predominantly used to speak of YHWH's outpouring of anger and wrath in judgement. Although Ezekiel too uses the verb with diverse nuances, the most noticeable usage is in relation to YHWH's wrath. For example, Ezek. 7.8; 9.8; 20.8; 13, 21, 33, 34; 30.15; 36.18; and 21.36, 22.31 use the phrase יָרַשׁ. In the present passage, Ezekiel changes what was for him a stereotypical threat of judgement — “I will pour out יָרַשׁ my wrath” (יָרַשׁ) — into YHWH's restorative activity — “I will pour out יָרַשׁ my spirit (יָרַשׁ).”

Such a reversal is further evident in the use of the phrase, “I will not hide יָרַשׁ my face (יָרַשׁ) any more.” The notion of YHWH “hiding his face” occurs predominantly in exilic and postexilic biblical material. In the prophetic books these collocations are part of an over-all context, which describes God's hiding as a justified response to Israel's disobedience. Prophets spoke about YHWH “hiding his face” in their threats of judgement (Isa. 5.25; 9.11; 10.4; 30.28; Jer. 4.4, 26; 6.11; 7.20; 21.12; 23.19; 25.37; Zeph. 1.14ff.).

This hiding of the divine face, which occurs only here in the book of Ezekiel (39.23, 24, 29), implies a break in communication that in this context is the opposite of covenant intimacy (v.22, 28). Judah's defeat and exile is explained in terms of YHWH's hiding his face (vv.23-24, 29). It relates to God's punishment of sin and especially to his judgement (cf. Isa. 54.8; 64.6; Jer. 33.5; Mic. 3.4). The exilic

70 Several times it appears in contexts where eating blood is forbidden (Deut. 12.16; 15.23; Lev. 17.13); or in the context of bloodshed or murder (Num. 35.33; Gen. 37.22; 1 Sam. 25.31; 2 Sam. 3.27–29; 20.10; 1 Chr. 22.8; 28.3). It is also used for pouring out of blood at the altar in a cultic setting (Exod. 29.12; Lev. 7, 4, 18). The verb is also metaphorically used to indicate the pouring out of heart or soul to the Lord in earnest prayers (1 Sam. 1.15; Ps. 22.14; 42.45; 142.2; Lam. 2.11).

71 Presumably this explains why LXX has τοῦ ἔμπροσθός μου (my wrath).

72 Ezek. 16.36; 20.28, 33; 23.8.

73 The majority of occurrences are in Psalms and the prophetic books. The original source of this expression is the seeking of YHWH's face (כוןenance) in the cultic place. See S. Wagner, ‘תָּרַשׁ’ ThWAT 5: 967–977. Positive experiences and connotations, “to cause the face to shine” are also mentioned in Ps. 4.7; 31.17; 67.2; 8.4.8; 20; 119.135; and Dan. 9.17. See Zimmerli, Ezekiel 2, 319–20; Block, Ezekiel 25–48, 483; S.E. Balentine, The Hiding of the Face of God in the Old Testament (New York: OUP, 1983) 65–76.

74 Divine abandonment is a prominent motif in Ezekiel's temple vision, given verbal expression by the people themselves when they rationalise their treacherous behaviour with the excuse, "YHWH does not see us; YHWH has abandoned his land" (8.12; 9.9).

75 The expression "to set face against" has special significance in Ezekiel (6.2; 13.17; 15.7; 21.7; 25.2, 21; 29.2; 35.2; 38.2. See J. Engnell, Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967) 126n, 4. For other use of the phrase see Jer. 21.10; 44.11; and Ps. 34.17 cf. Lev. 17.10; 20.3, 6; 26.17; 20.5. It is interesting to note that except for Job 13.14 and 34.29, in every occurrence of this idiom in the Old Testament this response is explicitly or implicitly portrayed as God's reaction to covenant betrayal. R.E. Friedman, 'The Biblical Expression mastir panîm', HAR 1 (1977) 4; Balentine, Hiding of the Face of God, 22–28.
promises in Ezek. 39.29 or Isa. 54.8, for instance, speak of the opposite, namely, that YHWH does not intend any more to conceal his face. YHWH will no longer be then a “hidden God” (Isa. 45.15).

By relating לזר to the expressions, “I will pour out (שפל) and “I will not hide (לא-אפרתי) my face (נפל) any more”, the prophet emphasises YHWH’s permanent restoration.76 This is fundamentally based on YHWH’s concern for his reputation, with the purpose of Israel and the nations being to make known the sovereignty of YHWH. YHWH’s sovereignty is seen in his regathering with the affirmation that “I will leave none of them remaining (לא-אפרתי) among the nations any more”. The pouring out of the Spirit in this passage serves as a demonstration or sign of YHWH’s sovereignty — a point that is consistently made in Ezek. 36.27 and 37.14.

In sum, for Ezekiel the regathered house of Israel will in the future receive YHWH’s לזר. The לזר they will receive will transform them internally, enable them to obey the statutes of YHWH, and empower them to settle and live in the land; and it will be a permanent possession of the people of Israel as a sign of YHWH’s covenantal intimacy.

2.2.4. The Recipients

It is clear from the text that Heilsworte (Ezek. 36.10; 37.11; 39.25) are addressed to the ית-לזר (the whole house of Israel). However, it is important to recognise that Ezekiel, who is addressing a situation in מגלה (the community in exile)77 when referring to ית-לזר, is inextricably linking it with the nation of Israel, which consists primarily of the descendants of the ancestor Jacob/Israel (28.25; 37.25; 39.25, cf. 33.24).

In the book of Ezekiel the favourite designation for his addressee is וייתצו ("house of Israel") and occasionally כני צאלא (‘sons of Israel’).78 Although the nation had been divided into two kingdoms in the 10th century, and ten of the twelve tribes had been swallowed up in the neo-Assyrian empire in the 8th century, Ezekiel uses the designation ‘Israel’79 for all who are left of that nation, currently represented primarily by the state of Judah and the exilic community in Babylon.80 This is clearly evident in

---

76 This is supported by the conjunction יוזב which attributes the permanence of a new relationship by the pouring out of the Spirit upon the house of Israel. See Block, ‘Gog and the Pouring Out’, 268.
78 The phrase כני צאלא occurs 83 times in the book of Ezekiel. Interestingly the phrase כני צאלא – sons of Israel” occurs only 11 times in Ezekiel, but is otherwise common usage in Old Testament.
80 See Greenberg, Ezekiel 21–37, 759.
Ezek. 37.15 and 37.32 which looks forward to a single Israel, under 'one king/shepherd'.

The emerging picture then is that Ezekiel expected a spiritual rejuvenation of יְהֹウェָה, particularly with the gift of the Spirit when the nation will be restored to יְהֹウェָה and prosper in the land of Canaan. What is not surprising is the fact that in the light of his surveys of Israel's history (chs.16, 20), Ezekiel is able to look beyond the present judgement to a new day for יְהֹウェָה's people. Ezekiel's restoration oracles seem to predict literal events; he undoubtedly envisages a real return of Israel to their hereditary homeland of Israel; the coming of the Spirit; the appointment of a Davidic Messiah; and a protracted period of peace and prosperity for the nation, though his vision remains narrowly nationalistic. What Ezekiel affirms is יְהֹウェָה's guarantee — "I am יְהֹウェָה; I have spoken; I will perform." However, we have to be aware of the fact that Ezekiel provides no clear chronology of the future occurrences.

2.3. THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

Consistent with the general notions of the רוח in the prophetic literature, the book of Isaiah, that most complex of the prophetic books, uses the term in a wide variety of senses. The meaning ranges from a common use of רוח as wind or breath to a higher theological notion of the רוח הוהי. There are a number of texts in the book of Isaiah

81 יְהֹウェָה will regather the scattered people out of the countries to which they had been dispersed (11.16-17a; 20.41; 34.11-13a, 16; 36.24a; 37.21a.); יְהֹウェָה will bring them back to their hereditary homeland, which has been cleansed of its defilement (11.17b-18; 20.24; 34.13b-15; 36.24b; 37.21b); יְהֹウェָה will bless Israel with unprecedented prosperity and guarantee the security of the nation in their own land (34.25-29; 36.29-30; 37.26; 38.1-39.29); יְהֹウェָה will restore the dynasty of his servant David as an agent of well-being and a symbol of unity for the nation (34.23-24; 37.22-25); יְהֹウェָה will establish permanent residence in their midst and reorder the worship of the nation (37.26b-28; 40.1-48.35).
82 Ezekiel shows this parochialism by making a clear distinction between יְהֹウェָה's people (ודו) and the תַּמְרָל (nations), used 90 times in the Book of Ezekiel.
83 See 16.62; 20.42; 28.24; 29.21; 34.27; 36.23; 39.7.
84 See 23.34; 26.5; 28.10; 39.5; 39.8.
85 See 12.25; 28; 29.18; 43.11.
86 Although from ch.34 to ch.48 his prophecies of hope become increasingly abstract. However, the vision with the dry bones which function symbolically for Israel, the Gog-Magog oracle (38-39), and the final temple vision are quite ideological. It is not difficult to envision the regathering and revitalisation of the nation as described in chs. 34 and 36.16-38 and the main elements should be taken seriously. See Block, Ezekiel 1–24.
88 The term רוח occurs fifty-one times in the book of Isaiah. See for the meaning of רוח as a designation for wind ( Isa. 7.2; 11.15; 17.13; 25.4; 27.8; 41.16, 29; 41.16, 29; 57.13; 59.19; 64.5), 'breath of life' or
where the eschatological bestowal of the מְרוֹם is mentioned (Isa. 11.1–2; 28.5–6; 32.15; 42.1; 44.3; 59.29; 61.1). 89 However, our interest lies in the texts (32.15; 44.3; 59.29) that foresee a time when YHWH will לְשָׁנָה or לְעָשָׁה (pour or empty out) YHWH’s מְרוֹם upon the people.

2.3.1. Isa. 32.9–20 90

The prophet’s expectation of the מְרוֹם upon people occurs within the context of a Heilsorakel. 91 Chapter 32 begins with a prediction of a coming king, 92 but the section follows immediately after vv.9–14 where the prophet delivers an oracle of judgement against the ungodly women of Jerusalem. But the judgement is reversed with the promise of salvation where the prophet along with his community expects an idealised future that will be not realised until יְהֹוָה לְשָׁנָה רְשָׁעָה.

2.3.1.1. The Expectation of מְרוֹם

This passage is quite unique in the Hebrew Scriptures, in that the prophet does not use the traditional Spirit–anticipatory vocabulary. The customary feature, the reference to YHWH’s Spirit as מְרוֹם, is missing (cf. Isa. 42.1; Ezek. 36.26; 37.14; 39.29; Joel 3.1), and instead the expression מְרוֹם מְלָכָיוּ (the Spirit from on high) is used. Unlike other parallel uses of מְרוֹם where the 1st person singular suffix is used to indicate the locus of

89 See Koch, Der Geist Gottes, 1991; Ma, Until the Spirit Comes, 1999 for detailed discussion.
this concept as YHWH's speech, in this passage it is specifically a prophetic proclamation of his expectation of salvation.

Of particular relevance to our discussion, however, is the use of the phrase היריעה as a designation for the Spirit of YHWH. It is interesting to note that this expression is not at all common in Hebrew Scriptures; the only parallel is found in Wis. 9.17.

The book of Isaiah uses מִרְאוֹת to mean 'high place' in the absolute sense, heaven. Nevertheless, the term is prominently used in the Deuteronomistic and prophetic literature and is generally referred to 'heaven', which is often designated the dwelling place of God (2 Sam. 22.17; Jer. 25.30; Isa. 33.5; 38.14; 57.15; Mic. 6.6; cf. Ps. 93.4; 144.7).

The emphasis on YHWH dwelling on high is a late Deuteronomistic phenomenon, where heaven was stressed as the place of YHWH and the location of his throne (1 Kng. 8.30, 39, 43, 49, cf. 1 Chr. 6.21, 30, 33, 39). It is interesting to note that in these passages the presence of YHWH believed to be found in Jerusalem and the temple is no longer to be conceived too directly and too narrowly, rather these Deuteronomistic texts suggest that YHWH is both located in the temple and also omnipresent. There is an increasing emphasis placed in exilic and postexilic times upon the transcendent aspect of the divine nature. The idea that YHWH was not tied to his sanctuary was demonstrated by the experience and the overcoming of the exile. There are two interesting possibilities here: (1) Since YHWH dwells in heaven his Spirit too dwells

---

93 מִרְאוֹת is used 16 times in the book of Isaiah, of which 6 references are related to heaven as the dwelling place of God (24.4, 18, 21; 32.15; 40.26; 57.15).
96 See B. Janowski, 'Ich will in eurer Mitte wohnen: Struktur und Genese der exilischen Schekina-Theologie', in P. Hanson, et al. (eds.), Der eine Gott der beiden Testamente (1BTh 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1987) 165–193 (178).
97 According to Solomon’s dedication speech in 1 Kgs 8.12ff., the temple is now the dwelling of YHWH, and the verbs יָשָׁב and יָשָׁע are used reciprocally to speak about this divine dwelling. The temple and Zion are perhaps seen in the same way (Amos 1.2; Ezek. 37.6f and Zech. 2.14). However, when Isaiah receives his call in the Jerusalem temple, he does not see YHWH himself there; rather YHWH dwells and remains unseen in the heavens. (Isa. 6.1ff.; Ps. 9.12; 132.13ff.; Isa. 8.18; Joel 4.17). See further discussions in J.T. Strong, ‘God’s Kôbûd: The Presence of Yahweh in the Book of Ezekiel’, in M.S. Odell & J.T. Strong (eds.), The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives (SBLSS 9; Atlanta: SBL, 2000) 69–95.
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there. This led to the possibility of speaking of the בורא of YHWH as the ‘Spirit from on high’. (2) The prophet’s emphasis that with the coming of the Spirit there will be דרומא (justice), שדוק (righteousness), שלום (peace), קמה (quietness) and בטוח (security 32.15–20), which indicates a possible explanation for the virtual absence of allusions to ‘the spirit’ in pre-exilic canonical prophecy. The use of ecstatic techniques and demonstration of spiritual possession by prophets with no true concern for Israel’s well being (Mic. 3.5; Jer. 23) led the canonical prophet to turn from appeals to ‘the spirit’ as the source of inspiration. Here the prophet may possibly be referring to the well-being only YHWH’s ‘Spirit from on high’ can bring.

The verb used here is neither יספ (cf. Ezek. 39.29) nor יספ (cf. Isa. 44.3) nor חנ (cf. Ezek. 11.19f, 36.26f), but דנ (poured out/emptied out) which is used for the first time in Isaiah. Here the Spirit is ‘poured out’ (ausgegossen) after YHWH’s judgement, turning the desert into a fertile field. A similar use of the term is in Deutero-Isaiah where the messianic figure has מחר (poured out) his life unto death (Isa. 53.12). A common redactional element or theological factor that links both passages is that the messianic figure or the Spirit pour out only after Israel is bared in judgement. In 20.3 God had commanded Isaiah to go about barefoot and naked as a sign of judgement; and in 32.11 the prophet warns the women to strip and make themselves naked in the light of YHWH’s wrath, which will leave the land waste until the Spirit is “poured out” in abundance. This outpouring brings about a reversal of the present condition, a spiritual renewal that is, indeed, revolutionary, the very opposite of the condition described.

101 However, this does not reflect the late Rabbinic belief that the Spirit had largely been withdrawn from Israel because of sin until the end. Examples like Wis. 1.4–5; Philo, Deus. 2; Gig. 47, 53 suggest its usage from an earlier period. The exile which on one hand had led to the belief that God’s presence had departed from the temple (since God was greater than any building), also pointed to the real experience that God was to be found wherever people sought him with a whole heart (Clement, God and Temple, 132–133).
102 This is generally explained by reference to the so-called ‘false prophets’ (Mowinckel, ‘The “Spirit” and “Word”’, 199ff.).
103 The verb occurs 16 times in the Old Testament. It means to make bare or pour out, both non- figuratively and figuratively (B.V. Seevers, “DITTOT 3: 529). In Isaiah there are only 4 reference to the meaning ‘lay bare’ is used in 3.17; 22.6 while ‘pour out’ is used in 32.15 and 53.12. See Montague, Holy Spirit, 40; Ma, Until the Spirit Comes, 81.
104 The Greek term χεο is generally used for ‘pouring out’ in LXX (Ezek. 39.29 and Joel 2.28). But in 32.15 the term ἐπξομα is used. The water image is missing from the LXX.
105 Or exposed his soul unto death; he voluntarily laid it bare, even to death’. See E.J. Young The Book of Isaiah (NICOT 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 399.
106 Young, The Book of Isaiah 2: 399.
Scholars unanimously agree that the reference here is to YHWH's Spirit, and the pouring out of the Spirit is seen as the sign of the beginning of the new age. However, diversity of opinion is maintained concerning the functional operation of the Spirit in this passage. The role of the Spirit is described as making the entire world fruitful and productive or as similar to the messianic forecasts (32.1) or refers to the power for new life for the people of God.

Although there is an element of new life that is evident in the text, the Old Testament concept of blessing is particularly suggestive in this passage. The expectation of the Spirit is given in a context of reversal, a reversal in the situation from a strong denunciation of complacent women who will shudder and beat their breast when the vintage fails and the land of (my people) yields only (thorns) and (briers) to fertile earth that produces abundantly.

In contrast to the announcement of doom, however, Isa 32.15–20 describes the new future of Jerusalem when the spirit of YHWH will be poured out upon people. Then people will receive agricultural blessing: (wilderness) will become (fruitful field), which will then become (forest). (righteousness) will abide in (peace), (quietness) and (security). As a result there will be (justice) will dwell in (forest). Justice will be established in the land and the inhabitants of the city will live in "peaceful houses, tranquil dwellings". This reversal of Jerusalem's fortune is based clearly on YHWH's sovereignty.

We cannot, however, overlook the fact that in their reversal motif the passages in 32.15–20 bear their closest resemblance to the blessing and curse tradition. In the

---

112 For similar usage see Isa. 5.6; cf. 7.23–25; 27.4.
114 All commentators translate יִרָמָל as fruitful fields. But LXX maintains Χερμάλ. Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39*, 1273, thinks the Massoretes thought of the mountain near Haifa. Watts, *(Isaiah 1–33*, 416 does not agree with this proposal. The word יִרָמָל is commonly used to indicate fertility or a fertile place (Jer. 2:7; 4.26).
promise of the Spirit, where we find an assurance from YHWH in which he calls Israel 'my people', a phrase diagnostic of covenant contexts.  

2.3.1.2. The Recipients

The identities of the potential recipients are to be seen from the previous section (vv.9–14). The didactic opening formula (v.9) with its 'summons to lament' (v.11f) is addressed to the complacent women, who are enjoined to mourn for the coming destruction of fields and house of the קִרְיוֹת יִהוּדָה ("joyous city" v.13). The accusation, clear though made indirectly, is expressed in the words descriptive of the women (v.9 and v.11) and the reference to קִרְיוֹת יִהוּדָה ("joyous city" v.13). The climax of the announcement is in v.14; clearly, the prophet has Jerusalem in mind. For he prophesies that "the palace will be forsaken, the populous city deserted; the hill and watchtower will become dens forever, a joy of wild asses, a pasture of flocks." It is reasonably certain from v.14 that the women addressed in the passage were living in Jerusalem and the expression המי in v.13 indirectly points to the fact that they belong to the people of YHWH. The structure of the saying indicates that its focus is on Jerusalem, a scene possibly after the destruction of 587 B.C.E.

With the above background in mind, in the immediate context the recipients referred to as 'us' are possibly a group of women. However, in v.18 there is evidence that the scope of the recipients is extended to כלם (my people) as a whole. It is difficult, then, to determine the actual recipients of the gifts of the מַקְדָּשָׁה, as Isaiah chs.1–39 use various terms and phrases to refer to YHWH's people. The term כלם most commonly refers to those who dwell in Zion, or Jerusalem, or Judah (10.24; cf. 1.3; 3.12; 5.13; 26.20). The text supports the view that only a community that has

---

122 See Exod. 6.7; Lev. 26.12; Deut. 29.6; Jer. 11.4; 31.33; 32.38.
124 See Isa. 60.15; 62.5ff; 65.18.
126 It is possible to argue that the present passage reflects a conscious post–587 B.C.E. redactional shaping meant to foreshadow themes which emerge in full force in chs. 40–55 and 56–66. For e.g. The Assyrian foe of Isaiah's day (10:5–11) is viewed as a type for which the later Babylonian destroyer serves as an antitype (23:13). The assault of 701 B.C.E. (1:1–9) foreshadows the destruction of 587 B.C.E. (6:13), just as the return of the destroyed N kingdom (721 B.C.E.) anticipates the full restoration of Israel following the Exile (11:10–16). See discussions in R.E. Clements, The Prophecies of Isaiah and the Fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E., VT 30 (1980) 421–36 and M. Sweeney Isaiah 1–4 and the Post-Exilic Understanding of the Isaianic Tradition (BZAW 171; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988).
127 For example, נְבוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל (sons of Israel e.g.17.3, 9; 27.6); בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל (houses of Israel – e.g. 8.16); בְּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל (house of Israel – e.g. 5.7); נְבוֹת מִצְרָיִם (man of Judah – e.g. 5.7); נְבֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (outcast of Israel e.g.11.12); בֵּיתlickr (dispersed ones of Judah – e.g. 11.12); בֵּית עִקְּב (house of Jacob – e.g. 2.5).
experienced and then lived through the judgement expects the gifts of the  הוה וה and sees in itself the nucleus of the new beginning after exile. The possibility here is that of a רעאלא (remnant Israel — 10.20). In Isa. 28.5–6, a leader is promised for the remnant, to whom is given a spirit of justice. With this leader and warriors to whom God will grant might, the remnant community will enjoy the eschatological promise of restoration which includes the return of exiles (cf. 32.1).

It is possible to conclude that a remnant community that experienced judgement are the ones who long for the Spirit. The prophet and the community expect that once the Spirit is poured out from heavens their physical environment will be reversed both in terms of natural fertility and spiritual renewal.

2.3.2. Isa. 44.1–5

After an oracle reviewing Israel’s unfaithfulness (43.22–28) the prophet proclaims YHWH’s faithfulness (44.1–5). In 43.22–28 YHWH presents the case: “your father first sinned” and “your mediators transgressed” as the reason for YHWH’s turning Israel over to exile (v.28). To make a sharp contrast to the harsh realities of YHWH’s abandonment, the Heilsorakel in 44.1–5 begins with the conjunction יְהוָהַ (but now), after which YHWH promises that יְהוָה יְהוָה (He will help you) by pouring out upon יְהוָה (your descendants), and that ‘I will bless יְהוָה יְהוָה (your offspring).’

2.3.2.1. The Expectation of יְהוָה

Unlike the traditional Heilsorakel vocabulary used for the coming of Spirit, viz. רצונ (Joel 3.1), יְהוָהנ (Ezek. 36.27) and יְהוָהנ (Isa. 32.15), יְהוָהנ (pour out) is used here. However, the traditional imagery of the Spirit being poured out like water/oil is maintained. The objects of יְהוָהנ are יְהוָהנ (your descendants) and יְהוָהנ (your

---


129 Westermann, Prophetic Oracles, 35.


131 R.F. Melugin (The Formation of Isaiah 40–55 [BZAW 141; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1976] 116), observes that past and future are contrasted, however, when 43.22–8 and 44.1–5 are placed side by side. The participle יְהוָהנ (44.1) makes the connection between these two texts, expressing the relationship between past and future.

132 יְהוָהנ is used only once in Isaiah. Commonly used in the cultic settings, for e.g. to pour out blood (of sacrifice— Lev. 2.1.6 etc.); to pour out oil in anointing (1 Sam. 10.1) or pour out water as in 1 Kgs 18.38.

133 The Greek translation (LXX) loses the water imagery by using רצונ.
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offspring), and this is the first time that נָשִׁי and נִגְדָּה in the whole of Old Testament.

There is diversity of opinion concerning the nature and role of נָשִׁי in the present passage. Opinions range from considering נָשִׁי (v.3b) as the prophetic Spirit of the eschatological era (cf. Isa. 11.2; Joel 3.1-2), to supposing it to refer to the Spirit’s role of restoring Israel’s priesthood, but the text would not support any such deductions. Most scholars contend that the creation language reinforces the life-giving effect of the Spirit. This is supported by its occurrence in parallel with water, which in the Old Testament is the source of refreshing, regeneration and vitality. The Spirit expresses the divine power which creates life in human and nature as Gen. 2.7; Isa. 32.15 and Ps. 104.3; this is the only meaning which can make it parallel to נָשִׁי which is used in its original sense of vitality or power which bestows fertility.

The promise of נָשִׁי is delineated in vv.2b-5 in two distinct yet related metaphors, viz, the outpouring of waters upon the dry land and Israel's revitalised growth as willows by the waterside (vv.4-5). The focus of transformation is upon the revival of the people of Jacob/Israel/Jeshurun. The image of water in the dry land is a prominent metaphor in Isaiah ( Isa. 12.3; 30.25; 32.2, 25; 32.31; 35.6; 41.18; 43.20; 51.3; 55.1; 66.12) and generally used in the context of YHWH's salvation, while נָשִׁי (a thirsty one) and נָשִׁי (a dry place) refer to the barrenness of Israel in exile. Here, the

---

134 These word pairs are used in Isa. 48.19; 61.9; 65.23 always in the context of YHWH’s promise.
137 North, Second Isaiah, 131.
140 See the variation in the usage: MT ‘For I will pour water on a thirsty, and streams on a dry place; LXX: ‘For I will give water to the thirsty that walk in the dry land.’ Targum: ‘For just as waters are provided on the land of a thirsty place, and flow on the dry ground’. יָבֵנָה can certainly be said of people's yearning for God, Ps. 42.3; 63.2 (C. Propp, Water in the Wilderness: A Biblical Motif and Its Mythological Background (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987)).
141 Most scholars argue for a metaphorical interpretation. See J.D. Smart, History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40–66 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965) 110; North, The Second Isaiah, 133; J.N. Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah 40–66 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 166; Schoors, I Am God Your Saviour, 79–80. “Thirsty” apparently does not refer to the lands, as the parallelism might lead one to believe. If that were true, it should be feminine to agree with נָשִׁי (dry land). Instead as a masc. form יָבֵנָה functions as a noun referring to persons (as it does uniquely in the book 21.14; 29.8; 32.6; 55.1). The person thirsting for God also appears in Ps. 143.6. While this is still a figurative usage, it indicates that the focus is spiritual, not solely physical.
outpouring of water on the thirsty land is not just a zweiter Exodus aus Babylon;\(^{142}\) rather it is God's coming (40.3–5) to transform Israel as the eschatological consummation at the end of the age.\(^{143}\)

The nature of בְּרָעָה as vitality and power that bestows fertility is explained further in the results of the outpouring. First, v.4 obviously means the increase of the people of YHWH in number, since the antecedent they (יִשָּׁחְצֵנֵהוּ — ‘they shall spring up’ v.4) is only the descendants and offspring in v.3, and thus does not refer to vegetation but to people. One should see this against the background of the destruction of Israel as a people in 43.28. Perhaps North is right to surmise that the exiles were unwilling to start families in view of the uncertainty of the future.\(^{144}\) It is possible to argue that the image of ‘dry’ and ‘thirsty’ may reflect the decrease in numerical strength and a promise of increase through the power of the Spirit. In its context this interpretation is supported by a) the picture of the growing grass and the willows by the stream,\(^{145}\) and b) predications in the messenger formula, (v.2a) that as Israel’s ‘Maker–Former–Helper’, YHWH will continue his work of salvation and will not allow his people to perish. Through יִשָּׁחְצֵנֵהוּ יִשָּׁרֵיִּינֵהוּ Israel has new chances of life and through YHWH’s blessing Israel will become a great people.

Deutero–Isaiah’s presentation of the function of בְּרָעָה is unique in its relation to ‘my blessing on your offspring’, a point which has not yet been taken sufficiently seriously by scholars.\(^{146}\) The effect of the Spirit in relation to the blessing of descendants finds its closest resemblance in the promises to the patriarchs in the Old Testament (Gen. 12.3; 22.17; 28.14).\(^{147}\) The promise to bless the nations through Abraham’s descendants is rare outside the patriarchal narratives,\(^{148}\) and occurs only in Deutero–Isaiah (44.3; 54.3). It is also interesting to note that the root בְּרָעָה does not occur at all in pre–exilic texts. Only from Deutero–Isaiah onwards does this term describe God’s future activity.\(^{149}\) This is because the promise of numerous increase and of Israel

---

\(^{142}\) In 32.15 the reference is to the restoration from Babylon, while in 44.1–5 a more general renewal of the people and their life.

\(^{143}\) Smart, History and Theology, 110.

\(^{144}\) North, Second Isaiah, 131ff., in the light of Jer. 29.6.

\(^{145}\) Ma, Until the Spirit Comes, 86.

\(^{146}\) Koch, Der Geist Gottes, 121, mentions this in passing. See also Ma, Until the Spirit Comes, 86.

\(^{147}\) It is generally acknowledged that Deutero–Isaiah uses patriarchal tradition frequently (41.8; 51.1; 49.5–6; 8, 19, 20ff; 54.3). See J.V. Seters, Abraham in History and Tradition (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1975); H.W. Wolff, ‘Kerygma of the Yahwist’, in W. Brueggemann et.al. (eds.), Vitality of OT Tradition (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982) 47–49.

\(^{148}\) See discussions in J.R. Wisdom, Blessing for the Nations and the Curse of the Law, Paul’s citation of Genesis and Deuteronomy in Gal. 3.8–10 (WUNT 2/133; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 2001) 36–42.

\(^{149}\) Isa. 44.3; 51.2; Ezek. 34.26; Joel 2.14.
becoming a בְּרִיכָה can only properly be understood against the background of hope in the exilic period.\textsuperscript{150}

A further result of the outpouring of the spirit is closely interlinked with the descriptions in v.5.\textsuperscript{151} Commentators are divided over the nature of the speakers described here.\textsuperscript{152} A number of scholars suggest that the reference is to the people of Israel,\textsuperscript{153} while others say that the reference is to enthusiasm among the exiles to resist the forces of assimilation, such as using Babylonian names, and to belong instead wholly to YHWH.\textsuperscript{154} The difficulty arises from the context, because it is improper for any Israelite born to reaffirm himself as Jacob, or to add the name Israel to his own.\textsuperscript{155}

Perhaps not surprisingly, it must be stressed that the majority of commentators hold that non-Israelites are referred to in this verse. Whybray and Elliger see a reference here to those who, having seen the coming glory of Israel, will join the people of YHWH (reference is made to Isa. 56.3, 6–8).\textsuperscript{156} The speaker must be representative of non-Israelites who witness the work of the life-giving spirit within Israel, and are so convinced by the absoluteness of YHWH that they turn to him.\textsuperscript{157} This is consistent with the broader context of 43.22–44.5, where the creed of the former heathens and their accession to Israel form a counterpoint to the taunts of 43.28. 42.1–19 has already

\textsuperscript{151} "This one will say, I am the LORD's; another will call himself by the name of Jacob, and another will write on his hand, The LORD's", and surname himself by the name of Israel."
\textsuperscript{152} For detailed discussion on text critical issues see Watts, Isaiah 34–66, 140; Koole, Isaiah, 364–365.
\textsuperscript{153} W. Grimm and K. Dittert (Deuterojesaja: Deutung – Wirkung – Gegenwart [Stuttgart: Calwer Bibelkommentare, 1990] 220–221) argue that the reference is to the Israelites. But these are not supported by the references in 44.5; cf. 43.22–28. A. Laato, (Servant of Yahweh, 101–102) suggests a return of disloyal Israel to join the loyal and true Israel which will return to Judah. See also N.H. Snaith, 'Isaiah 40–46: A Study of the Teaching of the Second Isaiah and its Consequences', in Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah (VT Sup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967) 184.
\textsuperscript{154} Watts, Isaiah 34–66, 144. See also Motyer, Prophecy of Isaiah, 342.
\textsuperscript{155} Westermann, Isaiah 40–66, 135–37.
\textsuperscript{156} Whybray, Isaiah 40–66, 95; K. Elliger, Deuterojesaja (BKAT 11.1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1978), 275–282, 364–370. J. Muilenburg, (‘Isaiah, Chapters 40–66, Introduction’, IB 5, 503) adds, "On one hand, the foregoing context would seem to suggest that the reference is to Israelites (vv.1–2); on the other, the return of disloyal Jews would not be nearly so much of a wonder as the conversion of aliens." Stuhlmueller (Creative Redemption in Deutero–Isaiah, 130–131) listing the reasons given for identifying those mentioned in this verse with Gentiles, adds that an Israelite in turning from the way of sin to the way of the Lord does not say that now he can begin to call himself Jacob and Israel. Elsewhere Deutero–Isaiah points out that even in their worst apostasy, YHWH never rejected his people as his own. He adds that it would be normal for a newly–converted Gentile, upon his full acceptance within the Israelite community, to exclaim that he is the Lord's and is named after Jacob and Israel. Recently, Ma, (Until the Spirit Comes, 87) has supported this argument.
\textsuperscript{157} Westermann, Isaiah 40–66, 138; Skinner, Isaiah XL – LXVI, 52–53; North, Second Isaiah, 134; Muilenburg, 'Isaiah, Chapters 40–66', 503; C. Stuhlmüller, Creative Redemption in Deutero–Isaiah (AnBib 43; Rome: Biblical institute press, 1970) 129n.448 and 130–31, identifies the speaker with Gentile proselytes to whom an invitation is extended to come to Jerusalem and worship in the temple.
talked about salvation for the world; and anyway it is not at all strange, historically speaking, that this pericope should talk about proselytes, for non-Israelites had traditionally been incorporated in the national community.\textsuperscript{158}

The thought of foreigners joining the returning exiles is not especially characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah; but equally, neither is the idea of their belonging specifically to the people known as Israel notably absent from his work (14.1; 44.5; 45.14; 49.7; 55.5). It is significant for us to recognise that for Deutero-Isaiah the exiles shall be led home to Zion, in an act of redemption that the nations themselves shall see, and that will attract and lead them to the knowledge of YHWH.\textsuperscript{159} Since the nations were included within the activity of YHWH's salvation, Israel becomes YHWH's witness to them (Isa. 43.10; 44.8; 55.4); Israel and the chosen servant of God are the "light to the nations" (Isa. 42.6; 49.5f.; cf. 51.4).\textsuperscript{160} This indicates that YHWH's activity on behalf of his people will possess an outward-looking power of attraction (cf. Isa. 60.1–3), that works particularly via the outpouring of the Spirit and by blessing the descendants (Isa. 55.4f.) to demonstrate the truth of YHWH before the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{161}

When investigating the effects of the Spirit upon Israel, we have argued that there would be a natural increase in the prosperity of the descendants and an increase in and spread of worshippers of YHWH due to the accession to the community of non-Israelites.

### 2.3.2.2. The Recipients

Deutero-Isaiah's favourite designations for his primary audience of YHWH's promise of salvation are יسرائيل ובериалי (Jacob my servant) and ינשראיאל והבריה (Israel, my chosen one).\textsuperscript{162} The prophet is consistent in tracing Israel's ethnic origins back to the

\textsuperscript{158} Elliger, 	extit{Deuterojesaja}, 239.

\textsuperscript{159} While Deutero-Isaiah was able to feature the election of Israel by YHWH (Isa. 41.8f.; 43.10; and 44.1f) as no other prophets did, he also was the one who at the same time expresses a positive view of the nations. See Isa. 41.17–20; 45.4–6; and 49.26; cf.45.14–17, 18.25.

\textsuperscript{160} Deutero-Isaiah's indication that the Gentile share in salvation is based on their response to God's saving vindication of Israel, and especially the gift of the Spirit in the eschatological future, may be the reason why the passages that refer to the 'eschatological pilgrimage of nations' (Isa. 2.2; 18.7; 60.1–22; 66.18–21; Zec.2.11; 8.20) do directly relate the Spirit to Gentile salvation.

See for e.g. יבלי (my chosen) is a designation that is used of all Israel in 43.20; 45.4; 65.9, 15, 22 cf. 1 Chr. 16.13; Ps. 105.6, 43; 106.5 (Duhm, 	extit{Das Buch Jesaja}, 311). See also H. Seebass, "'Erwähnung' I: Altes Testament", 	extit{TRE} 10, 1982, 182–189. In looking at the theological distribution of the specifically theological usage of this word, one notes that it receives particular emphasis in Deuteronomy (twenty nine times), Deutero-Isaiah (seven times), and Psalms (nine times). In the present passages יבלי is replaced by the name יישראל (v.2b). See Deut. 32.15; 33.5,26; Sir. 37.25. Interestingly, LXX translates יישראל as ἡ ἡγεσιμένος Ἰσραήλ.
patriarchs, and particularly to Jacob, who functions simply as a correlative of Israel. The repetitions of formulaic designations for Jacob and Israel are numerous in the book, and Deutero-Isaiah applies the name Jacob/Israel variously to the exiles of Judah in Babylon and to the remnant in Jerusalem.

However, according to 44.3 the recipients of the outpouring of Spirit are דֵּעֶן (your descendants) and כִּנְדִי (your offspring). The present promise speaks of a restoration beyond judgement where YHWH is inaugurating a new action in history in relation to his people. One possibility is to see this in the light of Job 21.8 which mentions of the wicked, that “their children are established in their presence and their offspring before their eyes”. This may suggest that the expectation of the Spirit is in the immediate future when the Israelites will return to their land (cf. Lev. 22.13, 1 Sam. 1.2.), and that the prophets’ predictions of the Spirit in the future may be described as the end of the offspring of the wicked. Another possibility is to see the promise as a distant possibility. Deutero-Isaiah’s emphasis on descendants and offspring also seems to suggest some future historical reality.

One cannot ignore the repeated use of כָּלַי (this one). Scholars are of diverse opinions concerning the term; a few exegetes argue that its focus on individuals means that only a few will be involved, while others argue that the threefold repetition means that many will come. It appears that the point is, in fact, twofold: the author is clearly talking about individuals, persons who of free choice and pure intent step forward to give themselves consciously to the God of Israel, the God of the covenant. This is evident from כָּלַי which speaks of putting oneself at YHWH’s disposal and of recognising oneself to be his own possession. As noted earlier, כָּל (this one) represents non-Israelites. However, one cannot be certain whether כָּל (this one) is a recipient of the Spirit; but although the passage is unclear about whether or not the Gentile will receive the Spirit, the inclusion of Gentile proselytes into the covenant as a

---

163 The patriarchs are named about 23 times: Abraham once; Isaac never; Jacob twenty two times.
164 Expressions like יִתְנָקֵל אֶצֶד (Jacob my servant 44.1, 2; 45.4), יִתְנָקֵל (Jacob whom I have chosen); יִתְנָקֵל (offspring of Jacob); אֶתְנָקֵל (house of Jacob); or שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (Tribe of Jacob); or שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (Israel, my chosen one – 41.8; 44.1; 45.4; 49.7); שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (house of Israel); שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (remnants of Israel); שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (men of Israel 41.14); שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (all the offspring of Israel 45.25); שׁוּבָא בְּרָאוֹת (all the remnant of the house of Israel 46.3) are significant for the prophet.
165 כָּל אֱֽלִישָׁבָא בְּרָאוֹת (all the remnant of the house of Israel 46.3) is of significance here.
167 For example, Whybray, Isaiah 40–66, 95.
168 J.L. McKenzie, Second Isaiah (AB; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968) 64.
169 For example, terms like לְכָל אֱֽלִישָׁבָא (all members of Israel) designate ownership to the king (1 Kgs. 20.41; Ezek. 9.4). North, Second Isaiah, 133.
result of the outpouring of the Spirit on Israel itself is phenomenal. For Deutero-Isaiah this is possible through the reappropriation of Abrahamic blessing.

To conclude, the coming of the new age is attributed to the ‘outpouring’ of the ‘Spirit from above’ (32.15) where the prophet and his community in Jerusalem hope for an imminent realisation of this long-awaited day of restoration. The recipients will experience YHWH’s reversal of fortunes, agricultural abundance, physical and emotional security, and moral restoration. In 44.3 the מָרָא of God will be poured out upon מַשָּׂא (your descendants) and upon נֶתֶנֵךְ (your offspring). As a result the מָרָא will bring numerical growth to Israel (44.3) which in turn will cause the Gentiles to turn to YHWH. Although the passage is not clear about whether the Gentiles will receive the Spirit, the inclusion of Gentile proselytes into the covenant as result of the outpouring of the Spirit itself is highly significant.

2.4. The Book of Joel

Unlike his contemporaries, the author of the book of Joel uses the term מָרָא only twice, uniquely to refer to the Spirit of YHWH (מָרָא x 2 in 3.1–2).

2.4.1. Joel 3.1–2

The present passage is part of a larger unit — Joel 2.18–3.5 — which is generally categorised as the Gattung of an announcement of salvation. In 2.18–3.5 the prophet

---


171 The general notions that are often attributed to מָרָא among Joel’s contemporaries, namely wind, breath, and human cognition or desire are obviously missing. For example, Joel makes a distinction between מָרָא and רָעָה. He uses רָעָה to refer to the seat of human will in 2.12, 13, probably pointing toward the postexilic developments on the use of the terms (Johnson, Vitality, 76; Albertz and Westermann, מָרָא, TLOT 3: 1208ff.).

172 Both these references appear in the second part of the book (2.18–3.21) where YHWH promises restoration for his people.

173 Hebrew verse divisions will be used hereafter. The MT of Joel 3.1–5 is English 2.28–32 and the MT of Joel 4.1–21 is English 3.1–21.

174 Joel 2.18–3.5 is generally considered as a single unit. See Wolff, Joel and Amos, 58; G.S. Ogden, ‘Joel 4 and Prophetic Responses to National Lament’, JSOT (1983) 26:103; idem, Joel & Malachi: A
records YHWH’s promise of salvation in response to the lament of the people. YHWH will restore the land to fruitfulness (2.19, 21–26), deliver Judah from their enemies (2.20), and assure his people of his presence among them (2.27). The goal of the promise is that His people may know YHWH (2.27). It is at this stage that the Spirit is promised upon all sections of society, followed by cosmic upheavals and salvation for those who call upon the name of the Lord.

2.4.1.1. The Expectation of  המושג

Key to our interest is the phrase "I will pour out (ךָשְׁעַי) my spirit upon all flesh" (ךְל-כָּנֵי). The conventional linguistic features related to an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit are evident: (1) the first person singular usage הירח as a reference to YHWH’s Spirit; (2) The verb יָמָש (Ezek. 39.29) which is generally used to signify the lavish measure and the extensive scope of YHWH’s gift.

However, there are scholarly differences in the treatment of the expectation of the Geistausgießung in 3.1–5. Bewer believes it to be the experience on the part of everyone (old and young, male and female, high and low) of those ecstatic spiritual states which had always been regarded as caused by a, or by the, Spirit of God. Joel however, hardly expects such a phenomenon (1 Sam. 10.10, 11; 19.20–24) in 3.1–5. Daniel Lys suggests that the promise of the Spirit to Israel is for the purpose of effecting the conversion and salvation of the nations of the world. But there is no suggestion of this in 3.1–2, and the broader context explicitly excludes this interpretation. Gowan argues that it refers to the ‘direct access to knowledge of the will of God’ which had always been thought to be a special gift afforded only to few (Exod. 35.31; I Sam. 11.6; 16.13 etc.). But in Joel, dreams and visions are not presented as enigmatic ways of knowing God.

---

Wolff, Joel and Amos, 58; Allen, Books of Joel, 97; Garrett, The Structure of Joel, 289–97.

See parallels in Ezek. 36.23, 28; 37.6, 14; 39.28.

For example Isa. 42.1; 44.3; 59.21; Ezek. 36.27; 37.14; 39.29; Hag. 2.5; Zech. 4.6; 6.8.

There are three occurrences of the term יָמָש in the book of Joel (3.1, 2 & b 4.19), twice referring to the pouring out of the המושג.

Bewer, Obadiah and Joel, 122.

Wolff, Joel and Amos, 66.


We may find such an echo in Num. 12.6–8, where the verb יָמָש is used along with תָּשָׁע and יָמָש, but this is absent in Joel 3.1–5. According to the Elohist, dreams and visions are the ordinary
Further, when compared with other prophetic writings, the gift of the Spirit in Joel is not explicitly given for obedience to legal statutes (Ezek. 36.26–27) or for a moral transformation. On the contrary, the author makes it clear that the Geistausgiebung will enable all people to נביא (prophesy) and to receive רשת (dreams) and יסורים (visions).184 In the Old Testament, prophecy,185 dreams and visions186 are means of revelation from God. The corporate gift of prophecy will enable every member of the community to stand ‘among YHWH’s council and [hear] his word at first hand’ (Jer. 23.18).187 Likewise, dreams are a common means of YHWH’s revelation (Gen. 15.1; 20.3; 28.12; 31.11; 37.5; 40, 6–19; 41.1–36) and are a legitimate form of receiving communication from YHWH among the prophets (Jer. 1.11; Dan. 2.7; Ezek. 13.7; Amos 1.1; Zech. 1–6). Here Joel seems to indicate a new prophetic existence,188 where everyone will stand in a relationship of immediacy with YHWH.189 Such an intimate relationship is accented by the use of phrases such as, “all those who call upon the name of the Lord” and “survivors whom YHWH calls” in 3.5. For Joel, prophecy, visions and dreams appear to be characteristic of an intimacy with YHWH, made possible by the Geistausgiebung.

A few scholars have argued that Joel is reflecting Num. 11.29, where the pouring out of the Spirit would make prophets of all of YHWH’s people.191 In Num. 11.29, the narrative points to the fact that the Spirit given in prophetic inspiration was attached to the office of leadership in succession to Moses. Such a picture is not found in Joel, where the context is of YHWH’s restoration of his people.

Many others interpret the present passage (Joel 3.1–5) in line with Ezek. 39.29.192 Thus Wolff considers that Ezekiel’s interest in connecting the deliverance of Jerusalem...
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from the foreign nations with the pouring out of the spirit finds its parallel in Joel 3.1–2. Although one may recognise linguistic similarities with Ezekiel 39.29, the Joel text does not fully support Ezekiel's expectation.

What is more probable is a similarity between Joel 3.1–5 and the Spirit tradition in Deutero-Isaiah, particularly 44.1–5. It is well acknowledged that Joel presupposes many Isaianic traditions. Joel (2.18–3.5) resembles the context and the structure of Isa. 44.1–5. (1) In Isa. 44.1–5 YHWH's promise comes to Israel in spite of their unfaithfulness, which was the reason for their exile (judgement). Similarly, in Joel Geistausgießung comes as the prophet calls Israel to return to YHWH, their God. (2.13). (2) Both texts focus on the transformation of nature (see Isa. 44.3a; Joel 2.19, 22–26). (3) A further parallel is found in the pouring out of the Spirit upon descendants (Isa. 44.3; cf. Zech. 12.10), a tradition that has been elaborated in Joel (Joel 3.1–2). (4) Finally, in Deutero-Isaiah, the immediate result of the promise is YHWH's blessing on offspring and belonging to YHWH, 44.5). As noted above, Joel (3.5) stresses the importance of loyalty to YHWH for the deliverance of Zion/Jerusalem, and it is significant to see even the expressions and belonging to YHWH, 44.5) being used in both Isa. 4.5 and Joel 3.5.

A point of importance, however, is the question of the inauguration of the Geistausgießung. Joel 3.1–5 has several indicators which point to the timing of the event. Of particular interest is the use of the conjunctive formula 'and it will come to pass afterwards' v.l which links an oracle (2.18–2.27) that speaks of a

193 Wolff, Joel and Amos, 66. Similarly, Ogden (Joel & Malachi, 37) points out that the background for the thought in 2.28–29 would appear to be Ezek. 39.25–29, an oracle in which Ezekiel promises restoration from among the nations and no more shame for Judah, together with the additional promise that Judah will know YHWH their God.

194 For example, 'For Yhwh's day is imminent' Joel 1.15 = Isa. 13.6 (cf. Ezek. 30.3; Ob 15; Zeph. 1.7); 'dawning like destruction from the Destroyer' Joel 1.15 = Isa. 13.6; reversal of an image for paradise Joel 2.3 = Isa. 51.3 (cf. Ezek. 36.35); 'Yhwh, am your God - there is no other' Joel 2.27 = Isa. 45.5, 6, 18; Joel 3.10 = Isa. 2.4; 'I will gather all nations' Joel 4.2 = Isa. 66.18. See Wolff, Joel and Amos, 8ff.; Crenshaw, Joel, 27–28 for further discussion.

195 Although there are numerous passages in the prophetic literature (for example, Jer. 31.12; 12.10–11; Hos. 2.12; 21.23; Ezek. 34.26–27) where we find assurance of new fertility for the land, the outpouring of the Spirit and the transformation of nature are linked only in Isa. 32.15 and 44.3 (H.M. Wolff, 'The Transcendent Nature of Covenant Curse Reversals', in A. Gileadi (ed.), Israel's Apostasy and Restoration, Essays in Honor of R.K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1988) 319ff.).

restoration beyond judgement, where YHWH is inaugurating a new action in history in relation to his people,\textsuperscript{197} to a divine promise of extraordinary manifestation (3.1–5).

The progressive thought in the \textit{Leitmotif} of \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּמִּיִּנִּיִּנִּn\textsuperscript{198} provides further directions to the expectation of the Spirit. First, in the book of Joel, the \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּמִּיִּנִּיִּn\) is present as a sign of the nearness of YHWH’s judgment (near; 1.15; 2.11; 4.14)\textsuperscript{199} — namely, a plague of locusts described as a mighty army (Joel 1.15; 2.1–11) that affects the nature and history of Israel and the nations. Second, for the prophet, the coming of YHWH’s judgment in terms of \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּמִּיִּn\) also stands behind the urgent call for the people of Israel to lament and return (2.11–14). It is after the people’s lamentation that YHWH promises salvation, and it is at this progressive point of time that the expression \(וְיֹיִםְיָמִיםָּm \) (‘and it will come to pass afterwards’ v.1) becomes significant. The phrase does not primarily mean the \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּm\); rather, it serves as a purely temporal formula of linkage which envisions some intermediate period of time in the future and/or possibly the time of the descendants.\textsuperscript{200} Third, the promise of the Spirit comes as a response to the people’s lamentation and repentance. Fourth, for the prophet again the \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּm\) as it relates to Israel becomes a day of escape (Joel 3.4b–5) and further is understood as judgement against the nations (Joel 4.14)\textsuperscript{201} Thus the prophet envisages the \(זֵקַת יָמִים\) as a time between \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּm\) — the judgement that breaks in on the people of Judah to bring repentance (so that they may escape) — and the time of final judgement against the nations.

\textit{2.4.1.2. The Recipients}

The recipients of the Spirit in this passage are \(הָּנֵבֵי בָּשָׂר.\) Joel has elaborated the usual second person plural usage ‘you’\textsuperscript{202} to specific categories like \(בְּנֵי הָאָדָם\) (your sons),

\textsuperscript{197} For example, \textit{YHWH} will restore the land to fruitfulness (2.19,21–26), deliver Judah from their enemies (2.20), and assure his people of his presence among them (2.27).


\textsuperscript{199} Everson, ‘The Days of Yahweh’, 331

\textsuperscript{200} Here for the prophet it is a time after YHWH restores the land to fruitfulness (2.19,21–26) and delivers Judah from her enemies (2.20).

\textsuperscript{201} The concept of \(יְהוָהָּּמִּיִּm\) assumes different meanings among the different prophets. See discussions in Pruess, \textit{Old Testament Theology}, 2, 272ff.

\textsuperscript{202} See Ezek. 36.26ff.; 37.14; 39.29; Isa. 32.15; 44.3; 59.29.
(your daughters), (your old men), (your young men), (male servants), and (maid servants) as recipients of the Spirit. 203

Scholars differ concerning the constituency of the beneficiaries of the Spirit. Does have a universal meaning, or is it limited to ‘all Israel’, or even to Jerusalemites? Earlier scholarship considered the reference to as universal, including all humankind. 204 But recent treatments of the subject tend to limit the scope by arguing that is an abbreviation for , a phrase with a clearly more restrictive nature. 205

In the Old Testament, the phrase occurs 40 times 206 and is used in two ways: one which refers to ‘human beings’ in general (Deut. 5.26; Job 12.10; 34.15; Isa. 40.5; 49.26; 66.16, 23, 24; 207 Jer. 12.12; 25.34; 45.5; Zech. 2.14) and the other to all living creatures (Gen. 6.17; 9.16f; Job 34.15). 208

Yet, when we turn to Joel 3.1 the phrase seems to carry a meaning different from its dominant Old Testament usage. Most scholars come to the conclusion that the entire oracle (Joel 2.18–3–5) is addressed to YHWH’s people and the reference to other nations begins only in Joel 4.1. 209 A few scholars have argued that refers to ‘man in infirmity’, 210 but in the present context does not really give this impression, because is not placed in opposition to . 211 It is more plausible that the phrase indicates inclusiveness across different degrees of kinship within society, and particularly the relationships within Israelite/Judahite society.

203 Such elaboration/inclusiveness might have resulted from postexilic concerns over identity, as to who are the real recipients of the promise. R. Albertz, A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, From the Exile to the Maccabees, (vol.2; trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1994) 375.

204 J.A. Bewer, The Book of Twelve Prophets (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1950) 123.


206 The term occurs 40 times with or without prepositions, excluding those with a definite article or pronominal suffix. See, G. Gerleman, ‘כִּלָּבְשָׁר’, TLOT 1: 284.

207 In Deutero-Isaiah is used in the context of salvation, where ‘all flesh’ will see God’s glory, and is invested with worldwide significance (Isaiah 40.5; 49.26; 66.23). In this case there are more possibilities here for universalising interpretations.


209 Wolff, Joel and Amos, 67.

210 Wolff, Anthropology of the Old Testament, 34–35; idem., Joel and Amos, 67; Allen, Books of Joel, 98.

211 Contra McQueen, Joel and the Spirit, 41; Koch, Der Geist Gottes, 129.

Such a notion is implied when the phrase כלא תבוא is elaborated as sons, daughters, old men, young men, male and female slaves.\(^{213}\) The specific reference to בנייכים (your sons) and בנותיכים (your daughters), an all-inclusive category,\(^{214}\) clearly points to the fact that the gift of the Spirit will be poured out upon the future generation (cf. 1.2).\(^{215}\) The author seems to be familiar with the motif of the ‘Spirit pouring out on the future generation’ that is found in Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 44.3) where, as we have said previously, the Spirit is poured out upon הגרד (descendants) and נכרי (offspring).\(^{216}\)

In addition to this, a further category is represented in the terms בנייכים (your old men) and בורותיכים (your young men). These are significant male representatives, older men who have the elevated status of decision-makers\(^{217}\) and younger men who fill the military ranks.\(^{218}\) This bestowal of the Geistausgießung upon ‘old men’ and ‘young men’ clearly suggests a crossing of the age barriers within the society.\(^{219}\)

The category which is most interesting here is the phrase בנייכים (male servants) and נכרי (maid servants).\(^{220}\) The absence of a possessive pronominal suffix (ם) highlights the fact that the extra categories בנייכים and נכרי have different social status outside those already mentioned in the comprehensive expression ‘your sons and daughters’ and ‘your old and young men’.\(^{221}\)

In the Old Testament the phrase occurs both in the patriarchal narratives and in the Deuteronomic literature (Gen. 12.16; 20.14; 24.35; 30.43; 32.5; 1 Sam. 8.16; 2 Kgs. 5.26; Eccl. 2.7) where ‘slaves’ social status as “property”\(^{222}\) is highlighted. It is interesting to note that whereas the majority of those Pentateuchal passages identify the

\(^{213}\) Prinsloo, *Theology of the Book of Joel*, 90.

\(^{214}\) Crenshaw, *Joel*, 165.

\(^{215}\) In the prophetic literature the combination – בנייכים (your sons); בנותיכים (your daughters) generally occurs in the context of YHWH’s judgement. For example, Jer. 5.17; Ezek. 16.20; 23.25; 24.21; Joel 3.8; Amos 7.17.

\(^{216}\) Zechariah too refers to the Spirit being poured upon the descendants, but the scope here is limited to residents of Jerusalem (Zech. 12.10).


\(^{219}\) Koch, *Der Geist Gottes*, 128.


nationality of the ‘male servants’ and ‘maid servants’ as Israelite references occur in
the prophetic literature where ‘male slaves’ and ‘female slaves’ are foreigners (Isa.
14.2; Jer. 34.11, 16). For example, Isa. 14.2 is significant because it could potentially
establish a universal connotation to the phrase we are discussing and possibly develop a
case for understanding the כלא-בשרא having an “all humankind” meaning.
Historically, such an interpretation is not impossible, as when the Babylonian captivity ended following the Persian capture of Mesopotamia, and the Jews returned to their
homeland, a number of slaves and slave women came with them (Ezra 2.64–65; Neh.
7.66–67). The reference to slaves in Joel 3.2 surely carries with it, therefore, the
probability of some Gentiles having been included.

This seems as far as one can honestly move toward an “all flesh perspective”,
and it would be a mistake to view this passage as Joel’s manifesto for a wholesale
incorporation of Gentiles into יְהֹוָה’s covenant through the outpouring of the Spirit. It
is interesting to note that out of all ‘the Twelve’, it is Joel who gives the Gentiles the
briefest treatment. They are presented as sinful figures worthy of punishment,
and charged with mistreating Israel (1.16); indeed, they have scattered the covenant
people to the corners of the earth (4.2), divided Israel’s land, and sold Jewish children
into prostitution for a drink of wine (4.3); and for these and other transgressions יְהֹוָה
will punish them (4.6, 16). Thus 3.1 does not argue for a universal, ‘all humankind’
connotation to the phrase כלא-בשרא; instead, the promise of the Spirit is irrespective of
gender, age or social standing, but it is contextually limited to the listening audience
(possibly the Judahites, probably all Israelites), which may include some Gentiles or
foreigners in its social composition.

The above argument for the inclusion of Gentiles or foreigners in the Israelite social
composition needs to be seen in the light of v.5, ‘calling upon the name of יְהֹוָה’. The use of the ethnically neutral phrases כלא אֶשֶר יִאמָר שְׁמִי הַיּוֹה הַמֶּלֶךְ (all who call
upon the name of יְהֹוָה will be saved) with its inverse form כלא יִאמָר שְׁמִי הַיּוֹה הָרָע (and among the survivors whom יְהֹוָה is calling) are
important in this regard.

223 For example Deut. 28.68; 2 Chr. 28.10; Esth 7.4.
226 Although Joel uses the term רִבָּם (nations) eight times (Hos. x 4; Amos x 3; Obd.x 4; Mic. x 6; Nah. x
2; Hab. x 7; Zeph. x 3; Hag. x 3; Zech. x 19 and Mal. x 4) the treatment on the subject is limited to
Joel 4.2–6.
227 P.R. House, The Unity of the Twelve (Sheffield: Almond/JSOT Press, 1990) 212; Gowan, Theology of
the Prophetic Books, 181–186.
228 Ahlström, Joel and the Temple Cult, 54.
The identities of the ‘caller’ and ‘those who are called’ are not so obvious in the passage. The phrase \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) (everyone whom, 3.5a) recalls \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) (3.1) and gives the appearance of universalism, but that is corrected by the restrictive specification, \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) (those who call upon the name of YHWH). It is highly probable that those who are doing the ‘calling’ once again limit the extent of 3.1’s \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \). In almost all cases in the Old Testament the phrase \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) represents an Israelite audience or caller. 1 Kgs. 8.43 may be an exception, where ‘\(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) (foreigners) and ‘\(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) (all the peoples of the earth) are included in Solomon’s prayer as those who can ‘call the name of YHWH’.

A majority of scholars have interpreted the phrase “all who call upon the name of YHWH will be saved” in the light of its cultic significance. But the present passage attests neither a cultic connotation as in Gen. 4.26; 12.8; 13.4; 21.33; 26.25, nor an expectation of YHWH’s response as in 1 Kgs. 18.24; Zech. 13.9; Ps. 116.4, nor a doxological purpose of proclamation or confession as in Isa. 12.4; Ps. 80.19; 116.13, 17. The phrase is used in 3.5 as a designation of an act that establishes relationship with YHWH (cf. Isa. 44.5), and that is as a confession of loyalty to YHWH; only an individual who confesses exclusive loyalty to YHWH will escape the terror announced by the signs and portents. Such a notion provides us with the possibility of speaking about a group of recipients wider than simply those who reside in Jerusalem.

Joel’s use of Zion tradition — specifically Zion as the place of security and safety — further supports our argument. Zion/Jerusalem becomes the symbol for

---

229 Crenshaw, Joel, 169.
230 The phrase \(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \) occurs 17 times as ‘to call on the name of YHWH’ Gen. 4.26; 12.8; 13.4; 21.33; 26.25; 1 Kgs 18.24; 2 Kgs. 5.11; Isa. 64.6; Jer. 10.25; Joel 3.5; Zeph. 3.9; Zech. 13.9; Ps. 79.6; 80.19; 116.4, 13, 17.
232 A.S. van der Woude, ‘\(\text{יִלְוַנְו} \)', \(\text{TLOT} 3 \), 1359ff.
233 C.J. Labuschagne, \(\text{TLOT} 3 \), 1165ff.
234 Wolff, Joel and Amos, 68. The verb \(\text{כָּלָלָל} \) (shall be delivered) here is significant, in that it often occurs in the prophetic oracles of judgement where YHWH is the subject. The verb indicates survival in the face of grave danger.
236 According to Ollenburger, (Zion the City of the Great King, 146) the use of Zion as a symbol of security and refuge is based first of all on the understanding that “YHWH is present there” (Joel 2.27; cf. Ps. 46.7.8; 48.4) concludes that ‘the central theological notion evoked by the symbol of Zion is the
security and necessity for ‘trust in YHWH’ (3.5). This reciprocal relationship is essential to the covenant. Here it becomes clear that not merely through physical membership in the people of Jerusalem is deliverance guaranteed, but only by the confession of loyalty to YHWH and by being responsive to the new call.237 It is noteworthy that the outpouring of the Spirit of YHWH is linked with the mention of the site of the coming deliverance as Zion/Jerusalem.

Similarly, the phrase נ_traits ניווה קרא אפרים (and among the survivor shall be those whom YHWH calls) create further interest. The terms ירחים (survivors) and פליטים (escapee) are often found in parallelism in other prophetic literature (Ob. 14; Jer. 42.17; 44).238 Scholars are divided on the use of these terms.239 Most treatments have opted to read the phrase as a designation for a “true worshipper.”240 For Wolff the text does not mean Israelites outside Jerusalem, but that same circle of Jerusalemites and Judahites, which is addressed throughout the rest of the book (Joel 1.2).241 Stuart considers them as those who will have managed to live through the destruction and exile of YHWH’s judgement.242

The most probable explanation would be that not only do Jerusalemites escape destruction, but so do other survivors who live outside the city, perhaps even in exile; and that they are referred to here together.243 The phrase נחנו מלחים (but now I will stir them up) in 4.7 probably supports the idea of the existence of Diaspora Israel,244 and thus there is sufficient cause to think that מים (3.1) and מים (3.5) both refer to ‘all Israel’, including even the Diaspora.245 It seems that, Joel makes a point by


237 The security that is found here comes through ‘a posture of subordination and trust’ (Ollenburger, Zion the City of the Great King, 157–58).

238 Wolff, Joel and Amos, 67; Crenshaw, Joel, 165–66.

239 These two clauses remind one of Zech. 12.8–9 speaking explicitly of an exclusion of the saved from a circle of those who will perish; Zech. 14.2 refers to ‘the rest of the people who shall not be exterminated in the city.’

240 Bewer, Obadiah and Joel, 124.

241 Wolff, Joel and Amos, 68; Crenshaw, Joel, 165–66.


244 Crenshaw, Joel, 170.

245 H.G.M. Williamson, Israel in the Books of Chronicles (Cambridge: CUP, 1987) 24–26. This aspect is further evident in the linguistic usages. The book of Joel mentions Zion seven times, Jerusalem six times (three times in parallel with Zion) and Judah six times (three times in parallel with Jerusalem). It is interesting to note that in the ‘oracles of judgement’ (1.1–2.16) the audience is identified as כל ירお得 (2.27, 3.2, 3) (3.19);
using the phrases "כָּל עַמּוֹדִים אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה קָרָא" and תָּהוֹן יְהוָה (all the inhabitants of the land), but also those who confess the 'name of YHWH'.

Geistausgießung in Joel, then, points to a continuing stream of thought concerning the democratising of the יְהוָה in the postexilic period. For Joel the effects of the Geistausgießung are prophecy, visions and dreams, which for him refer to an experience of intimate relationship with YHWH. The similarities with the Deutero-Isaiah tradition, particularly Isa. 44.1–5, further extend the scope of the expectations of the Spirit in Joel. The prophet brings further clarity as to who will receive the Spirit by utilising phrases like "כָּל עַמּוֹדִים אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה קָרָא" and תָּהוֹן יְהוָה in a unique way to incorporate different social categories that are present in Jerusalem as well as amongst those living outside Jerusalem, and he achieves this unique feature in two ways: a) through the elaboration of 2nd person plural בּוֹם (your) to your sons and daughters, old men and young men, but not to male slaves and female slaves; b) by the use of ethnically neutral phrases like "all who call upon the name of YHWH will be saved" with its inverse form "among the survivors whom YHWH is calling." This leads us to conclude that the promise of the Spirit is irrespective of gender, age or social standing, but that it is contextually limited to all Israelites, though that may include Gentiles or foreigners, and does indicate those living in Diaspora.

2.5. The Eschatological Bestowal of upon People in Hebrew Scriptures

The nature of the exilic and postexilic prophetic expectation was that YHWH would pour out the Spirit upon the covenant community when YHWH restored the nation of Israel from their present situation. The Spirit is depicted as the power of Israel's eschatological transformation. On the one hand it brings covenantal intimacy and fidelity to YHWH commandments, while on the other rejuvenation in the nature and security to the nation of Israel.

Thus, Ezekiel anticipated a spiritual rejuvenation of the house of Israel with the gift of the Spirit. It is a sign of YHWH’s regathering of Israel and his covenantal intimacy, and is an agent enabling people to live according to the commandments. The exilic remnant community that Isa. 32.15 represents, anticipated that prior to the coming of the Spirit YHWH would lay bare the people in judgement. The prophet anticipates that

246 For Paul (Rom. 10.13–14), Joel 3.5a is important documentation by which he makes no distinction between Jews and Greeks. He has thereby given a universal interpretation to the 'everyone' (πᾶς) of LXX which renders 'all' in 3.5.
with the coming of the Spirit there will be a reversal of fortunes in agricultural abundance, physical and emotional security, and moral condition. For the writer of Isa. 44.1–5, YHWH has begun his activity of salvation, and as a result will bring numerical growth to Israel which will in turn cause the Gentiles to turn to YHWH. For Joel the coming of the new age is attributed to the ‘outpouring’ of the Spirit; only lament and repentance will bring the long-awaited day of restoration, which will be ushered in by the overwhelming presence of the Spirit. This signals the turn of Israel’s fortune and as a consequence ‘all flesh’ (in Israel) will prophecy and see visions and dreams, which for Joel refer to an experience of intimate relationship with YHWH.

As to the question of recipients of the Spirit, there are diverse anticipations regarding their nature in the eschatology. The Spirit is poured out on the members of the remnant restored community. Ezekiel offers a broader perspective in which it is the descendants of the ancestor Jacob/Israel (28.25; 37.25; 39.25; cf. 33.24) who will receive the Spirit. However, both Deutero-Isaiah and Joel present a brighter picture in relation to the Gentiles. In 44.3 when YHWH pours out His Spirit upon (descendants) and upon (offspring), non-Israelites would join the covenant community. Although the passage is not clear about whether Gentiles would receive the Spirit or not, the inclusion of Gentile proselytes into the covenant as result of the outpouring is itself highly significant. For Joel, the Spirit not only ends all social inequalities, but also increases covenantal intimacy with YHWH, and this will in turn attract a wide variety of people to Mt. Zion, the centre of YHWH’s presence and worship. It is important to observe that it is the general prophetic universalism that welcomed foreigners who join themselves to the Lord within the land of Israel (Isa. 56.3) which provides the basis of such a view.
Chapter 3
ESCHATOLOGICAL BESTOWAL OF THE SPIRIT
UPON GENTILES IN POST BIBLICAL JUDAISM

3.1. Introduction

It is important for the present study to understand as fully as possible the nature of the promise of the Spirit upon Gentiles in the literature of Second Temple Judaism.\(^1\) There are a few documents emerging from the variegated Judaism of the period which refer both to the realised presence and future eschatological anticipation of the Spirit.

Two emerging trends need to be recognised as we endeavour to understand the expectation for universal outpouring of the Spirit during this period. a) The concept of an end-time gift of the Spirit to the people, particularly as the expectations influenced by Ezek. 36.27, Isa. 44.3 and Joel 3.1–5 reappears and is reinterpreted in Jewish literature of the period. b) Though references to an expectation of the Spirit upon Gentiles are minimal, the philosophical/apologetical Jewish literature of this period indicates that the gift of the Spirit is available to all including the Gentiles.

Several important witnesses in this period are silent with respect to the expectation of the Spirit upon Gentiles. In spite of the range of attitudes attributed to the Gentiles, especially their full participation in the eschatological salvation in Tobit,\(^2\) 1 Enoch,\(^3\) 2 Baruch,\(^4\) and Sibylline Oracles,\(^5\) the books are silent in relation to the promise of the Spirit on Gentiles.

The task, then of this chapter is (i) to locate and examine the various references in the post–biblical literature that picked up and reinterpreted the prophetic

---


\(^2\) Tob. 13.11; 14.7.

\(^3\) 1 Enoch 10.21; 90.37–38.

\(^4\) 2 Baruch 72–72.

\(^5\) Sib.Or. 3.657–808.
expectations of the Spirit upon the people, and to identify any developments, and particularly universalist trends, in comparison with earlier examples of the end-time Spirit traditions; (ii) to identify and elucidate other relevant passages in Second Temple Jewish literature that indicate either anticipation or availability of Spirit upon the Gentiles; (iii) to explain the attitude of expectation of the Spirit upon Gentiles, in the light of the above observations, either as marginal or central to the discussion in this period. The main purpose of these investigations is to determine how the conceptual background of expectation of the Spirit upon Gentiles throws light on Paul’s conviction that God has given the Spirit to the Gentiles.

3.2. Prophetic Expectation of the Spirit in the Post biblical literature

The expectation of an end time bestowal of the Spirit on corporate Israel, as noted in the prophetic literature, reappears in several post-biblical texts.6

I have not attempted to investigate on the rabbinic traditions on the subject in any detail, not least, since their relevance for understanding of Paul’s Pharisaic view of the matter is at best questionable. Scholars have already noted the influence of passages from Ezekiel and Joel on rabbinic expectations of the Spirit, however (see discussions in Menzies, Development, 104-111; Turner, Power, 129-132). However, I have noted two passages which may suggest that the rabbis did expect an outpouring of the Spirit upon Gentiles are worth noting. All citations are from David Kantrowitz, Soncino Talmud, Midrash Rabbah, and Zohar on CD ROM, (English Translation of Tanach by D. Mandel; Version Judaic Classics Ild., Institute for Computers in Jewish Life & Davka Corporation 1991-1998).

First, the Midrash on Lamentations 2.8 (= Lam. R. 4.14) refers to three passages traditionally attributed to the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit (Ezek. 39.29; Joel 3.1, 2 & Zech. 12.10). According to the text, R.Judah ha Nasi interprets the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit as part of the four שְׁמֵיכָתֵי מְנוּנָה ("pourings for good").

"There are four pourings [recorded] for good", as it is said, And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication (Zech. 12.10); And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out My spirit upon all flesh (Joel 3.1); And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My spirit (3.2); Nor will I hide My face any more from them; for I have poured out My spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God (Ezek. 39.29)– Lam R.2.8.

What is surprising is that the text does not clearly state whether the ‘pouring out’ is based on the function of the Spirit, or on the category of recipient. Since the text maintains a distinction regarding the recipients – a) the house of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, b) all flesh, c) the servants and handmaids, and d) the house of Israel, it is possible that the rabbis meant that the servants and handmaids were non-Israelites, as is the case in the original context. The discussion on the passage from Eccl. R. 2.11 focuses on the recipients of שְׁמֵיכָתֵי מְנוּנָה in Joel 3.2. “I acquired men-servants (עבדים) and maid servants (עבדות): these are the heathen nations, as it is said, and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out My spirit (Joel III, 2). In the Messianic future they will become servants of Israel, as it is written in Isaiah, and strangers shall stand and feed your flocks, and aliens shall be your plowmen and your vinedressers (LXI, 5)” – Eccl. R. 2.11. The text anticipates that in the Messianic future will be poured upon men–servants (עבדים) and maid servants (עבדות) – interpreted as the heathen nations. As a result of the Spirit’s outpouring the heathen nations will become servants of Israel (עבדים ליישאם). Therefore, Joel 3.1–2 is offered as scriptural proof that in the age to come the heathen nations will be part of Israel. However, this passage seems to be exceptional in the rabbinic traditions and not at all representative of their thought in regard to the nations.
3.2.1. The Septuagint

The scripture of the early church, the Septuagint, continued to maintain the eschatological anticipation of the Spirit bestowed upon people. As the Hebrew Scriptures did, the LXX associated the divine πνεῦμα with the passages central to our concern. πνεῦμα is associated with eschatological renewal of YHWH’s people and land (LXX Isa. 32.15; 44.3; Ezek. 36.25–27; 37.14; 39.29; Joel 3.2).

The translators also retain the nature of the recipients in the LXX of Ezek. 36.25–27, 37.14, Isa. 44.3–5 and Joel 3.1–5. The future anticipation is also maintained by the selective use of verbs — δώσω (Ezek. 36.27; 37.14); ἐπιθήσω (Isa. 44.3); ἐκχεῶ (Joel 3.1); ἐπέλθη (Isa. 32.15).

Second, S. 'Olam Rab.15 makes a reference to Holy Spirit and the Gentiles. The text mentions that the Gentiles were given the Holy Spirit before the Torah was given to Israel. “After the Torah had been given to Israel the Holy Spirit was withheld from the nations.” See discussions in M. McNamara, Targum and Testament, Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament (Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972) 107. The evidence of these midrashim, however, is late (probably Amoraic) and we cannot depend on such views having been in circulation in the first century C.E.


Thus to πνεῦμα μοι (Ezek. 36.27; 37.14; Isa. 44.3; Joel 3.1) for ψυχή and πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὑπνήλου for ψυχήν εἰς.
However, one needs to note two modifications in LXX Ezek. 39.29 and Isa. 32.15. First, instead of τὸ πνεῦμα μου (following רוח) LXX uses τὸν θυμὸν μου. Thus the reading is, “I have poured out my wrath upon the house of Israel”. It is possible that the translators were confused by the recurrent use of verb הקָם with רוח in previous passages (my wrath — see Ezek. 7.5; 14.10; 21.31; 30.15; 36.18 cf. Jer. 6.11; 14.16; LXX Ps. 141.3). It is highly incongruous to maintain the idea of Yahweh’s wrath being poured out upon the ‘house of Israel’ in the context of Yahweh’s promise of restoration!

Second, there is rather more diversity in the LXX’s version of Isa. 32.9–20, and the Greek text has a different reading when it comes to the recipients. The anticipated judgement is not translated as being upon any complacent women (MT 32.9) but upon ‘rich women’ (γυναῖκες πλούσια) and ‘confident daughters’ (θυγατέρες ἐν ἐλπίδι) (LXX 32.9), in the ‘rich city’ (πλούσιον πόλεως) and ‘pleasant houses’ (οἶκους) and ‘villages’ (κώμαι LXX 32.14). Although the LXX translators retain most of the original meaning concerning judgment, the translator distances himself from promise of the Spirit. The recipients of the Spirit expectation are indicated in the 2nd person plural form — ‘you’ (ὑμῶν). Similarly μου (my people) is translated as ὅ λαός αὐτοῦ (his people).

LXX indicates a bias towards the ‘pious one’ (εὐσεβής), and Carmel (Καρμῆλ) will be the place where righteousness dwells. In spite of the difficulties in the text, the LXX translators anticipate πνεῦμα upon ‘his people’, and the eschatological aspiration for the Spirit is still maintained; but there are no developments of thought along the lines of Gentile inclusion. In short, the Greek translators maintain the conceptual integrity of the eschatological anticipation of the MT — the Spirit will be poured out only on Israel.

3.2.2. The Pseudepigrapha

3.2.2.1. The Book of Jubilees

The Pseudepigraphal book of Jubilees, which dates to the middle of the second century B.C.E., conflates various Old Testament passages, particularly those in

10 Contrary to wrath being poured out, LXX Ezek. 39.29 is consistent with the MT in maintaining Yahweh’s programme of restoration. The Targum of Ezekiel follows MT with the addition of ישׁר תר.
11 The Targum also maintains a different reading.
12 Generally there are inconsistencies in LXX regarding the translation of μου. For e.g., LXX Hos. 11.7; cf. 1 Sam.13.8; 2 Sam. 10.13.
Ezekiel, in reinterpreting the coming of the Spirit in Israel’s future hope (Jub. 1.22–23).

The book presents itself as a divine revelation, which was disclosed to Moses on Mt. Sinai. The reference to the Holy Spirit appears in 1.20, where Moses intercedes for his people, and in v.23 where God speaks directly with Moses.

What is interesting is the author’s reinterpretation of the past to address the present. In the first instance the Lord predicts Israel’s apostasy (vv.7–14) when they live in the land. As a consequence God will hide his face (cf. Ezek. 39.29) and deliver them to their enemies. But God reiterates that only after confession of sin and repentance will a new time dawn (vv.15–18). Moses intercedes for the people (vv.19–21) and asks God to “create an upright spirit” (1.20; cf. Ps. 51.10; 1QS 1.24). And the Lord said to Moses, “…I shall cut off the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their descendants (Deut. 30.6; Ezek. 11.19). And I shall create for them a holy spirit, and I shall purify them (Ezek. 36.25b) so that they will not turn away from following me from that day and forever” (Jub. 1.23).

The language here is strikingly similar to that of Ezek. 36.25–27, which also associates a new heart and new spirit, as well as God’s own Spirit, with restoration and the keeping of God’s commandments by Israel. By conflating a version of Ezekiel’s promise of the Spirit with words spoken to Moses the first lawgiver at Sinai, the author drives home an insistent demand for obedience to God’s commands in a time of apostasy. His belief is that God will create a new spirit


In the remaining chapters it is an ‘angel of the presence’ that dictates the contents of the book to the writer. The author gives importance to the angelic activity. For e.g., 1.27; 2.1; 4.21; 12.22; 12.27; 16.16f; 17.11f; 18.10; 41.24. The author’s interests in angels are clearly seen in the reinterpretation of the creation story. Jub. 2.2 reproduces Gen. 1.1–3 but indicates that the author has understood the word נפש in the sense of a spirit or angel. The text then proceeds to enumerate the sundry types of angels or spirits, angels being among the seven classes of works that God created on the first day. See discussions in VanderKam, ‘Biblical Interpretation in I Enoch and Jubilees’, in J.H. Charlesworth et.al (eds.), The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblica Interpretation (JSPSS 14, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) 118–119. However, the book continues to refer to the Spirit of God as the source of revelation in 25.14; 31.12; 40.5.

See Horn, Das Angeld, 39, 146; Keener, Spirit in the Gospels and Acts, 9; Levison, Spirit in First Century Judaism, 252; Turner, Power, idem, Holy Spirit 115; Wenk, Community–Forming Power, 79.


According to the author, Israel had received the covenant but had failed to obey its stipulations (cf. 23:16, 19; 15:33–34; etc.). Both chps.1 and 23 survey the great difficulties, which will beset the
within his people, which would make possible a proper relationship between God and Israel. The author maintains the original motif — the expectation of the Spirit upon Israel. For the author of Jubilees, like Ezekiel, God's restorative activity begins with regathering the people, transforming their hearts, creating a Holy Spirit, and purifying them. As a consequence, in the ideal future Israel will live up to the covenant by obeying all the commandments. God's future dwelling with his people in the temple he creates will be forever (vv.17; 26–28), and he will be their king on Mt. Zion (v.28). Thus the writer develops an emphasis on the role of the Spirit in terms of fidelity to God's commandments.

However, the future anticipation of the Holy Spirit is promised only to Israel, God's chosen first born son (2.19–20). The Gentiles are not part of the author's eschatological perspective and so Jubilees provides no answer to our question.

3.2.2.2. 4 Ezra

We find a possible influence of Ezekiel in the late first century Palestinian Jewish apocalyptic writing of 4 Ezra. The book opens with Ezra greatly distressed over the destruction of Zion and the corresponding prosperity of her enemies (4 Ezra 3.1–3). Ezra prays and recounts Israel's history from Adam to the Babylon captivity (3.4–27), by which he shows the Israelites' continual inability to do right, and

---

19 Most probably reflecting a time period between Judas Maccabeus' war (161 B.C.E) and the breach between the Maccabaeans and the Essenes. See Winternute 'Jubilees', 44–45.

18 The author of Jubilees is poignant in his attitude toward the Gentiles. Hostility to nations is clearly evident in passages like 10.32; 24.28–33; 29.11; 30.4–6; 34.1–9; 38.1–10. Moreover, other nations are separated from God because he has placed spirits in authority over them to lead them astray (10.1–11). In Jub. 22.16 we read, "Separate yourselves from the Gentiles, and do not eat with them, and do not become associates of theirs, because their deeds are defiled, and all of their ways are contaminated, despicable and abominable."


attributes the failing of Israel to an evil heart. Yet you did not take away from them their evil heart, so that your Law might bring forth fruit in them (3.20). However, the present iniquities will be straightened out in the age to come (6.27–28) and the evil heart about which Ezra complained in 3.20 will be changed: 'The heart of the earth's inhabitants shall be changed and converted to a different spirit'. Although it is not clear from the context whether the reference to a 'different spirit' is to the divine spirit or a new human volition to respond to God, in either case the prophet Ezekiel's (Ezek. 36.26f.) influence can be deduced.

Interestingly, the author expands the anticipation of the Spirit to 'earth's inhabitants'. But in the light of the author's attitude of God's gracious faithfulness to ethnic Israel in the age to come, especially when Israel is said to be 'chosen' by God (4 Ezra 6.54) and identified as God's people 'whom you have called your first born, only begotten, zealous for you, and most dear' (6.58), it is difficult to see in this a universal bestowal of the Spirit upon the Gentiles. Other nations are despised as 'nothing', compared to 'spittle', and are said to be as significant to God as 'a drop from a bucket' (6.56).

Building on the traditions of the prophets, for whom the sinfulness of the Jewish people was the reason most often given for their misfortunes, the author of 4 Ezra provides hope to his own contemporaries after the fall of Jerusalem - a future hope where God will reward the righteous, and where the major cause of the present distress, the evil heart, will be changed to a different spirit.

---

23 People's failure to keep the law is constantly mentioned (3.4–36; 14.28–31). The restoration of the law is central to the author's instruction in 4 Ezra. The law is to be restored in order that all succeeding generations might observe it and 'find the path' (14.22 cf. 14.30; 9.31, 37).
24 "For evil shall be blotted out and deceit shall be quenched; faithfulness shall flourish, and corruption shall be overcome, and the truth, which has been so long without fruit, shall be revealed."
25 Some of the early manuscripts (Latin) lack "earth's".
3.2.3. The Qumran Literature

Since, the Qumran community and the wider movement of which it was a part viewed itself as being in many respects in direct continuity with earlier Israel, it is likely that at least some of the community’s hopes would fall within a broad definition of the eschatological anticipation of the Spirit. Thus Qumran’s reinterpretation of passages like Ezek. 36.25–27, Joel 3.2 and probably Isa. 44.3 are significant for our investigation.

A passage of interest is 4Q504 1–2 v.15 - “...you have poured (נַשָּׂא כַּפִּי נַשְׂא) your holy spirit upon us”. The preserved fragmentary manuscript from Qumran Cave 4 (4Q504–6) is a penitential prayer, comprising confessions of past sins and appeals for divine grace. Avoidance of sin and adherence to God’s law are predominant throughout this preserved fragment. The petitioner remembers God’s covenant faithfulness (iv.4–5), particularly for pouring (נֵפָשׁ) the Holy Spirit upon the community, so that they can turn their heart to God and to listen to God’s voice, as commanded through Moses (4Q504 1–2 v.13). It is highly probable that Isa. 44.3 influenced the composition of this passage, as among prophetic Spirit anticipatory usages the verbal form נֵפָשׁ is found uniquely in Isa. 44.3.

Baillet notes that the above scroll is lacking a sectarian bias. The recipient represents the whole people, which includes all in יהושע (v.11; cf. ii.11; iv.9; vi.12). The writer most likely belonged to the pre-Essenes, and his composition influenced the Essenes, including the Qumran community who probably

---

27 The Ezekiel manuscripts (1QEzek; 3QEzek; 4QEzek *; 11QEzek; also MasEzek) found in the Cave 11 are poorly preserved and do not contain the passage being discussed.
29 For further discussion see D.K. Falk, Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 69.
30 See similar usage “…you have favoured us with the Holy Spirit” in 4Q506. 131–132.
31 Baillet, ‘Un recueil’, 249, 250; See also Chazon, (‘Sectarian Prayer’, 5–8) who suggests a pre–Qumran origin.
33 Davies, ABD 6:971–72.
appropriated Isa. 44.3 as a promise fulfilled in their own community. However the outward facing motif of Isa. 44.3, of the Spirit outpouring as attracting non-Israelites, has been submerged under the author’s theme of the Spirit’s role in bringing the people’s heart into obedience to God’s commandments.

For the Qumran community, which perceived itself as the eschatological people of God (4Q504–506; CD 3.13–20; 7.9–8.2; 1QS 5.7–24; 9.3; 1QH 15.15–19),³⁴ the gift of the Spirit is granted to every member upon their entrance into the community (1QH 6.11–13; 7.6–7; 12.11–13; 14.13; 16.11b–12; 13.18–19).³⁵ The Holy Spirit abides on the community and is the possession of all. The Spirit is further sought in 1QS 3.6–12; 9.3–5 so that the faithful may draw near to God and stand eternally in His presence (1QH 16.11b–12). What is noticeable in the usage of the term Spirit is that the community is consistently reminded of the purging and cleansing role of the Holy Spirit. The phrase, ‘purify me’ (לִפֶּרֶנֶn

³⁴ See Vos, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, 55; Sekki, Meaning of Ruah, 90, 223; Elliot, Survivors, 76–95.
³⁷ CD 12.11 forbids the sale of slaves to Gentiles, because the slaves had entered the covenant of Abraham.
³⁸ See also CD 6.21
not help in our quest for any anticipation of the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from their becoming members of the covenant.

The influence of Ezek. 36.25-27 is further seen in 1QS 3.13-4.26 which refers to the inauguration of the new age and God's eschatological salvation for the elect. According to 1QS 3.17-19, 25 and 4.16-17, 21-24, God placed within each human being two spirits at creation - the Spirit of truth/light and the spirit of error/darkness. The eschatological fate of each human being at the time of God's visitation is determined by whichever Spirit is predominant in him (4.24-26). They have been appointed to influence the lives of human beings until the predetermined end of the existence of the spirit of darkness, after which the spirit of truth will reign. This future anticipation is accompanied by and consists of a refinement of the elect by God's spirit. That is, a cleansing (תפירה) and purification (נייטוע) by the Spirit of truth/holiness (4.21) occurs along the lines of Ezekiel 36.25-27, so that they will understand the knowledge of God and be enabled to live righteous lives (4.20-22).

In sum, the promise of the Spirit upon the entire community is limited to the members of the covenant community, in relation to their joining in the community as the true heirs of promise in the final purification of the elect and in sustaining the covenant relationship with God. This may be simply due to the fact that the dominant concern with the respect to Gentiles is to be separate from them in order to preserve purity, up until their final destruction by the righteous remnant.

---

40 Scholars are divided on the consistency of the pneumatology in the Qumran literature. Kuhn (Enderwartung, 131-32) argues that the Qumran scrolls reflect two different pneumatologies - the spirit of truth in 1QS 3-4 is not to be equated with the Holy Spirit of 1QH. P. Wernberg-Møller, ('A Reconsideration of the two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1Qserek III, 13-IV, 26)', RQ 3 [1961] 413-41) argues that in 1QS 3.13-4.26 the two spirits are merely human dispositions or impulses planted into every person's heart by God at birth. Menzies, (Development, 84-86) adds a developmental dimension to Wernberg-Møller's position by claiming that 1QH represents a later stage than 1QS. But Sekki believes that the two spirits treatise of 1QS 3.13-4.26 are impersonal dispositions within a person given to him at birth, and concludes that those expressions also includes a reference to the divine Spirit (1QS 4.6, 21). He considers this as a development within the Qumran community in which 1QS reflects a later stage than 1QH (Meaning of Ruah, chs.8-9). However a large number of scholars argue that the pneumatics of 1QS and 1QH are coherent, and that the spirit of truth in 1QS is identical to the Holy Spirit of 1QH. The Holy Spirit in 1QH expresses a present eschatology, while the spirit of truth in 1QS refers to a future eschatology. See W. Foerster, ('Der Heilige Geist im Spajudentum', NTS 8 (1961-62) 128-132); Turner, Power, 128-29; R.W. Kvalvaag, 'The Spirit in Human Beings in Some Qumran Non-Biblical Texts', in F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson (eds.) Qumran between the Old and New Testaments (JSOTSS.90; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 159-80.

3.2.4. Summary

The majority of texts explored above have shown that when the variegated Judaism of the post-biblical era cited Ezekiel, Joel and possibly Isaiah, it either reinterpreted or developed the prophetic anticipation of the Spirit in the age to come. Although the Septuagint, a significant witness from the period, continued to maintain the prophetic anticipation, other contemporary texts stressed the significance of the Spirit in cleansing and purifying the covenant community either in the present age or in a future time. In most of the texts surveyed the Holy Spirit will purify and will enable sectarian Israel to maintain an intimate relationship with God, by the obedience to the law; other texts expected a future coming of the Spirit, which will cause the recipient to obey God and follow His commandments. However, references to Gentiles receiving the Spirit are minimal. The general silence of the post-biblical literature concerning a universal outpouring of the Spirit, especially upon Gentiles, may indicate that this expectation was but a peripheral element in the hope of first-century Judaism.

3.3. The Spirit anticipation upon Gentiles in the rest of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal literature.

Apart from the above prophetic influences on the Second Temple Jewish writings, there are only a few instances in the apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings where we see an anticipation of the Spirit upon people linked to the Gentiles. There are indeed passages such as 2 Macc. 7.23; 14.46; Sib. Or. 4.46.189 which may refer to eschatological renewal and endowment with the spirit; however, these texts do not refer to the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Gentiles.

Interestingly, two passages in the Psalms of Solomon (which comes from Jerusalem Jewish circles during the mid-first century B.C.E.) indicate a link

---

42 It is only in certain quarters of rabbinic Judaism that we see Joel 3.2 being expounded to show that the Spirit poured out upon the Gentiles will make them part of God's community—an idea possibly developed along the lines of the eschatological pilgrimage of Gentiles.
44 The reference in both passage are to 'the breath of life'.

It has often been assumed that the Psalms of Solomon were produced in Pharisaic circles. See Trafton, 'The Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research', 3–19; W. Rollins, 'The New Testament and...
between the Spirit bestowed upon the future Davidic Messiah and that to be given to Gentiles. In 17.37 and 18.4 the Davidic Messiah (17.4, 21) will be endowed with the Holy Spirit to rule.\textsuperscript{46}

According to the psalmist, the end-time is nearer. The Spirit–endowed Messiah will appear and he will drive out the Gentile occupiers, aliens, and sinners (Pss. 17:27, 30, 32, 36; 18:5),\textsuperscript{47} gathering together a purified nation which he will lead in righteousness, justice and wisdom (17.23–25). The dispersed of Israel will return to their homeland (17.31; 11; 8.28) and will be settled upon the land according to their tribes (17:28). Jerusalem and the Temple will be re-sanctified (17.30); and ‘nations’ will come from the ends of the earth to see his δόξα ("glory", 17:31; cf. Isa. 55.5). All the ‘nations’ will ‘reverently stand’ before him (17.34). Then all will be ἱγκλοτ and ‘their king’ will be “Messiah, Lord”, (17:32). Two aspects need to be noted: a) the inclusion of Gentiles in the future age is a direct result of the Spirit–endowed Messiah’s restoration of Israel (cf. Isa.44.1-5);\textsuperscript{48} and b) the Messiah will impart ‘wisdom and happiness’ upon ‘all’, including members of the nations who ‘reverently stand’ before him (17.34). The exact meaning of this text is difficult to ascertain, since although it points to a positive attitude toward Gentiles, the traditional language about an outpouring of the Spirit upon Gentiles is missing. The author clearly believes that there will be an eschatological pilgrimage of Gentiles, not however because the Spirit is poured upon YHWH’s people, but rather through the salvific activity of the Spirit–endowed Davidic messiah.

3.4. The Expectation of the Spirit upon Gentiles in Post-biblical literature

Apart from the above survey of literature two other major writings, Wisdom of Solomon and Philo, owing to their Diaspora setting, offer a universal expectation of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{49} The traditional eschatological anticipation of the Spirit is not a common


\textsuperscript{47} The author here reflects the characteristic features of the messianic hope of contemporary Jewish literature (11QMelch 3, 2.18; 4Q284 3, 13; 1QSb 5.24–25; 1 Enoch 49.3; 62.2). See Turner, Power, 132.


\textsuperscript{49} A few texts in Joseph and Asenath (15.14-16; 19.11) suggest a universal expectation of the Spirit. Here Asenath was transformed, as she became a Jewish proselyte. Asenath ate the honeycomb, which was full of the spirit of life, and she was renewed as a person (15.14–16). She was transformed to heavenly beauty (18.6–11) and she received the Spirit of life, wisdom, and truth (19.11). Since dating
theme in these two writings. It is, however, significant to observe for both these authors that the Spirit is a present reality and is available to their contemporaries.

3.4.1. The Apocrypha

3.4.1.1. Wisdom of Solomon

Writing in Greek in Alexandria during a period covering the end of the Ptolemaic era (100 B.C.E.) and to the early Roman era (40 C.E.), the author, ‘a believing and cultured sage’, reflects on Israel’s heritage with the dual aims of encouraging his readers in the face of difficulties (probably persecution) and defending the Jewish faith against those who are in danger of apostasy. Obviously in continuity with the Hebrew tradition, and probably with the aid of Hellenistic philosophy, Wisdom of Solomon offers a certain universal outlook on Israelite faith in a Graeco–Roman world. It is within these interests that our reflections on the author’s expectations of the nature, function and recipients of the pneumatic wisdom are placed.

of Joseph and Aseneth is uncertain, we will not be discussing these passages for our purpose. There is a general agreement that the apocryphon dates prior to 115 C.E. See discussions in C. Burchard, ‘Joseph and Aseneth’—A New Translation and Introduction’, OTP 2:187-188; R.D. Chesnutt, ‘The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth, JSP 2 (1988) 21-48; idem, From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth (JSPPS 16; Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 80-85.


52 Generally scholars agree on the question of persecution as one of the issues that the author of Wisdom of Solomon struggles with. However, they disagree on the exact historical and political circumstances for the persecution. See Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 22-24; Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 190–91; S. Cheon, The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation (JSPPS 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 130.


Chapter 3

Pseudo-Solomon uses the term \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) in a variety of ways,\(^{55}\) including its reference to the divine \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) (1.4, 7; 7.22–25; 9.17).\(^{56}\) However, the author does not show any thought of (i) the divine Spirit as an eschatological Spirit yet to be available to all, or (ii) how God will endow everyone with His Spirit in the age to come. Rather for Pseudo-Solomon the divine \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) is now available for everyone irrespective of eschatological considerations. Such a view is possible for the author because he synthesises the divine \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) with Wisdom.

3.4.1.2. Pneumatic wisdom\(^{57}\)

There is indeed a debate over whether Pseudo-Solomon identifies Wisdom with Spirit. At one end of the spectrum there are scholars who argue that ‘Wisdom’ replaces ‘Spirit’,\(^{58}\) and on the other there are scholars who draw a distinction between Wisdom and Spirit.\(^{59}\) In the present thesis it will be maintained that Pseudo-Solomon does identify Wisdom and Spirit, and portrays both as the internal principle of the human and moral life.\(^{60}\) A few points supporting our argument need to be noted.

\(^{55}\) The terms occur 20 times in Wisdom of Solomon (1.5; 6, 7; 2.3; 5.3, 11, 23; 7.7, 20, 22, 23; 9.17; 11.20 (x2); 12.1; 13.2; 15.11, 16; 16.14; 17.17). The meaning ranges from common usages like \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) as breath (Wis. 2.3; 5.3, 11.20), wind (Wis. 5.11; 23; 7.20; 13.2; 17.17), the source of physical life (15.11; 16.14) to abstract usages such as “immortal spirit in all things”(12.1; 15.16).

\(^{56}\) Most scholars consider the reference of \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) in these texts to be to the divine \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \). See Isaacs, Concept of Spirit, 20; P.van Imschoot, (‘Sagesse et Esprit dans l’A.T.’, RB [1938] 23–49); Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 99; E.G. Clarke, The Wisdom of Solomon (Cambridge: University Press, 1973) 17; Gilbert, ‘Wisdom Literature’, 311–312; Menzies, Development, 61–62.

\(^{57}\) The term pneumatic wisdom is used here to refer to Pseudo-Solomon’s interest in identifying Wisdom with Spirit.


\(^{60}\) Van Imschoot, (‘Sagesse et Esprit dans l’A.T.’, 23–49) believes that in identifying \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \upsilon \mu \alpha \) with \( \sigma \phi \iota \alpha \) the author developed a tendency already begun in the Old Testament. However, Imschoot maintains that it is not until Wisdom of Solomon that the identification becomes complete, and along with him a majority of scholars identify this closer association, for example, W.O.E. Osterley, The Wisdom of Solomon (London: SPCK, 1917) 53; Larcher, Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse (Paris: Gallimard, 1969) 362–76; G. Verbeke, L’évolution de la doctrine du pneuma du Stoïcisme à S.Augustin (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945) 229; J.C. Rylaarsdam, Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1946) 103; Vos, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, 64; J.A. Davis, Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1.18–3.20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions of the Greco–Roman Period (Lanham: University Press of America, 1984) Chs.1.–3; M. Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 65; Menzies, Development, 62–63; J. Frey, ‘Die paulinische Antithese von “Fleisch” und “Geist” und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition’, ZNW 90 (1999) 49.
First, with the references to divine πνεῦμα, the author maintains a close affinity to the Spirit traditions of the Old Testament. The synonymous use of the terms ὁ θεὸς, σοφία and πνεῦμα (1.6–7) to express the omnipresence and omniscience of the Spirit of God (cf. Ps. 139.7; 4 Ezra 16.62) is one way in which he does this; and he also emphasises the conventional Jewish thought that the pneumatic wisdom flees away from ‘deceit’, ‘foolish thoughts’ and ‘unrighteousness’. Thus he brings out the nature of pneumatic wisdom as revelatory, particularly as the revelatory presence of God in human and moral life.

Second, in 7.7, as a response to Solomon’s prayer God grants him pneumatic wisdom which enables him to receive understanding to govern justly (7.15, cf. 8.11, 14). It also leads him to have intimate relationship (φιλία) with God (7.14), and to have intellectual knowledge (7.18–19), moral qualities (7.15f.), and ethical guidance (7.21). Here the author tends to follow the long-standing association

61 See Winston, (Wisdom of Solomon, 104; Collins, Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age, 197) for Stoic influence.
63 For scholars who support the reference here as to divine πνεῦμα see Isaacs, Concept of Spirit, 20; van Insschoot, ‘Sagesse et Esprit dans l’A.T.’, 37; Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 99; E.G. Clarke, The Wisdom of Solomon (Cambridge: University Press, 1973) 17 and Gilbert, ‘Wisdom Literature’, 311–312; Georgi, Weisheit Salomos, 403. For an opposite view see Goodrick, Book of Wisdom, 87; J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom, An English Translation with Introduction and Commentary (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957) 52 and Levison, Spirit in the First Century Judaism, 69–70ff do not consider it as divine Spirit. Levison recently construed the words ἄγιον πνεῦμα (Wis. 1.5) to describe the ‘spirit’ as constitutive of human life. For him the other two anthropological components are ψυχή (1.4a) and σῶμα (1.4b). The contrast is made between a holy spirit and a ψυχή (soul) characterised by deceit (1.4a) and a σῶμα (body) enslaved to sin (1.4b), into which σοφία will not enter. Levison considers that ἄγιον πνεῦμα is a human spirit that is pure through the instruction which is characteristic of the wisdom schools. He also assumes that the adjective ἄγιον used non-technically for πνεῦμα followed by genitival adjective, πανδεῖς, suggesting that the human spirit becomes holy through instruction. It is important to note that, contrary to Philo’s Platonic trichotomy of body, soul and spirit (see Philo, Opif. 29, 30; Leg.1.32–33, 37; Spec.4.123; Congr.132–134; Fug. 134–37), Pseudo-Solomon does not make any distinction between νοῦς and ψυχή or between ψυχή and πνεῦμα. See Wis. 9.15, 16.14 (Goodrick, Book of Wisdom, 87). Further, the concept of Wisdom is introduced in the book in the context of an exhortation to ‘rulers of the earth’ to seek the Lord. The intention of Pseudo-Solomon in 1.4–5 is not to highlight the triad of anthropological components of a human being; rather the emphasis is on the character of the κυρίος/ σοφία/ πνεῦμα.

64 πνεῦμα κυρίου is presented as having filled the world (LXX Jer. 23.24), but there is no biblical precedent for the reference to ‘holding things together’. Philo uses the phrase in Conf. 136; Somn. 1.63–64; Leg. 3.6; Mos. 2.133.
between the Spirit and wisdom, knowledge and understanding which is related to eschatological figures in the Old Testament.  

Third, Pseudo-Solomon shows that Wisdom proceeds from God as a spiritual essence (7.22–25). As Spirit, Wisdom is of utter purity, acting on all other spirits and penetrating all things (v.24, cf. 1.7), unique, all-powerful, and all-seeing. The function of this pneumatic wisdom is to renew all things, to indwell in holy people and to bring people into close relationship with God (make them φίλους θεοῦ). The author has integrated the role of the Holy Spirit in terms of renewing and indwelling a righteous people (κατανεφελέω LXX Ps. 50.12; 104.30).

Fourth, in 9.17, the author presents his own version of Solomon’s prayer (9.1–18). Pseudo-Solomon is fully aware of his own natural human limitations (9.5,6), and calls on God to prepare him with the pneumatic wisdom for his task as ruler of humans. To fulfil this leadership role he needs wisdom to enable him to perceive how to rule God’s people and how to build a temple patterned after God’s majestic cosmic sanctuary. Pseudo-Solomon believes that the pneumatic wisdom which is God’s “Holy Spirit from on high” endows him to govern God’s people justly (9.7), and that it gives him ethical guidance and teaches him what is pleasing (ἀρεστός) to

---

66 See LXX Isa. 11.1 (cf. Isa. 61.1; 1 Enoch 49.2–3).
68 Wisdom is said to be ‘of God’, for she is an ἀτμίς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως (a breath of the power of God), in a possible development of a thought expressed in MT Job 41.8 (LXX 7). Here the word for “air” in MT is ἀήμος; the LXX translates it as πνεῦμα. See LXX Job 41.8; 32.8b; 33.4b; cf. Sir. 24.3. See parallels to Exod. 19.18 as quoted by Philo (Her. 251 and Leg. 16.13). See A.G. Wright, ‘Wisdom’, in Jerome Biblical Commentary (London: Geoffrey Chapman, rep.1978) 562.
69 M. Gilbert uncovered the concentric structure of Solomon’s prayer and pointed out the author’s creative transformation of the sources from 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles. See M. Gilbert, ‘La structure de la prière de Salomon (Sg.9)’, Bib 51 (1970) 301–31. See also M. Kolarick, The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom (1–6) (AnBib 127; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991) 17–18.
70 Interestingly, there are many references to the Second Temple (restored by Zerubbabel ben Shealtiel and Joshua ben Jehozadak, Hag. 1.2; 2.2–9; Ezra 3.2) and its activities in the Second Temple Jewish literature. For e.g., Letter of Aristeas 83–99; Sir. 45.6–22, 49.15–50.26; Philo, Spec. 1.66–67; 1.114, 116; Som.1.215 etc. For further discussion see, C.T.R. Hayward, The Jewish Temple, A Non-Biblical Source Book (London: Routledge, 1996). See author’s special interest in associating πνεῦμα and σοφία when compared to Josephus (Ant.8.43, 45, 47ff) and the Testament of Solomon (1.1.7; 2.7b–8 10.1ff; 22.1–23).
71 See Exod. 25, 9.40; 26.30 for parallel notions. See also 1 Enoch 14.16–20, 26; 40.28–29; T. Levi. 3.4–6, 5.1–2; 2 Bar. 4.2–6. For Platonic influence of the ‘archetypes of things’ see, Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 203. Goodrick, Book of Wisdom, 218, claims that the idea is from the rabbinic theory of pre-existent sanctuary. However, the author seems to play down the details of the Temple building and the consecration of the Temple, which his contemporaries have so much interest in. See Jospehus, Ant. 8.45 ff. and T. Sol. 1.7; 2.7–8; 22.1–23.
God (9.9–10; 13, 18; cf. Sir. 48.16, 22). Thus, (a) the theophanic language associated with Solomon traditions (1 Kgs. 8 = 2 Chr.1) is used to describe the dwelling place and the coming of pneumatic wisdom (9.10), and has its parallel use in terms of wisdom’s role elsewhere (Sir. 24.4); and (b) the language is similar to the text of LXX Isa 32.15 where the Spirit comes from on ‘High’.

Fifth, by the association of the πνεῦμα with σοφία the author emphasizes the soteriological activity of pneumatic wisdom in the retelling of the history of Israel. (i) Wisdom protected Joseph in Egypt and finally brought him honour, as in Gen.41.38 where Pharaoh recognized the presence of divine Spirit in Joseph (Wis. 10.13–14). (ii) The divine Wisdom delivered the nation from slavery by entering the life of Moses and through him withstanding Pharaoh (Wis. 10.15), just as Isaiah 63 presents God as having put His Spirit in Moses to prepare him to lead the Exodus (Isa. 63.11ff.). (iii) The writer says that Wisdom guided Israel along the desert route, becoming for them a shelter by day and a flame of fire by night (Wis. 10.17) – a function assigned elsewhere to the Spirit (Isa. 63.14; Hag. 2.5). (iv) Wisdom taught Israel God’s providence and election through discipline in the desert by means of a prophet, Moses (Wis. 11.1), who according to the OT was a man of the Spirit of YHWH (Num. 11.25). The author equates the function and characteristics of the Holy Spirit as presented in the history of Israel with a post-exilic reading of pneumatic wisdom.

72 M. Gilbert, ‘Volonté de Dieu et don de la Sagesse (Sg 9, 17s.)’, NRT 93 (1971) 145–66, finds an echo of the prophecies of Ezekiel (36.26ff) on the Spirit’s active role in human moral life. See also Wenk, Community-Forming Power, 87.


74 ὁγιῶν ὅρκησον and ἀπὸ ὅρκησον δόξης – both expressions are known from the LXX (1 Kgs 2.8; Ps. 46.8; Dan. 3.54).


76 Enns, Exodus Retold, 137.

77 See MT Gen. 41.38

78 Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 113.

79 Larcher, Etudes sur le Livre de la Sagesse, 411.
By identifying πνεῦμα with σοφία Pseudo–Solomon assimilated the Israelite idea of the Spirit as the source of divine revelation and of a divine guidance to order human life/righteous living, and provided his community in Alexandria and the larger communities around with a new understanding of the Spirit.

Scholars have already noted the impact of association with Spirit upon the idea of wisdom, but what is more important for the present study is the impact of the wisdom tradition upon the theology of the Spirit. Pseudo–Solomon was successful in highlighting the very essence of the understanding of pneumatic wisdom — that it was universal in its scope, and that its order was revealed both spatially and temporally throughout the experienced world, not merely in the Torah or Temple. This made the Wisdom of Solomon unique in its contribution to the theology of the Spirit, by extending the perceived locus of the activity of the Spirit beyond the boundaries of Israel.

To sum up, the reference to divine πνεῦμα in Wisdom of Solomon is to a pneumatic wisdom, which falls in line with the traditional Jewish thought on

80 Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 116f. remarks, “by interpreting the concept of Divine Wisdom as Spirit, the Wisdom of Solomon rendered inestimable service to the former; and by transferring the functions of the Spirit to Wisdom, by making Wisdom the source of prophecy and by affirming that Divine Wisdom came directly into human consciousness and experience, it assured to Divine Wisdom the same capacity of contemporaneity that was enjoyed by Spirit.” See also, F.W. Dillistone, ‘Wisdom, Word, and Spirit’, Int. 2 (1948) 3: 275–28.

81 Montague, Holy Spirit, 110, points out that, enriched by the prophetic stream, wisdom brought to the theology of the Spirit an important relationship to the experiential, the daily living of God’s wisdom.

82 The older sapiential literature showed no interest in notions of ‘covenant’ or of a special ‘election of Israel’, either through its royal dynasty or its central sanctuary. Nor is there any attention given to Israel’s occupation of a special ‘land’. The universality of the wisdom carried with it in the fullest measure the conviction that the Lord is a universal God, but with Ben Sira the notion became nationalistic (See Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 18–46). Although for Ben Sira, Wisdom is the first of all the created beings (1.4–10) and has ‘held dominion over every people and nation’ (Sir. 24.6 [10]), she is given only to those who love her, and especially those who obey the law (1.26). Wisdom comes from the mouth of God, was assigned a dwelling place in Israel (24.7) in the tabernacle on Mount Zion (24.8–12, 23). See discussions in D. Winston, ‘Wisdom of Solomon’, ABD 6:126; P.W. Shehan, ‘Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverb 8 and Sirach 24’, CBQ 41 (1979) 365–79; J.T. Sanders, Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom (California: Scholars Press, 1983) 25; J. Blenkinsopp, Wisdom and Law in the Old Testament: Ordering of Life in Israel and Early Judaism (OBS, Oxford: OUP, 1983) 140–144; C.T.R. Hayward, ‘Sirach and Wisdom’s Dwelling Place’, S. Barton (ed.), Where Shall Wisdom Be Found? (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 45. For a study of wisdom and law in Ben Sira, Intertestamental literature, Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Apostle Paul, see Schnabel, Law and Wisdom, 10–15. See also R. Wilken (ed.), Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975); G. Boccaccini, Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991) 81–99; Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 59–62; C.M. Patte, The Reverse of the Curse. Paul, Wisdom and the Law (WUNT 2/114; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000) 21–30.
Wisdom and Spirit, and is the revelatory presence of God in human and moral life, renewing ‘all things’, and providing moral and ethical guidance in everyday life.

3.4.1.3. The Recipients of Pneumatic Wisdom

Opinions vary concerning the identity of the recipients of pneumatic wisdom in Wisdom of Solomon — to rulers only, or to the pious reader of Torah, or to faithful Jews, or to everyone.

Those who argue for a particularistic view do so for several reasons. First, the author makes a distinction between ‘ungodly’ and ‘righteous’ (chs.2–5), the ‘ungodly’ referred to here being apostate Jews. Second, there is a clear focus on Israel (chs.10–19), in which the ‘righteous’ are identified with the faithful Israelites (10.20; 15.1–3; 16.2, 6–7, 20; 18.1) and the ‘wicked’ with Gentiles (12.20, 22–24; 14.22–31; 15.14–15, 18).

With regard to the first argument, we need to observe that there is a deliberate abstention from ethnic labels in the interest of a universal typology of ‘righteous’ and ‘wicked’. Further, there is nothing in Wisdom of Solomon which identifies ‘Wisdom’ with the law or the Jewish people, and even the Jewish identity of the king seems strangely muted, despite the reference to people and temple (9.7–8). What is more, the biblical heroes in 10.1–21 remain anonymous, and at no point does the

---

85 Bennema, Power of Saving Wisdom, 70.
86 Clarke, Wisdom, 4–5, 14–15.
87 The text seems to support this, as the ‘ungodly’ are said to have gone against their training, sinned against the law and fallen away from God (2.12; 3.10). Scholars point out that Pseudo-Solomon indicates a tension between loyal and apostate Jews.
88 There exists a strong antipathy toward the Egyptians and other Gentiles (3.12; 12.3–11). Consequently, many commentators speak of “undisguised particularism” and find in Wisdom of Solomon that God is “partial to the Jews and inimical to their enemies.” See Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 181–91. Winston has pointed out that even Philo, the most universalistic of all Jewish writers, also entertains a sense of certain nationalistic triumphs. For example, Leg. 1.66–97; 2.163; Mos. 2.44; QG. 2.60. Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 45. A. Mendelson, Philo’s Jewish Identity (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988) 103–113, points out that even Philo’s argument for the philanthropia of Judaism often entails a claim of Jewish superiority. Similar trends have been noticed among other Hellenistic writers (Diogenes Laertius 7.33). See discussion in Collins, Jewish Wisdom in Hellenistic Age, 218–220.
89 See 3.8 where the ‘righteous’ are generalised.
90 See, S. Cheon, ‘Anonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon’, JSP 18 (1998) 112–119 who argues that the anonymity is to refer to the author’s own community. See also Collins, Between Athens and Jerusalem, 1983, 185; cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, 76, 119, 158 on the heroes of biblical history as ‘types’ of the saved.
author fault the Gentiles for failing to observe peculiarly Jewish customs. The sins for which the Gentiles are condemned are idolatry and infanticide (Wis. 13.10–14.31, 15.7–19).

It is therefore important to recognise that despite the author’s interest in the special relationship between God and Israel, he defines pneumatic wisdom broadly enough to encompass everyone. Three observations emerge from the text.

First, Pseudo-Solomon emphasises that pneumatic wisdom is available to all: ‘she is easily observed by those who love her, and is found by those who seek her’ (6.12; cf. 1.1–2; 6.21–23). Moreover, she is limited to no single nation but covers the whole world, and orders all things well (8.1). Thus, ‘in every generation she enters into holy souls and renders them friends of God and prophets’ (7.27), while ‘a multitude of wise men is the salvation of the world’ (6.24). The Spirit is available to all those who ‘seek’ and ‘pray’ (7.7).

Second, although Solomon functions as the ideal of a king and a wise man, he represents a larger audience. It is evident that Solomon is no different from other human beings: see for example the references to Solomon as mortal, equal to everyone (Ἰσχίος ἁπάντων), and a descendant (γηνεύης) of the first-formed (7.1–6).

Third, unlike the conventional Jewish wisdom instruction directed to βίβας (sons), the author primarily addresses the κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν (1.1), the βασιλείς (6.1a; 7.5); the δικαιοσαί (6.1b; 8.11); and the τραυνον (6.9, 21, 24). They are encouraged in Wis. 6.9–11 to find pneumatic wisdom and obtain her (6.9–11), the assumption apparently being that the ruler who gains wisdom will rule rightly (6.21–25). This suggests that such rulers – even if Gentiles – who are recipients of the pneumatic wisdom will gain favour in the sight of God.

The majority of scholars would argue for a figurative use indicative of a larger audience. Reese would take the royal address figuratively, indicating that such

91 Unlike Ben Sira, the author of Wisdom nowhere explicitly identifies Wisdom with Torah. Aside from a marginal reference in 18:9 to the Passover sacrifice and 9.5 on Temple makes no mention of the sacrificial cult.
93 See Prov. 1.8,10, 15; 2.1; 3.1,11, 21; 4.1,10, 20; 5.1, 7, 20; 6.1, 3, 20; 7.1, 24; 8.32.
95 See Winston, Wisdom of Solomon, 102; Georgi, Weisheit Salomos, 402; Grabbe, Wisdom of Solomon, 60; Reider, Book of Wisdom, 50. For example, M. Kolarcik (‘The Book of Wisdom', in
designation is merely a Hellenistic literary convention;\textsuperscript{96} Winston's point is that it is a feature that is characteristic of the tracts on kingship popular at the time.\textsuperscript{97} It is possible to recognise the point that Hellenistic philosophers admonished rulers on morality while recognising their common morality with their subjects.

Similar literary conventions are familiar among the Hebrew biblical writers, of calling for the delivery of solemn messages to the broadest possible audience,\textsuperscript{98} for example, Isa. 1.2; Hos. 5.1; Micah 3.1, 9; Joel 1.2 and Ps. 48.2–3. Of particular interest is the LXX translator's reading of Isa. 51.4. The text departs from its Hebrew original by appealing to \textgreek{\beta ασταλεις} where the original has only \textgreek{\ησανις} (my people). It is likely that the LXX translator intends a figurative makeshift of all Israelites into kings. It is feasible that the author uses the same universal appeal employed by the prophets and later by the LXX translator, whether on his own initiative or following a then current tradition, to indicate a larger audience including both Jews and non-Jews of his time.\textsuperscript{99}

For the author the gift of pneumatic wisdom has an eschatological dimension too. He anticipates an eschatological judgement at which God will punish and reward people depending on whether they have followed the way of pneumatic wisdom or the way of lawlessness (Wis. 5.1–23). The ungodly may oppress the righteous in this life, but before God's judgment seat the righteous will be exalted and rewarded with immortality (2.21–3.9) whereas the ungodly will be punished. Thus pneumatic wisdom is a soteriological necessity,\textsuperscript{100} and is not for some future time, but for now, to prepare those who seek and desire it.

In conclusion, Pseudo–Solomon understands the Spirit in a universal way. This he does by identifying \textgreek{πνευμα} with \textgreek{σοφια}. The author brings in a new dimension to the understanding of Spirit in the Diaspora and the result is that the pneumatic

\textit{New Interpreters Bible}, [Vol.5; Nashville: Abingdon, 1997] 454 argues that the royal image denotes humanity in general. According to him the reader is being addressed as one who reigns over thoughts and actions, words and deeds. The reader, then, is ultimately one who bears kingly responsibility for both just and unjust actions.

\textsuperscript{96} Reese, \textit{Hellenistic Influence}, 72–78.
\textsuperscript{97} Winston, \textit{Wisdom of Solomon}, 101.
\textsuperscript{98} Although the prophetic literature does not use the exact phrase (\textgreek{κρινοντες την γην}), the following example surmises the point. The most distinctive example of this is the opening of the book of Isaiah 1.2 – “Hear, O ye heavens, and give ears, O earth....”
\textsuperscript{100} Scholars have already noted that in this passage Wisdom and the Holy Spirit have given a soteriological function. Verbeke, \textit{L'évolution de la doctrine du pneuma}, 229; Vos, \textit{Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen}, 64; Menzies, \textit{Development}, 62–63; Turner, \textit{Power}, 125–126.
wisdom is now seen to be available to all those who seek and desire it, quite apart from anything eschatological.

3.4.2. Philo

The writings of Philo of Alexandria provide us with further insights into another strand of understanding and expectancy of the Spirit in Second Temple Jewish Literature.

Philo, a prominent member of the Jewish community of Alexandria, probably writing for several different, though perhaps overlapping audiences, attempts to interpret Jewish beliefs in universal terms in a way that was appropriate to the Hellenistic world in which the Jews of the Diaspora were living. Philo's works could have both apologetic and exegetical functions, involving the presentation of their common Jewish traditions in the social setting of Alexandria.

---


104 Scholars do recognise that Philo was influenced by various philosophical traditions of the time. For example, Philo's thought is structured by Platonic dualism. See Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 38ff. For the influence of Stoicism and Pythagoreanism see J. Dillon, The Middle Platonist: A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220 (London: Duckworth, 1977) 139–183.

105 But the growing trend in Philonic scholarship is to see him instead as an exegete of the Laws of Moses. For e.g., P. Borgen, Philo of Alexandria, An Exegete for His Time (SNT 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 535–38; Birnbaum, Place of Judaism in Philo's thought, 16.

and at the same time providing a basis for the struggle for survival as Jews in that society. It is within these contexts that we approach Philo's usage of the term πνεῦμα.

In contrast to the usages of his Jewish predecessors, the range of meaning associated with πνεῦμα in the Philonic literature is extensive and diverse.¹⁰⁸ Most of these references are scattered throughout¹⁰⁹ his expository and allegorical works,¹¹⁰ probably because most of them are wholly scripture bound.¹¹¹ Interestingly, one does not find any of the traditional Spirit-anticipatory passages (Ezek. 36.27; 37.14; 39.29; Isa. 32.15; 44.3; Joel 3.1–5) reinterpreted by Philo.

Scholarly categories are helpful for understanding Philo's use of the term πνεῦμα.¹¹² It represents the element of air or wind¹¹³ or an immaterial force,¹¹⁴ and

¹⁰⁸ See A. Laurentin, 'Le Pneuma dans la Doctrine de Philon', ETL 27 (1951) 390–436; M.J. Weaver, Pneuma in Philo of Alexandria (Ph.D. Dissertation, Notre Dame University, 1973) for a detailed analysis on the semantical range of πνεῦμα in the Philonic literature.

¹⁰⁹ Philo uses πνεῦμα more than 151 times in his writings. See P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth, R. Skarsten, The Philo Index, A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 285. It is particularly striking to note that in most of the miscellaneous works (with the exception of De confusione linguarum) the term does not appear – De animalibus, De vita contemplativa, De Deo, Hypothetica, De sobrietate.

¹¹⁰ πνεῦμα occurs 78 times in Philo's allegorical works, while the term occurs 62 times in his expositions.

¹¹¹ It is widely acknowledged that Philo used the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. See Barclay, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora, 166; Borgen, Philo of Alexandria, 38. Most of the references Philo uses regarding the Spirit are direct quotations from the Greek Pentateuch. For example Gen. 2.7 is repeatedly cited in Opif. 134; Leg. 1.31; 3.161; Det. 80; Plant. 19; Her. 56; Somn. 1.34; Spec. 4.123. For further discussion see Borgen, Philo of Alexandria, 63ff.; Birnbaum, Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought, 17, 23–24. On Philo's use of the Greek Bible, see Y. Amir, ‘Philo and the Bible’, SPhilo 2 (1973) 1–8; idem, ‘Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo’, in M.J. Mulder (ed.), Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (CRINT; Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1988) 1: 440–444; D. Gooding and V. Nikiprowetzky, ‘Philo’s Bible in the De Gigantibus and Quod Deus’, in D. Winston and J. Dillion (eds.) Two Treatise of Philo of Alexandria (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983) 89–125.

¹¹² Opinions on the range of meaning attributed to πνεῦμα vary. A. Laurentin, 'Le Pneuma dans la doctrine de Philon', ETL 27 (1951) 391–404, insists that Philo's use of πνεῦμα is a unified, coherent concept. For Laurentin πνεῦμα is always πνεῦμα θεοῦ. This is because, behind each occurrence of the word lies a reference to its divine origin. The difficulty with Laurentin's position is that he does not take the individual contexts seriously. For Verbeke (L'évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma, 237–51) the term is variously used to refer to one of the four elements, air; to wind and breath; as an immaterial force which links material elements together; rational aspect of the human soul and the prophetic inspiration. It is interesting to observe that the recent Philo index by Borgen (The Philo Index, 285) avoids any kind of classifications of the term. This is a stark contrast to earlier indices which make very definite categorisation. See I. Leisegang (Philonis Alexandrini, Opera QVAE SUPER SVNT, vol.7 Indices Ad Philonis Alexandrini Opera [Berolini: Walter De Gruyter, 1930] 660–661), who classifies the term πνεῦμα into seven categories – elementum; ventus; spiritus; spiritus corpora permeat; est meis, ratio anima, est inspirationis auctor, and θεόν, θεοῦ.
also encompasses both physical and psychological manifestations. The term, too, represents rational thought (Leg. 1.32–38) and charismatic inspiration (Gig. 23).

Interestingly, Philo is not always consistent in maintaining the various distinctions that Verberke and others have proposed when using the term πνεῦμα. In his allegories, Philo overlaps the word’s anthropological and theological meanings (Plant. 23–24 and Leg. 1.36–38). Similarly the anthropological, cosmological and theological distinctions of πνεῦμα are overlooked in Gig. 22-23.

Philo’s lack of interest in prophetic eschatology is evident from his very selective use of scriptural citations (Isa. 5.7 = Somn. 2.172f.; 11.6–9 = Praem. 87; Isa. 48.22 = Mut. 169; Isa. 50.4 = Her. 25; Isa. 54.1 = Praem. 158,159; Jer. 2.13 = Fug. 197–201; 2.34 = Spec. 4.7; 3.4 = Cher. 49; 15.10 = Conf. 44; Ezek. 18.8 = Spec. 3.32). The overt omission of Spirit anticipatory passages indicates that for Philo the divine πνεῦμα is not something that is to be anticipated for the future; rather, as for Pseudo–Solomon it is a present reality available to him and to his contemporaries.

It is important to note that there are only few passages in the whole of Philonic literature that refer to any eschatological anticipation at all (Praem. 164–172). Philo mentions the eschatological redemption of Israel (Praem. 164), the deliverance from Gentile oppressors ( 164 ), the pilgrimage of exiles to Zion ( 165) and prosperity in the land (168). There is no reference to Gentiles being part of the restoration by God in the future; for Philo, since the Spirit is now already available to ‘all’ (in its

113 πνεῦμα is placed in parallel with ὀξή in Gig 22; Ebr. 106; Cher. 3, 111; Sacr. 97 and Opif. 29-30; Abr. 160; Deus. 35–36. See also Her.242 and Opif. 131. It is also the breeze and thus πνεῦμα is both τῆς εὐκρατείας τῶν πνευμάτων (a well-tempered breeze in Opif. 41), and πνεῦμα πλησίοντος (a violent head-wind in Agr. 174 cf. Abr. 92). Philo do not always maintain a clear distinction between various usages of πνεῦμα. For example in Cher. 111; Praem. 41; Ebr. 106; Sacr. 97 (cf. Wis. 5.11).

114 See Imm. 35–36; Her. 242.

115 Thus πνεῦμα is πνεῦμα ζωῆς in Leg. 3.161; Det. 80, 81. Thus it is the vital physical principle of all living beings. See similar usages in 2 Enoch 30.8a Wis. 15.16 (cf. Mos. 1.93; Immut. 84; Gig. 10), at the same time, the ὀξήτως (substance) of the soul, the higher and most dominant part, the mind (Leg. 1.32–42; Spec. 4.123; Her. 55–56; Det. 83; QG. 2.59) of all human beings.


117 To enter into these sundry debates would take us beyond the scope of this study. See Isaacs, Concept of the Spirit, 26ff. for further discussion.

118 Another passage of interest is Mos. 2.43–44, which indicates Philo’s belief that Gentiles would abandon their ‘peculiar ways’ and ‘turn to honouring’ the laws of Jews. But here too we do not find any reference to the Spirit being given to the Gentile in the context of restoration. See discussions in H.A. Wolfson, Philo, Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam (2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1947) 2: 415–417; T.L. Donaldson, ‘Proselytes or
restrictive sense), it is not related to the coming Gentile pilgrimage.

There are a few passages, though, which probably indicate the availability of the Spirit for all including the Gentiles (Leg. 1.31-38; Her. 56; cf. Det. 80; Her. 259; Virt. 212-219) to which our attention now turns.

3.4.2.1 The πνεῦμα θείον given at creation

3.4.2.1.1. The Nature of πνεῦμα

Scholars do agree that Philo refers to a universal πνεῦμα θείον, which is given at creation (Leg. 1.31-38; cf. Opif. 134-147; Her. 56; Det. 80). While allegorising the second account of the creation of man (Gen. 2.7), in Leg. 1.31-38, Philo portrays God as forming earthly man from the earth, and breathing into him the breath of life, so making him a living soul. Further, Philo brings into the creation story a bipartite division of soul, viz. one

---

119 The nature of πνεῦμα is manifestly divine (πνεῦμα θείον), for it proceeds, and is derived, from God himself (Leg. 1.37; Spec. 4.123); it is further more, part of the aether (αἰθέριον πνεῦμα) and a divine fragment (Plant. 18; Det. 90; cf. Opif. 146; Spec. 4.123).

120 See Wolfson, Philo, 1: 393-413; Verbeke, L'évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma, 242; Leisegang, Der Heilige Geist, 76-102; Laurentin, 'Le Pneuma', 411; Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 336-338; B.A. Pearson, The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology (1973) 18-21; Menzies, Development, 64; Davis, Wisdom and Spirit, 52; Vos, Traditions Geschichtliche, 66-67; Isaacs, Concept of Spirit, 35; Bieder, TDNT 6: 372.

121 See the discussions in T. Tobin (The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation [Washington, DC.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983], 56-132), on Philo's interpretation of Gen. 1.26-27 and 2.7. For Tobin the manifold inconsistencies of Philo's interpretation are to be explained in terms of his loyalty to a long tradition of exegesis that he himself only partially develops and modifies. On the other hand see Runia, Philo of Alexandria, 556-58, 334; idem, 'God and Man in Philo of Alexandria', JThS 39 [1988] 48-75 who argues for both theological and philosophical aspects to Philo's interpretation.

122 Εὔφυσάμεν is used 13 times in Philo's writings while citing LXX Gen. 2.7. See Opif. 134, 135; Leg. 1.31, 33, 36, 36; 3.161; Det. 80; Her. 56; Somn. 1.34; Spec. 4.123; 123; QG. 2.59 (cf. 1 Kgs. 17.21; Ezek. 37.9; Wis. 15.11).

123 It is interesting to note that when Philo discusses LXX Gen. 2.7 in Det. 80, he refers to πνεῦμα ζωῆς. Elsewhere he refers to it as πνοή ζωῆς (Plant. 19; Somn. 1.34). Isaacs (Concept of Spirit, 35), makes the observation that this is due to the difference Philo makes between the heavenly man of Gen. 1 and the earthly man of Gen. 2. According to Isaacs' interpretation of Philo, only the heavenly man who is the copy of the original possessed πνεῦμα. The material man had only the reasoning power πνοή (Leg. 1.42; Opif. 144). Thus, Philo uses the πνοή to explain his understanding of the imperfection of the earthly man. But it is difficult to make such distinctions, because in Opif. 135 (cf. QG. 1.4, 51) Philo speaks of earthly man as being created ἐκ τῆς γεωμόρφος οὐσίας καὶ πνευμάτως θείου or the equivalent usage πνοὴν ζωῆς (breath of life as in Opif. 134; Leg. 1.31; Plant. 19; Hers. 56; Somn. 1.34 and Spec. 4.123).

124 See Her. 55; Plant, 18ff.; Spec. 4.123.
rational and good part, and one irrational and evil part (Leg. 1.22; 33). According to Philo, it is into the rational soul that God breathed the divine Spirit, which forms the mind, the highest element of the soul.

To the question of the nature of πνεῦμα as the rational aspect of the soul, Philo argues consistently that it is the divine Spirit which makes the νοῦς rational and capable of knowing God. Philo identifies πνεῦμα as the force which generates thought (Plant. 23–24; Spec. 1.6; cf. Fug. 182). He asserts that the spirit is breathed into each person at creation to provide the individual with a cognitive, spiritual capacity, a capacity that is actualised in the experience of and encounter with the Spirit of God. The πνεῦμα provides the basis of knowing God, and the means of a relationship with God (Leg. 1.33–34, 37–38; cf. Plant. 18).

3.4.2.1.2. The Recipients of the Spirit:

For Philo the recipients of τὰ ἀγαθὰ (here including πνεῦμα) are all human beings (Leg. 1.34), even those who are not perfect (μὴ τελειώτι – Leg. 1.34).

It is not immediately clear from the text to whom Philo refers as οἷς μὴ τελειώτι. The phrase μὴ τελειώτι occurs in various forms in his allegorical works (Leg. 2.91; 3.89; 3.212; Det. 144, 175; Plant. 6, 93, 94; Sostr. 13; Her. 82; Somn. 1.213), and significant descriptions of the phrase are found in Det. 172–175 and Leg. 3.89. While describing the characteristics of wise men and worthless men, Philo uses οἷς μὴ τελειώτι (Det. 175) to refer to the imperfect nature of the latter (Det. 173 cf.

---

126 It is the divinest part of human beings (Det. 29), the godlike image (Opif. 137), the copy of the divine reason (Opif. 136). See other occurrences Det. 90; Plant. 18ff.; Her. 55. In the Old Testament writers do not make any dichotomy between what is breathed and that by which it is breathed. What is designated by νῦν ἐνσω (breath of life) is the breath (I Kgs. 17.17; Isa. 2.22; Prov. 20.27; Dan. 10.17), something that, according to Gen. 7.22 the animals also possess. The expressions ζωή and ἀνάστασιν are generally used. When God withdraws this breath of life from a person, he or she dies (I Kgs. 17.17ff; Job 27.3; 34.14ff; Josh. 11.11; 10.40; 11.14; Deut. 20.16).
127 Philo states that God is visible only to the mind (Cher. 100–101). See discussions on ψυχὴ, νοῦς, πνεῦμα in E. Brandenburger, Fleisch und Geist, Paulus und Die Dualistische Weisheit (WMANT 29; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968) 114–134
128 See parallel usage in Post. 160. God’s characteristics of goodness are a constant theme in the Old Testament scripture, particularly demonstrated in the giving of rain upon the sea, springs in the desert, waters in barren soil. See Isa. 35.7; 41.18; Ps. 65.10ff; 67.7; 104.10; 107.33; 112.1–4; 144.12–14; 4 Ezra 16.60.
129 There is not a single reference in LXX where μὴ is used with τελειωτις. For the use of τελειωτις see Gen. 6.9; 18.3; 2 Sam. 22.26; 1 Chr. 25.8; Sir. 44.17; 2 Esdr. 2.63. Wis. 6.16 seems to be closer to Philo’s presentation. The term is often used in relation to Noah (Gen. 6.9; Sir. 44.17; cf. Post. 173; Gig. 5; Deus. 117, 122; Abr. 31; QG. 1.97).
It is highly probable that μῆ τελειοι (Leg. 1.34; 3.89) indicates a similar usage and thus includes all human beings, in spite of their moral standing, as recipients of the Spirit.

But for Philo, all may not gain (ὡφελεω) from the έμφυσον (in-breathing) of the Spirit (Leg. 1.34). In other words, the universal divine Spirit is available to all, but the Spirit's permanence is not guaranteed since it is closely bound with human accountability. In his allegory On Giants, Philo discusses the theme of the abiding of the Spirit, introducing Gen.6.3 to explain why the Spirit cannot abide forever among 'us' (τι πολλαοι (masses of men)). For him God's spirit dwells particularly in the thought of all humanity, but is unable to abide permanently due to the unworthiness of fleshly life (28–31 cf. 53). In the present passage (Gig. 20) Philo makes it clear that (τι πολλαοι are the ones who lack reason or soul; reprobate;
and those who choose what is base instead of what is noble. 138 The usage of πολλοί probably echoes μη τελειοι as discussed earlier (Leg. 1.34).

On the other hand, for Philo the abiding of God's Spirit can only be the privilege of those who lead the tranquil and contemplative life (Gig. 47-55). 139 He who does so then has always the divine πνεῦμα at his side, taking the lead in every journey of righteousness. It requires single-mindedness (Mos. 2.265) and a detachment from sensual preoccupation (Det. 17; Gig. 53; Deus. 2). 140

Scholars have described Philo as echoing Stoic thought, 141 but Philonic literature does not maintain that type of pantheistic view. 142 M.E. Isaacs has suggested a parallel usage in 4 Macc. 7.13–14, where the author associates πνεῦμα with reason. Isaacs assumes apologetic motives behind both writings and indicates that they emphasise the supremacy of inspired wisdom over reason in a pagan context. 143

A preferable option would be to see links to sapiential literature. Contemporary Hellenistic literature associated πνεῦμα and σοφία. 144 God permeates all creation with Wisdom (Sir. 24.3–5; Wis. 1.9; 7.22; 8.1; cf. Job 34.14; Ps. 33.6; 104.30; 139. 7ff.; Prov. 8.22–31; Judg. 16.14), 145 yet this divine, cosmic Wisdom is imparted only to those who love God, especially prophets and sages.

Thus for Philo a significant aspect to his universal appeal is that πνεῦμα is given at creation to all human beings. He makes his appeal to fellow Jews in the Diaspora concerning the gracious nature of God towards Gentiles on the ground that the Spirit breathed into human reason is the common possession of all human beings.

138 See Sacr. 69.
139 See Gig. 53.
140 In a similar way Philo talks about the loss of virtue in Leg. 1.107; Det. 48; Her. 292; Somn. 2.235; cf. Fug 55; Det. 70.74; QE. 2.38. See D. Zeller, 'Life and Death of the Soul', SphA 7 (1995) 21.
142 Isaacs, Concept of Spirit, 22.
143 Isaacs, Concept of Spirit, 41.
Consequently God has not left the Gentiles without knowledge of Himself, thus offering a possibility for their "incoming" into the Israelite community.

3.4.2.2. The Gift of Prophecy to Every Worthy Man (Her. 259; cf. Gig. 22)

Philo's interest in the universal Spirit is found in one another particularly significant passage — Her. 259, according to which, the gift of prophecy is available "to every worthy man" (πάντες όι ἄστειοι, cf. Gig. 22).^146

3.4.2.2.1. The Nature of the Prophetic Spirit:

In Her. 259 Philo highlights the fact that a prophet is a passive instrument through which the πνεῦμα θείου speaks. Being a spokesperson, the prophet has no utterance of his own, but all his utterances come from elsewhere, the echoes of another's voice (ὑπηχούντως ἐτέρου).^147 However, Philo makes a clear distinction here between the nature of πνεῦμα as the rational aspect of the soul and as the gift of prophecy or other special charismatic endowments. In Spec. 4.49, while describing the ecstatic possession of the prophet Philo mentions that "reason (λογισμός) withholds" and "surrenders the citadel of the soul to a new visitor", the θείου πνεῦμα which plays upon the vocal organs and dictates words which clearly express its prophetic message.

Scholarly opinions concerning the nature of prophecy in Philo include associations with the rabbinic idea of the bath qol,^148 and Greek and Egyptian notions of prophecy.^149 However, Wolfson believes that Philo's views on prophecy are derived from Scripture and then adjusted to Platonic terminology regarding frenzy.^150 It is interesting to note that the language employed by Philo in describing the experience is almost entirely derived from a non-Jewish background — for

---

^146 According to Philo this is endorsed by 'Holy word'. It is surprising to recognise that Philo's argument is not supported by a scriptural proof text, which makes the usage both ambiguous and unique in Philo. Generally Philo uses ἐφεσός λόγος; (42 times) to refer to LXX Scriptures. ἑγωντος is used is also used (Cher. 124; Det. 161; Post. 158; Ebr. 208; Her. 258; Abr. 156, 177, 258; Mos. 2.11, 96, 188; Decal. 155; Spec. 2.151; Virt. 201. See also Spec. 1.65; QG 3.9; 4.196; Mos. 2.188. On the contrary, the wicked may never be the interpreter of God, so that no worthless person is 'God inspired' (Her. 69).

^147 See also Spec. 1.65; QG 3.9; 4.196; Mos. 2.188. On the contrary, the wicked may never be the interpreter of God, so that no worthless person is 'God inspired' (Her. 69).


^149 See Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism, 183. Recently, Winston, while distinguishing the 'ecstatic' and 'hermeneutical' prophecies argues that Philo's descriptions of predictive prophecy reveal that he has adopted the more radical form of Greek ecstatic prophecy. For D. Winston ('Two Types of Mosaic Prophecy According to Philo', JSP 4 [1989] 53), Philo was following the footsteps of his favourite philosopher, Plato (Phdr. 244A–245C; Tim. 71E; Ap. 22C; Meno. 99C; Ion. 543C; cf. Plutarch De def.or. 431B–438, 414E) in relation to the prophecies of Abraham and Balaam. See also, J.R. Levison, 'Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy According to Philo', SphA 6 (1994) 83–89.

^150 Wolfson, Philo 2.10ff.
example θεσπίζω (foretell), κατοκωχή (possession), ενθουσιάζω (be inspired), μανία, θεοφόρητος (possessed or inspired by God), ὑπερχεω (prompt). But for Philo, prophecy is the same as the prophecy referred to in the Old Testament (Mos. 2.40, 246–252, 259), where Moses in Her. 258–266 is described as ‘possessed’ and ‘prophesying’.

Thus the Spirit is the source of charismatic revelation, wisdom and knowledge, and empowering with skills and ability — an idea that is consistent with the rest of Judaism.

3.4.2.2.2. The Recipients of the Gifts of Prophecy

References to prophets or to the recipients of the gifts of prophecy are numerous in Philonic literature. The Old Testament heroes like Abraham (Her. 250, 265), Moses (Leg. 3.43; Gig. 57; Plant. 118; Her. 290; Fug. 147), Balaam (Mos. 1.277), Samuel (Somm. 1.254), Elijah (Deus. 136), Isaiah (Mut. 169), Jeremiah (Conf. 44), and Hosea (Mut. 139) are all prophets. Interestingly, even Zipporah (Mut. 120) and Hannah (Somm. 1.254) are considered to be prophetesses.

---

152 There are eight instances of the type of prophecy that are cited by Philo (See Leg. 3.43; Gig. 57.2; Plant. 118; Sobr. 68; Conf. 44; Migr. 84; Her. 70, 250, 265, 290; Fug. 147, 186, 197; Mut. 110.3, 120, 139, 169; Somm. 1.254; Mos. 1.277; Con. 88; see Wolfson, Philo, 2.34–35). A.J. Heschel (Theology of Ancient Judaism 2 [London:1965] 161–165,220–223) cites parallel rabbinic sources for many of these cases and suggests that Palestinian homilists who may have preached in Alexandria probably influenced Philo.

153 See also Decal. 32.35. For Philo ξοτοσις was an experiential feature of the prophets of the Old Testament (Her. 258–266). Further, Philo indicates that the Spirit given to the Seventy Elders (Gig.23; Fug. 186) and Bezaleel (Gig. 23) were special charismatic endowments. Thus the seventy elders were given ‘spirit of perfect wisdom’ and Bezaleel was filled with ‘the divine spirit, with wisdom, understanding, and knowledge to devise in every work’


155 Borgen (Philo Index) lists about 94 references to προφήτης.

156 The reference to προφητευα occurs only nine times in Philo (Her. 259; Cong. 132; Mut. 126, 203; Abr. 98; Mos. 2.3, 187; Spec. 4.51; Praem. 55).

157 Isaacs (Concept of Spirit, 49) argued that Philo confines the references to the gift of prophecy to the prophets of the Old Testament. Unfortunately, Isaacs is unaware of Somm. 2.251–252 which refers to Philo’s claim to participate in the Spirit. See Turner, Power, 125.

158 Philo refers to Zipporah as having a prophetic nature. Outside canonical literature there are no references to Zipporah tradition; it appears only in the later Rabbinic Literature (Exod. R. 1.32, 33; 5.8; 27.1; Deut. R. 6.1). Philo’s Zipporah tradition seems to be unique, particularly in view of her Cushite origins.

159 The reference to Hannah as ‘prophetess and mother of a prophet’ is found in Somm. 1.254. In the canonical and non-canonical literature alike, Hannah was never portrayed as a prophetess. This is also true with the Rabbinical literature.
It is not clear, however, to whom Philo refers to as ἀστεῖος (worthy/refined). The term is frequently used by him to refer to those who are morally in good standing and who possibly belong to a socially elitist group. In the moral sense of the term, ἀστεῖος is specifically used for Israelite figures,160 ‘guardians’ and ‘stewards’ of the ‘teaching of virtue’ (Det. 66), ‘people of high birth’ (ἐγγενῆς) and those ‘trained in the practice of philosophy’. In Prob. 72 Philo refers to ἀστεῖοτης as existing both in Greece itself and outside Greece and among the Persians and Indians (Prob. 73–75).

It is of significant importance to recognise Philo’s use of ἀστεῖος and προφήτης together in Her. 78.161 In his discussion on μάννα Philo allegorises Gen 15.4 in relation to seeing God. While expounding the words ‘come out of’, Philo talks about the mind leaving the body behind. For him, ‘ecstasy’ does literally mean ‘a standing out of’.162 After mentioning the multitude of common people as the blind race who prefer what is mortal to what is immortal, Philo observes, ‘and it is only ἄστεῖος who sees (βλέπει) and therefore they of old were called “prophets”’ (cf. 1 Sam. 9.9).163 He also points out that prophets were formerly called ‘seers’ (ὄρωντες).164 He who advances ‘outside’ is called not only ‘seer’ but also the ‘seer of God’ (Her. 78). Her. 78 generalises the usage of ‘prophet’ to refer to the whole nation of Israel as ‘seer of God’ (Θεῶν ὄρων).165

Philo’s universal interest is further indicated by his inclusion of wise men as prophets.166 Even the wise in pagan religions are considered as ‘seeing’. For

---

160 Noah (Leg. 3.77); Abraham (Migr. 130; Her. 243; Mut. 168; Somn. 1.171); Jacob (Leg. 3.24, 191); Moses (Post. 31; Mut. 168, 204; Congr. 131) and Enoch (Deus. 140).
161 See also Cong. 132. While he eulogises the birth of Moses Philo refers to him as ἄστεῖος who with ‘wisdom given by divine inspiration’ received ‘the art of legislation’ and προφήτεια.
163 For Philo ‘seeing God’ involves ecstasy (Opif. 70–71; Her. 69–70, 263–265).
164 Often βλέποντες is used as synonym. See Deus. 139; Migr. 38; Her. 78; QG. 4.138.
165 Similarly in Abr. 98 Israel is presented as having the task of priesthood and prophecy on behalf of all humanity (see also Spec. 2.163). The link between priesthood and prophet might have been drawn from Spec. 4.193, ‘the true priest is necessarily a prophet’. Likewise Philo takes the Jewish community to be God’s special possession in the world, in the sense that a ruler of a kingdom can own it all, yet have his own particular property (Plant. 55–60; cf. Spec. 4.180–181). If Israel is the nation dearest of all to God, she has also received the task of priesthood and prophecy on behalf of all humanity (Abr. 98). Thus Philo interprets the temple prayers and sacrifices as offered on behalf of all the nations (Spec. 1.97, 168–69, 190). Birnbaum, (Place of Judaism in Philo’s Thought, 181) inform us that Philo does not use the name ‘Israel’ for the real nation either before or during his time.
166 Philo uses the term δοξος as synonymous with prophet (Gig. 5, 22; Deus. 1.3). The link between spirit and wise men is made in Gig. 22–24.
example, the Persian Magi, who “silently make research into the facts of nature to gain knowledge of the truth, and through ‘vision’ (εἰμιφάσεις) clearer than speech give and receive the revelations of divine excellency” (Prob. 74); the Athenians, who are “the most sharp-sighted” (δεξιοδικέστατοι) in mind — ‘for as the pupil is in the eye or reason in the soul, so is Athens in Greece’ (Prob. 140); and the philosophers of Greece and foreign lands, who are “the best observers” (θεωροί) of nature and all things in it (Spec. 2.45).

Nevertheless, Philo brings in a contrast between recipients of the gift of prophecy, and the non-recipients — the φαύλοι167 and μοχθηροὶ168 who can never be prophets (Her. 52, 259; cf. Det. 133). According to Philo, the φαύλος will never become an interpreter of God (ερμηνεύει γενέσθαι Θεοῦ).169 Similarly, μοχθηροὶ generally refers to those who disobey and oppose the commandments (Ebr. 16; Virt. 94).

Thus it is reasonable to conclude that for Philo αὐτεῖοι may encompass a philosophically knowledgeable inclusive social elite group who receive special charismatic endowment, similar to that of Old Testament prophets, which enables wisdom, and facilitates knowledge of and fellowship with God.170 However, Philo excludes the φαύλοι, probably a moral, ethical or a social entity, from the charismatic gift of prophecy.

Scholars have pointed out that Philo’s usage of παντὶ δὲ ἀστεῖω προφητεῖαν has parallels in Stoic thought.171 According to the Stoics only the σπουδαῖοι

---

167 The term occurs mostly in the sapiential literature (LXX). For eg. Job 6.3, 25; 9.23; Prov. 5.3; 13.6; 16.21; 22.8; 29.9; Sir. 20.17; cf. 3 Macc. 3.22.
168 Only a few references are found in the Philonic literature (Ebr. 16; Spec. 4.77; Virt. 94; QG. 4.211).
169 For a similar usage see Det. 133. Specific examples of φαύλος include Esau (Sac. 18.121), Pharaoh (Det. 112), Cain (Det. 119) and Lamech (Post. 55). Interestingly Philo uses φαύλος together with ‘Egyptians’ many times (Leg. 3.13, 37). In Fug.17ff. Philo contrasts φαύλος and ἀστεῖος, where αὐτεῖοι are juxtaposed with φαύλοι. Throughout his allegorical writings, Philo uses Egypt to represent the life tied to the body or to youthful passions (Cong. 80ff.; cf. 20–21; Fug. 147f.; Sacr. 48; Det. 95, 104; Somn. 2.266; QG. 4.177). This seems to indicate Philo’s contempt, rooted in his people’s history, which spills over onto the Egyptians living in Alexandria in his own days. See discussion in D.I. Sly, Philo’s Alexandria (London: Routledge, 1996) 21; Mendelson, Philo’s Jewish Identity, 116. The term also refer to the moral baseness of ‘sinners’ (Sacr.128), those who are ‘crafty in wickedness’ (Leg. 3.2), those who hide themselves from God (Leg. 3.28, 48), those who give pre-eminance to body and regard pleasure as the end and aim of life (Leg. 3.37, 191; cf. Leg. 2.17; Virt. 9) and whose action are most vile (Mut. 193). Other example include the countless multitude (Leg. 3.2) who are ‘unskilled in art’ (Gig. 2), ‘without knowledge’ (Gig. 2), ‘unjust’ (Gig.2).
170 See Turner, Power, 125.
171 Wolfson, Philo, 2, 47.
(Stobaeus, *Eclogae* 2, 114) or sapientes (Cicero, *De Divinatione*, 2, 63, 129) can be diviners. But there are obvious differences. For the Stoics, prophecy is a natural and necessary process (Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1, 352n) and the qualifications required are those which render men fit for the power of divination.

The presence of the Spirit upon worthy men is already found in the Old Testament and runs throughout the Second Temple period (Mic. 3.5–7; Ps. 51.11). It is probable that Philo was following the sapiential tradition, where we find frequent division of humanity into the 'wise' and 'foolish', or in parallel with this into 'just' and 'unjust' (e.g. Wis. 1.2–5; 1.6–5.23).

By affirming that the gift of prophecy is available to all ἀστεῖοι and therefore to his own contemporaries, Philo is at odds with the earlier scholarly notion that the Spirit of prophecy has withdrawn from Israel, to return only in the eschatological future. What is significantly new in Philo is that the charismatic gift of the Spirit of prophecy is no longer limited to a relatively few good wise men within Israel, but is for all ἀστεῖοι, whose membership is not limited by ethnic boundaries. Philo makes a universalistic assumption with a particularistic connotation. He maintains the distinction between the rational aspect of the soul and the prophetic/charismatic Spirit, and conceives of the Spirit as given to all — but only a few will benefit from it.

3.4.2.3. The Spirit Experience of Abraham the Proselyte

The reference to the reception of the Spirit by Abraham occurs in *Virt.* 212–219, where Philo discusses 'nobility' (*εὐγενεῖσι*) — a virtue rather than good parentage as the key to true nobility. Abraham and Tamar serve as illustrations.

172 Philo uses ἀστεῖος and σπουδάζω interchangeably. (See *Prob.* 60; cf. *Leg.* 1.93; 3.189; 3.217; *Post.* 28; *Abr.* 99; *Mos.* 2.147; *Spec.* 3.22; *Prob.* 41, 54, 60, 100; *QG* 3.11b, 21, 4.167, *QE* 2.6). σπουδάζω is used 141 times. See Borgen, *Philo Index*, 312–13.


174 We find a similar idea in the rabbinic writings. For example, the *bath qol* informs the sages who are gathered together at different occasions that Hillel the elder, and Samuel the lesser are worthy of Spirit but cannot receive it because of the evil generation to which they belong. (*t.Sota* 13.2–4; *Song.* R. 8.13; *Sukkah*.28a) See A. Marmorsten, 'The Holy Spirit in Rabbinic Legend', in J. Rabbinowitz and M.S. Lew (eds.), *Studies in Jewish Theology* (London: OUP, 1950) 126.


176 See Levison, 'Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel', 35–37.

177 On his discussion of εὐγενεῖσι, Philo emphasises that the possession of gifted and virtuous ancestors does not benefit their children unless these inherit those gifts or follow those virtues. On the one hand Philo describes degenerate sons of good parents. Adam vs Cain (*Virt.* 198–200); Noah vs.
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of *εὐγένεια* since they both come from ignoble backgrounds; and not only do they become virtuous, but they also turn to belief in God. However, what is particularly important for us is the example of Abraham for whom according to Philo, ‘*virtue*’ came not through birth but was grasped by the *νοῦς* through the *πνεῦμα*.

Scholarly opinions vary in considering the role and function of the *πνεῦμα* in *Virt.* 212–219. There are those who argue that Abraham’s spirit experience transformed him into an effective orator. For others the spirit makes Abraham into a successful *Weisheitslehrer*, while for others it made him a mystic. The present

---

178 Philo has been lauding Abraham as the ideal proselyte (*Virt.* 219). Then he adds a section on women proselytes, giving Tamar as the example of a free-born foreign woman and Bilhah and Zilpah as examples of slaves. It is interesting to note that Philo does not call Tamar a proselyte explicitly. See *Leg.* 3.74; *Deus.* 136f.; *Cong.* 124; *Fug.* 149–156; *Mut.* 134; *Somm.* 2.44; *Virt.* 221. Like Dinah, Tamar is completely allegorised (except for one instance). See D. Sly, *Philo’s Perception of Women* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 174–76.

179 Runia (*Philo of Alexandria*, 180ff.) considers the term ‘virtue’ is used to refer to virtues formulated in the Laws of Moses (*Spec.* 4.132–238; *Leg.* 195–96f; *Praem.* 4–5).

180 Levison, *Spirit in First Century Judaism*, 95ff. finds a resemblance to a catalogue of the elements, which comprise the orator’s delivery in the first century rhetorical handbook, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Skill in rhetoric should be an essential tool of the competent ruler, and was part of his education. In addition, the Graeco–Roman author expected the king to exhibit exemplary virtue. Levison also finds parallels not only for the rhetorical skill – stature, carriage, movement, voice – but also for Abraham’s physical presence. Levison’s argument cannot be accepted for two reasons. (i) He ignores the larger context of the text. The key to the passage is Philo’s discussion about how Abraham, a person of ignoble birth, achieved *εὐγένεια*. In reviewing Pentateuchal history (*Virt.* 187–227), Philo affirms that a virtuous life is the basis for *εὐγένεια*. Polytheism is evidence for the absence of nobility (*Virt.* 213). The polytheists can gain nobility by becoming proselytes like Abraham, and joining the Jewish *πολιτεία* (*Virt.* 212–219). In such a context Levison’s argument for Greek rhetorical virtues is not appropriate. It is important to recognise that Philo’s discussion on *εὐγένεια* centres around moral and ethical aspects and not so much around rhetorical skills. In fact, Philo is critical of oratorical skills in *Virt.* 213.

181 C. Noack, *Gottesbewußtsein*, Exegetische Studien zur Soteriologie und Mystik bei Philo von Alexandria (WUNT 2/116; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 2000) 40–99. For Noack, the Spirit becomes der Meister der Rhetorik Abrahams. By the indwelling of the Spirit in the soul, Abraham becomes the competent speaker in a missionary context. But the difficulty with Noack’s argument is that, in Philo, Abraham is never presented as a missionary, but rather more as a convert from polytheism. The key factor is not how Abraham mastered rhetoric to convince his audience, but rather how Abraham came to believe in one God and how the Spirit led him in the right path and helped his nobility. Sandmel (*Philo’s Place in Judaism*, 104) had already pointed out that the motif of Abraham as a missionary in the rabbinic literature is missing in Philo. He warns the danger of comparing the one Philo with the many rabbis to inhibit any facile generalisation. But one might tentatively suggest that with respect to proselytism, for the rabbis Abraham is a missionary par excellence, while for Philo he is the significant convert. See also Knox, ‘Abraham and the Quest for God’, *HTR* XXVIII (1939) 55–60.

182 Sze–kar Wan, ‘Abraham and the Promise of the Spirit: Galatians and the Hellenistic–Jewish Mysticism of Philo’, *SBL* 1995 Seminar Papers, 7–22. The basis for his argument is linking the present passage with the allegorical interpretation of ‘soul progression’ in *Gig.* 60–61, with the three stages of development on the spiritual journey towards perfection *Abr.* 70–71; and the experience of the highest form of *ἐκκλησία* designated as ‘prophecy’ in *Her.* 265. Such an interpretation does not
text is characteristically and uniquely Philonic. It is important to observe that in every step of Abraham's way, and particularly the events of Abraham's conversion and his subsequent life, the Spirit plays an integral and indispensable role.

3.4.2.3.1. Abraham, a Polytheist

Philo emphasises the fact that Abraham was a Gentile, and a polytheist at that (Virt. 212–213). Abraham, most ancient member of the Jewish nation, was a Chaldean by birth; his father was an \(\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\\kappa\omicron\varsigma\); and as the son of an \(\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\\kappa\omicron\varsigma\), Abraham's past was rooted in the Chaldean belief system. This Philo characteristically summarises as holding on to the things which control the events that befall each man for good or for ill, and believing that there is no originating cause outside what is perceived by the senses.

Further, Philo refers to Abraham's background belief as based on a 'polytheistic creed' (Virt. 214) and 'the false creed'. He describes these beliefs as the

---

183 According to Sandmel (Philo's Place in Judaism, 96), the passage is a good example of Philo's merging of the literal and the allegorical interpretation. Abraham leaves Chaldea, Abraham leaves astrology; departure from the literal Chaldea ensures departure from astrology. Recently, many scholars have identified the missionary nature the text. See Georgi, Opponents, 57–60; Wan, 'Abraham and the Promise of the Spirit', 12; Noack, Gottesbewusstsein, 36ff. 1.

184 The portrait of Abraham in this text is presented as literal interpretation. It is important to recognise that Abraham is put forward as an exemplary model—a symbol of virtue. See B.L. Mack, Logos und Sophia, Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum (SUNT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1973) 76.

185 For other symbolic interpretations of Abraham's migration, see Ebr. 94; Her. 287–89; Somn. 1.60–62; Abbr. 60–80. For further discussion see W.L. Knox, 'Abraham and the Quest for God', HTR 28 (1935) 55–61.

186 Cf. Somn. 1.168. The phrase 'the founder of the whole Jewish nation' is used Mos 1.7 to describe Abraham.

187 For Chaldeans as astrologers, see Gig. 62; Mig. 178, 187; Her. 96–97, 277; Mut. 16; Somn. 1.52, 53; Abbr. 67, 69, 72, 188; QG. 3.1: 4.88. See C.K. Wong, 'Philo's Use of Chaldaiai', SPhA 4 (1992) 1–14.

188 Philo condemns the Chaldeans as astronomers with considerable force in Arb.69–70 (cf. Wis. 13.2). See E.R. Goodenough, By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, 138; Wolfson, Philo, 2: 78 for further discussion. Interestingly, Philo seems to have believed that the stars could foretell (Mos. 2.1226; Leg. 1.8; Opif. 58). In Cong.2 Philo makes Abraham appear to have studied grammar, geometry, astronomy, rhetoric, music, etc. But there is a difference between the ability to foretell and the ability to control. Ascription of ruling power to the stars would be to Philo atheism. See Sandmel, Philo's Place in Judaism, 158. Philo seems to break away from Josephus’ view that Abraham was a founder or mediator of astrology (A.J. 1.1161–168), and instead of this the assertion is made here and elsewhere in Philo that astrology as such leads away from authentic knowledge of God. See further discussion in Georgi, Opponents, 57

189 Cf. Abbr. 69ff.; Decal.52–65.

190 See ΠΩΛΗΘΕΩ ΔΕΞΙΑ in Opif. 171 and QE. 2.2. See also QG. 3.1 for Chaldean doctrine
'knowledge of many' (Virt. 213), 'strange laws', and 'monstrous customs' which assign divine honour to 'stones and stocks' and 'lifeless things' (Virt. 219). Philo considers Abraham’s polytheistic acquaintance with the ‘many’, the ‘secondary’ and the ‘created’ as the reason for his total absence of εὐγένεια. The result is an ignorance of ‘the One’, ‘the Primal’, ‘the Uncreated’ and ‘the Maker of all’.

3.4.2.3.2. The Spirit Experience of Abraham and his belief in One God

Substantive evidence emerges from Virt. 212–219 concerning Philo’s emphasis on various Spirit experiences of Abraham. The primary reference to the Spirit’s activity occurs in Virt. 214. According to Philo, Abraham recognises the error of polytheism when he is εἰπθειειδας (divinely inspired). The ‘divine inspiration’ sets Abraham in motion towards nobility whereby he becomes the standard (κατλόγων) of nobility for all proselytes (Ἀπασιν ἐπιλήπτας Virt. 219).

Abraham’s journey is also symbolic in the sense that it becomes a pursuit of ‘the One’. Interestingly, even in this symbolic stage the Spirit experience plays an important role. For Philo, Abraham’s yearning to know ‘the Existent One’ (τὸ δύν) was fanned by the divine oracles (Virt. 215). The divine oracles are guiding his steps, and he goes seeking for ‘the One’ until he receives clearer vision (φαντασία) of his existence and providence. Thus Abraham is properly spoken of as the first to believe (πιστεύσαι) in God (cf. Gen. 15.6), for he was the first to grasp a firm and unswerving conception that there is one Cause above all (Virt. 216). Such

---

191 Philo’s contempt is registered against the worship of lifeless images in Spec. 1.21; Decal. 66, Mos. 2.205; Cont. 7; Spec. 1.28–29.

192 According to Philo, (Spec. 1.19–20) the heavenly bodies are not gods, but are subordinate rulers. “And if anyone renders the worship due to the Eternal, the Creator, to a created being and one later in time, he must stand recorded as infatuated and guilty of impiety in the highest degree.”

193 Generally εἰπθειειδας is used for divine revelation. See Deus. 4; Mig. 84; Som. 2.172; Mos. 2.259, 263, 272.

194 The passage seems to echo Philo’s conviction reflected elsewhere about the role of the Spirit in the knowledge and conception of God (See Leg. 35, 37, Gig. 20).

195 The journey is understood as both literal and historical, since Abraham does leave his native country, his race, and his paternal home. See Philo’s reference to proselytes in Virt. 102–4; 180; Spec. 1.51; Spec. 4.178.)


197 See Det. 67; Mut. 202. Philo makes a close link between prophecy and λόγια. In Is.95 he speaks about interpreters of dreams as ‘prophets’ who expound θεία λόγια. Similarly, in Mos. 1.57 people listened to Moses speaking oracular utterances and he grew κατλόγους and was transfigured into a prophet (See also Mos. 1.57; 2.176, 245, 246; Spec. 1.146, 188).
knowledge of God bestows outstanding capabilities, gives a royal character, and compels the surroundings to respectful recognition.\(^{198}\)

It is interesting to observe the response of those among whom Abraham settled. According to Philo, people recognised Abraham as king because of the greatness of his soul, and his spirit was the spirit of a king.\(^{199}\) The reason is that Abraham sought something, 'another more august', and was inspired.

Further whenever Abraham became possessed (κατασχέθησθαι), everything about him changed into something better. His physical body was transformed, especially eyes, complexion, stature, carriage, movements, and voice. The θειὸν πνεῦμα made its lodging in his soul and invested his body with singular beauty, his voice with persuasiveness and his hearers with understandings.\(^{200}\) Philo's conclusion on Abraham's experience is that a lone wanderer without relatives or friends was of the highest nobility who craved kinship with God\(^{201}\) and ranked among the prophets (218). Thus, he is the καυνὸν of nobility for all proselytes\(^{202}\) who have come to settle in a better land, a commonwealth full of 'vitality' and 'life'.

Thus, it is the Spirit experience, which made Abraham into something that he could not become by himself.\(^{203}\) True nobility resulted from Abraham's decision to believe in One God with the aid of the Spirit. This experience of the first person of whom it can be said that he believed, is normative for all proselytes.

The purpose of Philo's description of Abraham in Virt. 212–219 is apologetic.\(^{204}\)

\(^{198}\) See for Abraham's kingship Gig. 64–65; cf. LXX Gen. 23.8–9, 13. See F. Calabi, The Language and the Law of God, Interpretation and Politics in Philo of Alexandria (Atlanta, GA.: Scholars Press, 1998).


\(^{200}\) In Mos. 1.57–59 and 2.272, Philo describes a similar bodily transformation in Moses, who under the influence of inspiration looked like a prophet (J.R. Levison, 'Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus', JSJ 26 [1995] 314–315). See also Levison, Spirit in the First Century Judaism, 92.

\(^{201}\) It is interesting to note that while interpreting Gen. 1.26 and 2.7 in Opif. 69ff, 134ff. and QG. 2.62 Philo interprets kinship as existing between the highest part of νοῦς and λόγος See W.E. Helleman, 'Philo on Deification and Assimilation to God', SPA 2 (1990) 64–65.

\(^{202}\) See Somn. 1.160; Mos. 17; Virt. 219.

\(^{203}\) Georgi, Opponents, 58, considers the Philonic Abraham as a pneumatic. Sandmel (Philo's Place in Judaism), 105 while treating Virt. 212ff. fails to recognise the role of the Spirit in the passage.

\(^{204}\) When compared with the picture of Abraham in contemporary literature, Philo's presentation here in this passage seems to be unique. In most of these texts Abraham is exalted as the perfect model of Torah observance, (Sir. 44.19; Jub. 12.1–14; 15.1, 2; 16.20, 26; 17.17–18; 23.10; I Macc. 2.50–52; T. Levi. 9.1–14; T. Benj. 10.4; T. Abr. 17; 2; Bar. 57.1–3; Apoc. Abr. 1–8) his faithfulness at times of testing (Sir. 44.19; Jub. 17.17–18; 19.8; I Macc. 2.25; Jdt. 8.25); his circumcision (Sir. 44.20; I Macc. 2.52 his rejection of idolatry, Jub. 12.1–4; Apoc. Abr. 1–8) and his hospitality (T. Abr. 17).
Philo, by describing the genesis of the Jewish people as coinciding with the rejection of star worship and the discovery of monotheism, both embodied in the conversion of Abraham, the possibility is open to all Gentiles trapped in the same astrological web to become believers of the one God. For Philo the designation “Jewish people”, consequently, does not refer simply to his fellow-Jews but to all who hold the right belief of God regardless of ethnicity. Gentiles can become “Jewish” by means of adherence to monotheism. Philo shows that it was possible to regard the reception and the indwelling of the Spirit as a phenomenon in the life of the Jewish community as the people of God. Moreover, it is the indwelling of the Spirit that makes it possible for proselytes to be part of the people of God.

3.4.2.4 Summary

For Philo, the divine πνεῦμα is not an eschatological entity, but rather a present reality available to him and to his contemporaries. By divine grace a person participates in the divine πνεῦμα at creation and it is for him the principle of life as well as of reason. The πνεῦμα is also for Philo a charismatic prophetic spirit, which abides with all οἱ ἄνθρωποι. In both cases, the permanency of the divine πνεῦμα is not guaranteed for everyone, because of his or her moral status. Thus the nature of reception is an overlapping concept. Through Abraham’s story, Philo presents the model for all proselytes to be open to the indwelling of the Spirit that makes it possible for proselytes to belong to the people of God.

3.5. Conclusion to Part 2

As noted in Chapter 2, the future anticipation of the Spirit upon the people of God emerged as an exilic and postexilic phenomenon. However, two texts (Isa. 44.1–5; Joel 3.1–5), come close to saying Gentiles will be included in the future. Interestingly all receive special attention and elaboration as marks of his perfect righteousness which is depicted within the context of God’s election and covenant. Abraham’s righteousness is viewed as a cause for blessing to Abraham and his descendants (Sir. 44.21; T. Abr. 17, 18). Only in Sir. 44.21 is any hope extended to the Gentiles on the basis of the Abrahamic covenant. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs express universalist hope for the nations (T. Levi. 2.11; 4.4; 18.9; T. Ash. 7.3; T. Benj. 9.2; 10.5, 8–10; T. Dan. 6.7; T. Naph. 8.3,6). The essential Jewish elements of the covenant and the relation to Abraham to the Mosaic law, are not featured. See Sandmel, Philo’s Place in Judaism, 75–76; Georgi, Opponents, 53. Interestingly, Josephus presents Abraham with virtues which would make him attractive in the Hellenistic world (Ant. 1.161–168). The essential Jewish elements of the covenant and the relation to Abraham to the Mosaic law, are not featured. See Sandmel, Philo’s Place in Judaism, 75–76; Georgi, Opponents, 53

205 Georgi, Opponents, 56. See also Birnbaum Place of Judaism in Philo’s Thought, 61–127 for detailed discussion.
206 Georgi, Opponents, 58.
207 In Somn. 2.251–52 he himself participates in the Spirit experience.
promise of YHWH’s Spirit. What is surprising is that in Isa. 44.1-5 and Joel 3.1-5, when God pours out his Spirit upon the people of God, Gentiles will be attracted towards Zion and become part of the soteriological community. However, there are no references which imply that the Gentiles will receive the Spirit in the age to come. The wider belief regarding the eschatological pilgrimage of Gentiles presumably influenced such a thought.

Marie Isaacs makes two distinctive observations regarding the period of our discussion. First, Isaacs has argued that the Jewish Diaspora writers ‘were not primarily orientated towards eschatological thinking’, arguing that the Spirit was more often associated with the past than with the future activity of God.\textsuperscript{208} Second, she also draws a similar conclusion about the place of the Spirit in the thought of Palestinian Judaism. According to her, the role played by the Spirit in the eschatological thinking of Palestinian Judaism is minor.\textsuperscript{209}

With regard to the first argument, one may agree partially with Isaacs, that Philo was not oriented towards eschatological thinking. However, we have noted a number of passages from Philo (\textit{Her.} 259; \textit{Gig.} 22; 47, 53, 55), which suggest the Spirit was not limited to the past but is available in the present. For Pseudo-Solomon (1.4-7; 7.7; 7.25; 9.18) the present reality of pneumatic wisdom is significant for future salvation. Both Philo and Pseudo-Solomon emphasise the present availability of the Spirit to both Jews and Gentiles. It is important to observe that unlike sectarian Jewish groups in Palestine, the Diaspora writers were engaged in accommodating and reinterpreting Israelite faith in the light of their context, by universalising various aspects of Jewish faith and so presenting it more attractively to their pagan neighbours.

Regarding the second conclusion, eschatological anticipation of the Spirit was not completely absent in the period we are discussing. There existed many and various strands of thought concerning the future bestowal of the Spirit. One consistent thought of the post-biblical sectarian Jewish literature was the explicit reference to the anticipations of the Spirit as in Ezek. 36.26-27, Joel 3.1 and Isa. 44.3. These Spirit anticipatory texts became valid descriptions for the age to come. The experience of the Spirit in the past fell short of the complete fulfillment of these texts, and writers of this period continue to announce God’s promise of the Spirit in

\textsuperscript{208} Isaacs, \textit{Concept of Spirit}, 82. Although Isaacs notes that Philo still thought of the Spirit as ‘a permanent principle at work in the present, both in man and in the universe’.

\textsuperscript{209} Isaacs, \textit{Concept of Spirit}, 84.
the imminent future. They mourn the present situation of lawlessness and desire to see the fulfillment of the bestowal of the Spirit upon their community in the future so that it would purify the covenant community and enable them to follow God’s commandments forever.

In Qumran circles eschatological awareness was so high that one can rightly speak about a “realized Spirit eschatology”; the events of the end were perceived to have already begun to happen, particularly when the Spirit promised in Ezekiel, Isaiah and Joel was taken to have been received with their joining of the eschatological community.

It is surprising to see that both in the Hebrew scripture and the post-biblical literature anticipation of Spirit upon the Gentiles is almost nonexistent, and that the promise of the Spirit is on the people, only when they become members of the community of God.
PART 3

PAUL'S CONVICTIONAL BACKGROUND REGARDING
THE OUTPOURING OF THE SPIRIT AND THE GENTILES

Introduction to Part 3

The previous chapters examined evidence for the expectation of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the Gentiles in the age to come, in both Hebrew Scriptures and post-biblical literature. The majority of texts indicated that such a concept is rare, and that it is only the covenant community to which the promise is clearly given. However, it is argued that at least two texts anticipated that Gentiles would become part of YHWH's covenant community when YHWH pours out the Spirit as part of the restoration of Israel.

In chapter 3 we have traced various interpretative traditions concerning the anticipation of the Spirit in the age to come. The study demonstrated that one strand was prominent in a number of documents, where the writers were negative about their contemporary situation of lawlessness and desired a bestowal of the Spirit upon their community in the future so that the Spirit would purify them and bring them in obedience to God's statutes. However, Qumran literature indicates that God has already poured the Spirit of purification upon the community. It was also pointed out that the apologetic stream of post-biblical Judaism tends to maintain a broader interpretation of the availability of the Spirit.

While placing Paul's understanding of the significance of the promise of the eschatological Spirit against and within these traditions, the objective of this section is to provide a further background, i.e., Paul's pre-Christian convictions about the Spirit, particularly as they evolved from his own self-perception as a Pharisee and persecutor, an aspect that past scholarship has neglected.

Past scholarly treatments of Paul's theology of the Spirit have worked largely without regard to any knowledge of the life of Paul, and wholly without regard to his pre-Christian background as a Pharisee or persecutor. Thus Hermann Gunkel,1 arguing against the idealistic2 and rationalistic3 exegetical approaches to New

---

1 Gunkel, Influence.
Testament Pneumatology, emphasises that the study of πνεῦμα has to begin by investigating the effects of the Spirit. However, for Gunkel the question of Paul’s background experiences, whether Jewish or Hellenistic, 'cannot be decided a priori'. For him what is important is Paul’s awareness of the ideas concerning the πνεῦμα which were prevalent in the early Christian communities, which then have to be checked as to whether or not Paul approved them; and whether on this basis ‘an understanding of his own teaching is to be gained’. Gunkel ultimately did not explain what questions the pre-Christian Paul might have brought along with him when testing the ideas of πνεῦμα in the Urgemeinde.

A more recent example is F.W. Horn who places Paul in a developmental schema. For Horn, claims of possessing the Spirit are primarily a theoretical conclusion of early Christian theology resulting from the dependence of perception on a mixture of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish views of the Spirit. He raises the question ‘what was the horizon of urchristlicher Pneumatologie?’ and answers it by saying that the early Christian community perceived the resurrection of the dead as a sign of the return of the Spirit. Christ’s resurrection led the disciples to believe that the expected Messiah will endow the Spirit upon the elect. Horn further considers Paul’s theology of the Spirit as primarily rooted in the Hellenistic community of Antioch, and for him this becomes the matrix for Paul to build his pneumatology. Thus Paul becomes the next stage in Horn’s development scheme.

Clearly, scholars who have attended to the topic of Pauline pneumatology have not adequately determined how Paul might have come up with his own questions and experience while dealing with the characteristics, role and function of the Holy Spirit in the early church. As a result there is a necessity for clarification of the connections between Paul’s biography and his theology of the Spirit.

Can such a clarification on the relationship between Paul’s biography and his theology of the Spirit be possible? What can we say about Saul the Pharisee’s belief on the Spirit? We cannot know with absolute certainty the answer to these questions since our sources lack sufficient information on the subject (Phil. 3.5; Gal. 1.14). But

4 Gunkel, Influence, 76.
5 Horn, Das Angeland, 1992.
6 Horn, Das Angeland, 89–115.
7 Horn, Das Angeland, 115.
8 Others who show no interest in setting Paul’s theology of the Spirit in any kind of biographical context are Schweizer, ‘Spirit of Power’, 259–278; idem, TDNT 6: 389–455; idem, Holy Spirit; Fee, Empowering Presence.
we can know from Paul's autobiographical statements that he shared a broad range of convictions which reflect features of pre-70 A.D. Pharisaic beliefs and also of other strands of Second Temple Judaism. Working from such a background we shall seek to answer the above questions from the available sources, particularly Paul's vocabulary and features of Pharisaic belief that we know independently of Paul.

In this section we will attempt to clarify the awareness of the ideas concerning the πνεύμα which emerge from his pre-conversion life. The task is to identify from Paul's autobiographical and Luke's biographical statements his affiliation to the strands of thought available during the time, particularly as a Pharisee in relation to the traditions of the law and as a persecutor of the church. The rationale for utilizing such a possible background is to provide a link between the various strands of expectation of an outpouring of the Spirit in the Hebrew Scriptures, in post-biblical literature, and in Paul himself, which might assist us in elucidating the interrelation between Paul's biography and the origins of his thoughts on the Spirit.

Chapter 4

THE PRE–CHRISTIAN PAUL, THE PHARISEE AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

4.1. Introduction

The Jewish identity of the Apostle has been increasingly recognised in the last few decades. Consequently, Paul's pre–Christian Jewish identity as a Pharisee has become important to our inquiry especially for understanding the range of attitudes about the Holy Spirit which were familiar to Paul and within which both his pre–Christian life and the Damascus experience took place.

In the light of this recent interest, we must first examine Paul's account of his pre–Christian conviction as a Pharisee - his 'zeal' for the law and traditions and then the implications of such a conviction in relation to his possible views on the Holy Spirit and the Gentiles. While acknowledging the difficulty in getting back to the mind of Saul the Pharisee, our attempt in this section will be to speculate on the likely beliefs of a zealous pre–70 A.D. Pharisee. Within such parameters the juxtaposition of Paul's Pharisaic convictions and the expectation of the Spirit may inform our inquiry into Paul's initial thoughts on the Spirit and help us to narrow down our attempts to understand his pre–Christian insights on the Holy Spirit.

4.2. Pre–Christian Paul, the Pharisee

There is a tension within the scholarly community regarding the autobiographical (Gal. 1.13–14; Phil. 3.5) as well as the biographical (Acts 16.37; 21.39; 22.25; 23.6; 25.11; 26.5) references to Paul's origins in Tarsus, and his affiliation with the Pharisaic movement.

This has resulted from the scholarship of a previous generation which postulated a pure, Torah–centered Judaism for Palestine, and a syncretistic Hellenistic Judaism of

---
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the Diaspora. However, recent scholarship has warned us about this false dichotomy. It is not the intention of this study to revive the old debate about the location of Paul’s upbringing, Tarsus or Jerusalem, but rather to highlight the fact that such assumptions can lead us to diverse conclusion on Paul’s understanding of the Spirit. Importantly, our interest lies in Paul’s self-perception as a Pharisee (Phil. 3.5; Gal. 1.14; cf. 2 Cor. 11.22), and in gaining insights into his expectation of the Spirit in line with the wider perception in the post-biblical period.

4.2.1. The Tarsus Factor

The ‘History of Religions’ school emphasised a Hellenised approach to Paul’s perception of the Spirit. The assumption is based on Paul’s upbringing in a Hellenistic environment, particularly in Tarsus, and its consequent influence on him and his theology. Thus R.B. Hoyle states, “Paul came of a family settled in Tarsus which may be taken as typical of Jewish families in the Diaspora subjected to Hellenistic influences.” Further, in his chapter on ‘The Influence of Hellenistic Judaism on Paul’s view of the Spirit’, Hoyle draws conclusions from Stoic and Hellenistic Mystery religion to prove his thesis.


3 M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period (2 vols.; trans. J. Bowden London: SCM Press, 1974); idem, Jews, Greeks and Barbarians, 1980; L.H. Feldman, 'How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine', HUCA 57 (1986) 83-111. In Feldman’s view, although Hellenistic elements were extensive, they were essentially superficial and did not profoundly affect the nature of Judaism. Feldman frequently minimizes the evidence of Hengel. See also J.N. Sevenster, Do you know Greek? How Much Greek could the First Jewish Christians Have Known (SNT 19; Leiden: Brill, 1968). It is important to recognise that there is no ‘either–or’ but a complex interaction of influences on many levels. See recent discussions in T. Engberg-Pederson (ed.), Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide (Louisville, KY.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001).


6 Those who have argued for a Hellenistic influence have interpreted the theology of Spirit in Paul along the lines of Stoicism and Mystery Religions. See R. Reitzenstein (Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen: nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen (Berlin: B.G. Teubner, 1920), who appears to have been the first to call attention to the Spirit in the Mystery Religions. Other examples include Bousset, Kyrios Christos; J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity (vol.2, London: Macmillan & Co., 1937) 465. For criticism of the above positions see Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 182–200.


8 Hoyle, Holy Spirit, 211–265.
It is enticing to bring in cultural and religious-historical affiliations from Tarsus to explain Paul’s pneumatology; nevertheless, it is important to recognise that: a) only Luke gives us any information about Paul’s Tarsus upbringing; b) it is difficult to argue what could have been so very particular about the mental environment of Paul in Tarsus that it would have influenced his life more than the milieu of any other place (Syria, or Jerusalem); c) we may agree with many scholars that Paul was born in Tarsus, but then suppose that he later developed close ties with Jerusalem; that Paul was indeed a Diaspora Jew, and that this accounts for his exposure to Hellenism, but that he grew up as a child in a Hellenistic Jewish house in Jerusalem, his parents, like other Jewish Diasporians, having returned to their mother country (Acts 23.16).

4.2.2. Paul’s Self perception as a Pharisee

While emphasising his Jewishness, Paul refers to himself as a member of the Pharisaic group (Phil. 3.5; cf. Gal. 1.13–14; 2 Cor. 11.22). He explains his credentials in terms of progressing (προέκοπτων) in Judaism beyond many of his own age among his people (Gal. 1.14), his zeal (ζηλος) for the “traditions of the forefathers” (Gal. 1.14), and his zeal (ζηλος again) to persecute the church (Phil. 3.5–6); and as to righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) under law, he claims to have been blameless (Phil. 3.5–6). Luke too supports Paul’s testimony describing him as a Pharisee (Acts 23.6; 26.5) who was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of the Pharisee Gamaliel (Acts 22.3; cf. 5.34), and as believing in the resurrection of the dead (Acts 23.8). The use of the term

---

10 We recognise that, although Tarsus and its surrounding areas had some influence on Paul, we should be careful not to ascribe to them more influence on his life than Judea and Galilee.
11 van Unnik, ‘Once Again: Tarsus and Jerusalem’, in Sparsa Collecta I, 321–327, reaches the conclusion that, “Paul was born in Tarsus, it was in Jerusalem that he received his upbringing in the parental home, just as it was in Jerusalem that he received his later schooling for the rabbinate”. His argument is built on three participial usages (γεγεννημένος, ἀναπτεραμμένος, πεπαιδευμένος).
12 W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem (Cambridge: CUP) 124, n.66. Hengel, Pre-Christian Paul, 38, thinks that Paul was more profoundly influenced by Jerusalem than by Tarsus.
15 Among the Pauline literature, only in Phil. 3.5 do we find Paul himself claiming an association with Pharisaism. In Gal. 1.14 Paul makes no mention of his Pharisaism. Although 1 Tim. 1.12–17 can be regarded as a statement from Paul, it is located in a letter which a majority of scholars doubt that Paul wrote.
16 See discussions in Haacker, Paulus, 54–55.
ακριβετα, ‘strictness’ (Acts 22.3; 26.5), in Luke’s description of a Pharisee is particularly notable.17

Paul’s combination of terminology,18 — the verb προεκόπτων, the noun form ζήλος and — the Lukan use of ακριβετα, is particularly helpful in elucidating Paul’s pre-Christian background.19

The term προεκόπτω (Gal. 1.14 cf. 1 Tim. 4.15), originally a nautical term “to make headway in spite of blows”, came to connote in the philosophical and religious writings of the Hellenistic world “the process of moral and spiritual development” in an individual.20 It is used in this way by Josephus of his own “great progress in education” (μεγάλην παιδείας προέκόπτων – Life 8; cf. Lk. 2:52; 1QS I.14). The imperfect form προέκόπτων (Gal. 1.14) stresses the idea of a continuing process of moral and spiritual development. Paul uses the term to refer to his progress in Judaism beyond many of his contemporaries.21

Although Paul himself does not use the term ακριβετα in his letters, it is both a characteristic feature of Pharisaism,22 and an idea clearly suggested by Paul’s descriptions of himself in Phil. 3.6 and Gal. 1.13–14. In Josephus, ακριβετα is used in relation to Pharisaic dedication and to their most careful exposition of the law (J.W.1.5; 110; 2.8, 162; Ant. 17.41; Life 38, 191).23 Similarly, Luke refers to Paul in Acts 22.3 as having been educated καταντα ακριβεταν at the feet of Gamaliel.

The term ζήλος is used to describe Paul’s ‘zeal for God’ (Acts 22.3) and ‘zeal for the traditions of the fathers’ (Gal. 1.14).24 Various interpretations have been put

17 Hengel, Pre–Christian Paul, 40.

18 See discussions in Betz, Galatians; J.D.G. Dunn, The Epistle to the Galatians (BNTC; London: Black, 1993); E. de W. Burton, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921); R.Y.K. Fung, The Epistle to the Galatians (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); R.N. Longenecker, Galatians (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1990)


forward. a) The term is used to describe Paul's membership in a Zealot party. b) It relates Paul to an emphasis on Maccabaean zeal for the Law, which could inspire the killing of offenders against the Law, who polluted the land. c) \( \zeta \eta \lambda \omega \zeta \) could also denote intense loyalty to the Law, and a defence of it unrelated to violence and killing (cf. 1QSa 4.4; 9.23; 1QH 14.14; T. Ash. 4.5). In Gal. 1.14 Paul defines the nature of his 'zeal' as not so much political but expressive of loyalty to the 'traditions of the fathers', and particularly to the teachings and practices developed in the Pharisaic traditions of Second Temple Judaism.

There is no doubt that employment of the term in Paul's autobiographical and biographic references indicates his affiliation with the Pharisees. However, it is still important to recognise that even if these terms were often Pharisee-specific, they also embraced the wider interests of Judaism in general.

4.3. The Spirit and the Student of Torah

Given, then, that Paul was a Pharisee before he became a Christian, can we deduce from what we know of pre-70 Pharisaic aspects of that understanding of the Spirit which might shed light on Paul's pre-Christian understanding, the language he used to

---


26 The term 'zeal' can be understood on the model of Phinehas, who slew the Israelite and the Midianite woman whom he had brought with him into the congregation of Israel (Num. 25.10–13; cf. Sir. 45.23–24; 1 Macc. 2.54; 4 Macc. 18.12. See other examples: Simeon and Levi (Gen. 34; Jth.9.4; Jub. 30.5–20) Elijah (Sir. 48.2; 1 Macc. 2.58) and the Maccabees (1 Macc. 2.19–27, 50, 58; 2 Macc. 4.2; Josephus *Ant.*12.271), and see also discussions in Hengel, *Zealots*, 1989); W.R. Farmer, *The Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956; M.R. Fairchild, 'Paul's Pre-Christian Zealot Associations: A Re-examination of Gal. 1.14 and Acts 22.3', *NTS* 45 (1999) 514–32; S.A. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch*. *Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2* (SNTSMS 114; Cambridge: CUP, 2001).

describe his pre-Christian zeal and particularly in his expectations regarding the Spirit. 28

Regarding the nature of the Spirit anticipation during the period of our concern, Hengel has argued that the charismatic interpretation of Scripture 29 was a characteristic of prophecy in the Judaism of the Hellenistic and Roman period. According to him, prophecy during the first century CE had two other characteristics: the eschatological possession of the Spirit, 30 and a prophetic interpretation of historical and political events. 31 For Hengel, the Pharisees experienced the above-mentioned characteristics along with other sectarians, and he refers to passages like J.W. 3.352; 399–408 and jTaan. 68d, 49f. to exemplify Pharisaic interpretation of scripture; to Ant. 17.43ff.; tPes. 4.2 to highlight Pharisaic ideas on the possession of Spirit, and to Ant. 14.174ff. to point out Pharisaic activity in prophecy. 32 It is no doubt probable that various deviant groups did claim Spirit possession or were involved in charismatic interpretations of Scripture, but there is little in any of the above passages to provide any clear indication about the anticipations of the Spirit that might have circulated in Pharisaic circles. 33

A significant passage that informs Paul’s self-description in Phil. 3.5–6 and Gal. 1.14 (cf. Acts 22.3) is found in Ben Sira. All three of the key words προκλητικῶν, ζήλως and ἀκριβείᾳ occur in the last chapter of the Book of Ben Sira. 34 In his autobiographical conclusion (Sir. 51.13–30), 35 Ben Sira tells how he kept seeking Wisdom from his youth, resolving to tread her paths without relenting (Sir. 51.13–19).

---

28 It is important for us to note here that the earlier NT scholarship (Jeremias, New Testament Theology [New York: Scribner’s, 1971) emphasised the Jewish belief in the NT era about the withdrawal of the Spirit from Israel. Recently, Levison (‘Did the Spirit Withdraw from Israel?’, 35-57) demonstrated that such an argument is based on poorly interpreted consensus which ignores the literary context of t.Sotah 13.2-4, which according to him “is an affirmation that with the presence once again of the righteous in the first century A.D., the Holy Spirit could reappear following its temporary withdrawal after the death of the latter prophets.” ‘Holy Spirit’ DNTB, 509.

29 Examples include, Dan. 9.2’s reinterpretation of Jer. 25.11; 1 Cor. 2.13 (Hengel, Zealots, 234–35).

30 Hengel quote the examples from 1QpHab. 2.5; 9.6; CD 4.4; 6.11; IQSa 1.1 and Acts 2.17ff; 8.15ff.; Rom. 5.5; 8; Gal. 3.2. Josephus speaks of prophetic activity among the Essenes during the period (Ant. 13.311–13; 15.373–79; 17.345–48). The experience of Qumran is attested by 1QS 4.2–8, 20.26; 1QH 12.11–12 (Hengel, Zealots, 235–36).

31 For example, J.W.1.78; 2.112 (Hengel, Zealots, 236).

32 Hengel, Zealots, 237.


34 Pate, Reverse of the Curse, 134.

35 Scholars have doubted the originality of 51.13–28. See A.A. Di Lella, Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom. CBQ 28 (1966) 101–105; P.W. Skehan, ‘The Acrostic Poem in Sirach 51:13–30’, HTR 64 (1971): 387–400. However, one needs to recognise that the poem has several points of contact with the rest of Ben Sira’s book, and must at least be regarded as representative of the kind of wisdom circles in which Ben Sira moved (Collins, Jewish Wisdom, 53).
In Sir. 51.17–18 the Torah/Wisdom teacher exclaims that he made progress (προόρισμή) in wisdom and has been zealous (εὐθαλάσσω) to follow her. Similarly in v.19 the author portrays himself as one who pursues (διηκριβωσάμεν) Wisdom by strictly following the Mosaic Law.

Building on this, we may be able to find a correlation between pre-Christian Paul and the anticipation of the Spirit. Sir. 39.1–11 provides a lead into our discussion. Ben Sira’s self-conscious reflection upon his own scribal calling as the one ‘who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High’ (Sir. 39.1) indicates the role of the Spirit in the process.

In 38.24–39–11 Ben Sira compares the long periods of time that the γραμματεύς 36 has for meditation (as the one who studies Torah), with the ceaseless demands made on the time of farmers, artisans, smiths and potters (Sir. 38.24–30). Though the latter are not asked to play a part in councils and public assemblies, or to be judges, instructors or rulers, their work is nonetheless essential for the maintenance of the life of the world (vv.31–34). The scribe who devotes himself to studying Torah and combines this with the exploration of other ancient modes of wisdom, searching out truth and illuminating what is obscure, is an adviser to rulers, and enriches his understanding by travel and by diligent prayer and reflection (cf. Sir. 6.18; 8.8).

However, in Sir. 39.5 the author emphasises the need for ‘prayer’ (προσευχὴ) and ‘supplication’ (δεινόθεσσαλ) for the reception of wisdom. He then points toward the role of the Spirit as the ‘spirit of understanding’ (πνεῦμα συνέσεως) in the experience of the Torah student. Here the author brings in the notion of divine inspiration that comes through the spirit of understanding as sent from God. As a result the scribe “pours forth (δημβρέω – lit. rains) the words of Wisdom” (Sir. 39.6; 50.27), 37 and “meditates on God’s secrets;” he “reveals instruction in his teaching” and “glories in the law of God’s covenant” (Sir. 39–7–8). 38 A transition happens to the one who

37 It is interesting to note that δημβρέω is used to explain the outpouring of the sage’s wisdom – only when the Spirit of understanding comes upon the student of Torah is he able to pour out wisdom (39.6; 50.27). The traditional prophetic Spirit-anticipatory vocabulary is used (ἐκχεισ, cf. Joel 3.1–5) in 24.33.
38 Scholars have noted a hierarchy in the anticipation of wisdom upon people. Davis (Wisdom, 16–24) argues for three levels or stages of sapiential achievement. First, those who engaged in traditional vocations attain the lowest level of wisdom. Second, a higher degree of wisdom is realised by the scribe who devotes himself to the study and practice of the Torah; and third, the highest level and very culmination of sapiential achievement is obtained when God graciously gives the Spirit. A.R. Brown,
devotes himself to studying the Torah\(^{39}\) of the Most High (Sir. 38.34), the Prophets (Sir. 39.1), and the parables and proverbs in the Writings (Sir. 39.2–3): one who previously has been a seeker after Wisdom now becomes her possessor (Sir. 39.7ff).\(^{40}\) For Ben Sira, it is the πνεῦμα συνέσεως that makes the difference.\(^{41}\)

Thus Ben Sira, self-consciously a teacher,\(^{42}\) having made progress (προκοπή) and been both 'zealous' (ζηταός) and 'strict' (ἀκριβεῖως) in his conduct, gained the 'prize possession' of Wisdom/Torah\(^{43}\) and now functions as an intermediary between Wisdom and the people.\(^{44}\) The sage now pours out instruction. He encourages and exhorts people to seek (Sir. 4.11,12 – ζητέω), to obey (Sir. 4.15 – ὑποκούω) and to listen to Wisdom (4.15 – μετέχω), particularly through the study of Torah in the teaching of the sage (Sir. 3.1; 6.23; 23.7; 31.22; 39.13; 51.28). The reward is that Wisdom will bring divine blessing and a share in the future when God calls to account the nations of the world (Sir. 4.15).

The idea here is not that in the future the Torah teacher will become an inspired interpreter but that the Spirit of God is providing the abilities of wisdom in the present;

\(^{39}\) Wisdom is necessarily linked to the study of the Torah; study, meditation, and observance of Torah lead to wisdom (1.26; 6.37; 15.1; 21.11).

\(^{40}\) For example Exod. 28.3 (Bezaleel); 35.31; Deut. 34.9 (Joshua); Isa. 11.2. (messianic figure). See Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 99–118; J. Marbök, in M. Gilbert (ed.), La Sagesse de L’Ancien Testament (Leuven: Université, 1979) 308; Davis Wisdom, 22–23.

\(^{41}\) For example Exod. 28.3 (Bezaleel), 35.31; Deut. 34.9 (Joshua); Isa. 11.2. (messianic figure). See Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 99–118; J. Marbök, in M. Gilbert (ed.), La Sagesse de L’Ancien Testament (Leuven: Université, 1979) 308; Davis Wisdom, 22–23.

\(^{42}\) For example Exod. 28.3 (Bezaleel), 35.31; Deut. 34.9 (Joshua); Isa. 11.2. (messianic figure). See Rylaarsdam, Revelation, 99–118; J. Marbök, in M. Gilbert (ed.), La Sagesse de L’Ancien Testament (Leuven: Université, 1979) 308; Davis Wisdom, 22–23.

\(^{43}\) It is interesting to note the parallels between Ben Sira’s reference to the calling of the student of Torah and his own autobiography. He seeks (ζητεῖω 39.1, 3 = 51.14, 21) wisdom in prayer (προσευχή 39.5,6 = 51.13). His search for wisdom leads him to a way of life and instruction (παραδίδει αὐτῷ 39.8 = 51.16, 23 cf. 51.26, 28) according to the law (39.1 = 51.16). The sage made progress in Wisdom/Torah and earnestly commits himself to live accordingly. Having ‘gained a prize possession’ (through the Spirit 3.6) the writer invites others to learn wisdom through his instruction (39.8–11 = 51.23–30).


\(^{45}\) The identification of Wisdom and Torah is made elsewhere in Sirach, though less forcefully (1.11–30; 6.32–37; 15.1; 19.20; 21.6; 23.27); see G.T. Sheppard, 'Wisdom and Torah: The Interpretation of Deuteronomy Underlying Sirach 24.23', in G.A. Tuttle (ed.), Biblical and Near Eastern Studies (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 166–76.

\(^{46}\) The Cross and Human Transformation: Paul’s Apocalyptic Word in 1 Corinthians [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995] 38–39 contends that the scribe in general is the person in whom the creational endowment of wisdom comes to full fruition, whereas others attain only a limited degree of wisdom. See also J. Liesen, Full of Praise: An Exegetical Study of Sira 39, 12–35 (JSJSS 64; Leiden: Brill, 2000) 64.
that is what places the sage above all the other artisans. This reflects the general trend in Second Temple Judaism concerning the emerging leadership of Torah teachers. It is possible to argue that Paul's autobiographical statements in Philippians and Galatians, and even Luke's biography in Acts, have links to this description of the characteristics and role of a Torah/Wisdom teacher.

4.3.1. The Spirit and the Interpretation of Torah

The notion that the Spirit of God will enable the Torah teacher is very much in line with the Second Temple period's awareness that divine enlightenment, particularly by the Spirit of God, is necessary for the study of Torah; and that someone who was filled with the Spirit really could adequately interpret the words of Holy Scripture which were inspired by God.

The association of the Spirit with the ability to interpret the Scripture is implied in several texts from the Qumran literature (IQS 8.16; IQH 20.12 = 4Q427 f8ii:8). In the Thanksgiving Hymns of the community, the author presents himself as the persecuted and exiled leader. He regards that the community is totally dependent on his leadership. Although the author recognizes that his leadership is a matter of controversy, he makes claims to authority for the teaching which he had received under divine inspiration.

---

45 J.L. Crenshaw ('The Book of Sirach: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections', NIB, 5: 813) connects the usage 'spirit of understanding' (39.6) to that of the Davidic ruler of Isa. 11.2. Such a notion is, however, rather remote from the present passage.

46 Though Paul does not, in fact, use the phrase πνεύμα σοφίας in his letters, we may discern Ben Sira's influence on Paul in 1 Cor. 2.6ff. Paul presents the Spirit here as a source for divine wisdom, though he ignores its links with Torah. Paul affirms that 'God has revealed to us through the Spirit', 'things' that were formerly hidden to 'them' have now been revealed to 'us' (cf. Sir. 39.7-8). The relationship of Paul's past life with Ben Sira's description of his own can be traced further in his usage of words like σοφός and γρηγορομαντής (Sir. 51.13, and see parallel usage in 1 Cor. 1.20) and παίδευτης (Sir. 51.23 and see parallel usage in Rom. 2.20). See Schnabel, Law and Wisdom, 232-34; Pate, Reverse of Curse, 137; Nestle–Aland (NA, 769–74) detects twenty–six allusions of Paul to Ben Sira.

47 During the post-biblical era, prayer for divine enlightenment is found in Ps. 119.12, 18-19, 27, 33-35, 73. Torah can only be properly understood if God himself grants divine insight to his people.

48 Scholars have described the inspired interpretation of the scripture in terms of 'charismatic exegesis', a term used to describe the type of biblical interpretation practiced in the Qumran community. See W.H. Brownlee, 'Biblical interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', BA 14 (1951) 61; Aune, 'Charismatic Exegesis', 126-150; Hengel, Zealots, 239–244.

49 Scholars have noted various types of interpretation that were available in Qumran. G. Vermes ('Biblical Proof–Texts in Qumran Literature', JSS 34 [1989] 493–508) indicates that there are four categories of interpretations: (1) eschatological actualisation, (2) direct proof, (3) reinforced proof, and (4) proof of historical fulfilment. See also, D. Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M.E. Stone (ed.), Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period (CRINT 2.2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) 504–505; Aune, 'Charismatic Exegesis', 133.

50 There are other passages in IQS reflecting the belief that the community's interpretation of Scripture was given by revelation. However, the Holy Spirit is never mentioned in connection with the charismatic interpretation of Scripture (IQS 1.9; 8.15; 9.13).
possibly through the Spirit (IQH 20.12 = 4Q427 f8ii:8).\(^{51}\) It is important for us to recognise that we are talking about a community whose ‘initiates’, particularly the novices, are obligated to follow Torah, and that the community’s central figure was believed to have received divine inspiration to interpret Scripture.

Similarly in the *pesharim* the author associates himself with the spirit of revelation (cf. 1QpHab 7.1–5; 1QpHab 2.7–9). The Teacher’s inspired insight into the writings of the Old Testament prophets (1QpHab. 7.4) and into eschatological mysteries show him to be the possessor and expounder of God–given insights.

Philo refers to the inspiration of the Spirit in his role as allegorical interpreter. The divine Spirit illumines the mind to enable it to grasp the full wisdom of the scriptural narrative. By the Spirit, the ‘eyes’ of the God–seeker’s understanding are ‘opened’ to the hidden or allegorical meaning within the law (*Plant.* 23.27; cf. *Spec.* 3.1–2, 5–6). In *Som.* 252 Philo claims to hear a voice, a voice from within, which leads him to interpret Torah (cf. *Mos.* 2.264–65).

Later, in rabbinic circles too, such a notion continued to be prevalent. Thus in *Lev. R.* 35.7, R. Aha. said, “He who learns in order to do is worthy to receive the Holy Spirit.” R. Yudan in *Song.R.* 1.8 expounds, “Whosoever openly makes known the words of Torah, he is worthy of the Holy Spirit”.\(^{52}\) In the celebrated dictum of R. Phinehas ben Jair, “The Torah leads to watchfulness, watchfulness to strictness, strictness to sinlessness, sinlessness to self-control, self-control to purity, purity to piety, piety to humility, humility to sinfearing, sinfearing to holiness, holiness to the Holy Spirit, and this last to the resurrection of the dead.” (*t.Sotah* 49b; *Abod. Zar.* 20.b)\(^{53}\)

We conclude, then, that in Second Temple Judaism, the notion was prevalent that biblical interpretation involved the Spirit’s inspiration.\(^{54}\) The implication of such a

---

\(^{51}\) The identity of the Teacher of Righteousness as the author of *Hodayot* is disputed. See discussions in D. Dombkowski Hopkins, ‘The Qumran Community and 1 Q Hodayot: A Reassessment’, *RevQ* 10 (1981) 323–64. However, the nature of these claims suggests that the author of these Hymns could well have been the Teacher of Righteousness who is mentioned in the Damascus Document (CD 1.3-2.1; 5.20-6.11) and the *pesharim* (4Q171 3.15-17).

\(^{52}\) On a similar line in the tannaic commentary related to the portions of Exodus 13.17–14.26–31 (*Mek.Bešallah* 7): ‘R. Nehemiah says, “Whosoever taketh upon himself one precept in faith is worthy that the Holy Spirit should rest upon him.”’ See also *Bek.64b*: “R. Levi b. Hiyya said: ‘One who on leaving the synagogue goes into the House of Study and studies the Torah is deemed worthy to welcome the Divine Presence’” (cf. *Eccl. R.* 2.11).


\(^{54}\) D. Georgi (*Opponents*, 84, See 181–83 n.59.) has located the matrix of inspired exegesis in the synagogue, where “the medium of Jewish propaganda was the synagogue worship and the exegesis of the law presented there”.

conclusion is that, while Paul might have anticipated the inspiration of the Spirit in his own study of the Torah and his interpretation of the traditions, he probably thought that the Spirit was available only to a selected few. These select recipients would be those involved in teaching Torah, and particularly in acquiring the right interpretation in the light of their own particular beliefs. They would probably have been suspicious of the claims of Spirit inspiration made by other sectarian groups.

4.4. Other Possible influences

We can also argue that Saul the Pharisee would have associated the divine Spirit with its diverse range of effects. For pre-Christian Paul, the Spirit could be associated with prophecy, or with creation, or with wisdom in relation to the expected messianic figure. For our purpose, two particular strands need to be noted.

4.4.1. The Spirit and Resurrection

In the light of the Pharisaic belief in resurrection of the dead, and in contrast to the Sadducees who disbelieved in it (Acts 23.8; Josephus Ant. 18.16), it is possible to argue that Paul might be familiar with the notion of the Spirit having a part in the raising of the dead.

This idea of God bringing the dead back to life is found in both biblical and post-biblical literature (Deut. 32.39; 1 Sam. 2.6; Wis. 16.13; 4Q521). In the OT, it is associated with the Spirit only in Ezek. 37.1–14 (cf. LXX Isa. 26.18), though the association continues in Second Temple (2 Macc. 7.22) and Rabbinic Judaism (cf. t.Sotah 49b = Song R. 1.9; Midr.Ps. 104.30; Lev. R. 27.9). The second of the Eighteen Benedictions, Birkat gevurot concludes with ("Blessed...He Who revives the dead"), and ("Resurrection of the dead") indicates a continuity of thought.

---

55 By focusing on the Pharisaic background of Paul, we are not excluding the possibility that Paul was also influenced by other streams of thought on the Spirit in Second Temple Judaism. See Turner, Power, 86–104.
56 Such a notion is found in the Palestinian Judaism for example, 1QS 8.15–16; Jub. 25.14; 31.11; L Enoch 91.1; L A B. 9.10; 20.2–3; 28.6; 31.9; 62.2; 4 Ezra 5.22. (cf. 1 Thess. 5.19–20; 1 Cor. 12.7–11; 2 Thess. 2.5; Rom. 1.2; 11.3; 16.26).
57 Such a notion is found in the Palestinian Judaism for example, 1QS 5.24–25; 4QPsTa; L Enoch 49.2–3; Pss. 17.37; T. Levi. 18.7, 10–12.
58 See 1QSb 5.24–25; 4QPsTa; L Enoch 49.2–3; Pss. 17.37; T. Levi. 18.7, 10–12.
60 It is to be noted that the exact nature of resurrection depicted in these texts is debated, though there is no doubt that the notion was prevalent in the Second Temple Judaism. See discussions in D.S.Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (London: SCM Press, 1964) 369ff.; Montague, Holy Spirit, 89–90.
61 See discussion in Horn, Das Angeld, 90–96; Schäfer, Die Vorstellung vom heiligen Geist, 120–21.
A passage of significant interest is 2 Macc. 7.23 (cf. 7.9; 12.44; 14.46).\(^{62}\) In 2 Macc. 7.1-42, seven brothers and their mother are martyred because they refuse to obey King Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who wants them to transgress the laws of God by eating pork. They give their life voluntarily for God’s laws, in the belief that God will give it back to them by raising (ἀναστήσσω) them to life (7.9, 14, 23). Importantly for us, this is to occur through the Spirit of life (7.23).\(^{63}\) The notion of martyrriological resurrection seems to be the predominant message in the passage,\(^{64}\) as the author is talking about the heavenly vindication of the martyrs (7.9, 23, 37-38), where the ‘King of universe’ will give back life in the future (7.9) as a reward for their fidelity to God’s law.\(^{65}\) Since the passage emerges from a milieu where ‘zeal’ (ζηλος 2 Macc. 4.2) for law is significant, it is possible that Saul the Pharisee would have been familiar with it (Rom. 4.17; 1 Cor. 15.52; 2 Cor. 1.9; 1 Tim. 6.13 cf. Jn. 5.21).\(^{66}\)

4.4.2. The Spirit and Purity

Another strand of thought with which the pre-Christian Paul might have been familiar is the relationship between the Spirit and purity.\(^{67}\) It is generally agreed that the Pharisees were a group concerned for the maintenance of purity; their concern was to keep the purity laws either for cultic reasons, in relation to the Temple; or for reasons of personal piety, by applying the laws of ritual purity to their everyday lives; or for socio-political reasons, to purify Israel by summoning her to return to the true ancestral traditions.\(^{68}\)

---

\(^{62}\) Probably written in first century B.C.E. See J.A. Goldstein Il Maccabees (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983) for provenance and date.

\(^{63}\) G.W.E. Nickelsburg (Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism [HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1972] 107) argues that the resurrection is not simply individual vindication, but a restoration of community. See Ezek. 37.5, 9-10 (Song. R. 1.9), where the prophet had already envisioned the revivification of the dead as an effect of the gift of the spirit.


\(^{65}\) Interestingly the messiah figure involved in this process is kept to judge the wicked and rescue God’s remnant. The resurrection of the righteous to eternal life and the eternal destruction of the wicked are aspects of the eschatology of Psalms that are never directly associated with their messianism, possibly because they are not functions of the retributive judgment against the enemies which is associated with the coming Davidic king (Nickelsburg Resurrection, 131-34).


\(^{67}\) That the Spirit flees away from an unclean environment was a rather common notion: 1 Sam. 16.14; 1 Kgs. 22.24 (2 Chr. 18.23); Ps. 51.11; Mic. 3.5-7; 1 Enoch 67.10; Sib.Or. 4.187-88; cf. Josephus, A.J. 6.266; L.A.B. 60.1; Philo, Gig. 19-29; 47; 53; QG. 1.90; Deus. 2.

\(^{68}\) It is not clear what motivated the Pharisees for their concern for purity. Scholars argue variously for cultic interest (Neusner, Rabbinic Tradition, 3.288; idem, From Politics to Piety, 83) or to socio-political and cultural reasons (N.T. Wright, New Testament and People of God, 186ff; Dunn, ‘The Incident at Antioch’, 139.)
In the post-biblical literature, purity became a matter of primary concern from the Maccabaean crisis onwards (For e.g. 1 Macc. 1.47, 54, 62; Jub. 3.8–14; Pss. 8.12, 22; 1QS 3.5; CD 5.6–7; 12.9–20; Josephus Ant. 3.261; Philo Spec. 3.205). As noted in our previous discussion, Second Temple Judaism’s anticipation of the Spirit as a purifying Spirit (Jub. 1.23; 1QS 3.6–8; 4.18–21; 9.3; 1QH 7.6–7; 14.13–14; 16.15, 19–20) might well have influenced pre-Christian Paul. What is particularly significant here is the role of the Spirit in the purification of the righteous, and in maintaining their intimate relationship with God by obedience to the law. In light of 1 Thess. 4.8, 2 Thess. 2.13, Rom. 15.16, and cf. Rom. 14.14 it is possible to argue that Paul was familiar with this notion.

4.5. Conclusion

In sum, the collocation of the themes and the terms deployed in his autobiographical statements (Gal. 1.13–14; Phil. 3.5–6 cf. Acts 22.3; 26.1ff.) indicates that in his former life Paul was a zealous Pharisee. On the basis of our discussion it is plausible to say that Paul would have known of various strands of thought on the nature and effects of the Spirit that were prevalent in the first CE. At least three strands seem particularly close to home for him. The first is the notion that divine enlightenment, specifically by the Spirit of God, is necessary for the study of Torah and that only someone who was filled with the Spirit could really adequately interpret the words of Holy Scripture, which were inspired by God. The second and third emerge, respectively, from the belief in resurrection and the concern for purity in relation to the Spirit.

What is noticeable in all of the above strands is the Spirit’s relationship with the Law, and its role in the maintenance of the covenant community. Thus: (i) the Spirit is available for those who study and practice Torah; (ii) God through the Spirit in resurrection will vindicate those who show fidelity to Torah; and (iii) the Spirit is available for those who maintain purity and obedience to Torah. The likely implication of such a set of convictions is that Saul, the Pharisee, would not have expected Gentiles to receive the Spirit in the age to come.
5.1. Introduction

In the preceding section attention was drawn to the fact that both the letters of Paul and the Book of Acts point towards Paul’s past as a Pharisee. Along with Paul’s Pharisaic background, a significant aspect of his pre-Christian career was his role as a persecutor of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ.

While many details in the references to Paul’s involvement in Stephen’s martyrdom and later his persecution of the church in Acts are disputed, at least two observations are generally allowed: Paul was involved in persecution of the Spirit enthusiastic group surrounding Stephen, and the persecution resulted in the propagation of the Gospel over a wider area (Gal. 1.13, 22; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6; Acts 8.1ff.; 11.19ff.).

On the basis of the above assumptions, the rationale behind our enquiry is to place within this broader picture the question: Whatever triggered persecution, does it have a link to the Spirit expectations of Paul? Is there a possibility of relating the context in which Paul’s persecution activities took place and to see the significance of the pneumatic activities of the groups surrounding Stephen in that context? The answer to these questions has its limitations: (i) the historical data surrounding Paul’s persecution of the church in his letters is minimal and not very self-explanatory, and (ii) there is a need to depend on Lukan information to supplement our data on Paul’s past convictions. It is within these limitations that we enquire into the self-perception of Paul, in his former life as a persecutor of the church, and in his expectation on the bestowal of the Spirit which is reflected in this phase of his biography and theology.

---

5.2. Paul the Persecutor

While addressing the communities in Galatia, Corinth, and Philippi, Paul claims that he was a persecutor of the church, as one who wrought much havoc on the church in order to destroy it (Gal. 1.13, 22; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6). For Luke, Paul was known to be a persecutor of the church; he is introduced at the time of the first persecution (against Stephen) and the "great persecution" (Acts 8.1). Paul is presented as "breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 9.1, cf. 8.1-3; 22.4-5; 26.1ff.). In Acts, Paul persecutes Christians because they belong to "the Way" (Acts 9.2; 22.4); he is involved in "opposing the name of Jesus of Nazareth" (Acts 26.9; cf. 22.5, 19-20; 26.10-12).

In spite of Luke’s consistent emphasis and relative knowledge of Paul’s involvement in the persecution of the church, particularly the group surrounding Stephen, skeptical scholarship has denied any such links. Those who deny that the book of Acts is primarily historical, but consider it a heavily redacted document suggest that Paul’s relationship with Stephen was erroneously inserted by Luke, a case that has been built on the notion of a discontinuity between Paul as seen in his letters and the portrayal of him in Acts. However, a recently emerging consensus, which affirms both historicity and continuity, counters such a disjunction between

---

2 Paul’s own references to his pre-Christian background are inadequate, for they leave considerable voids in our knowledge about the nature, reason(s), victims or even the location of Paul’s involvement in persecution – possibly due the polemical nature of issues addressed in his letters. See discussions in A.J. Hultgren, 'Paul’s Pre-Christian Persecutions of the Church: Their Purpose, Locale, and Nature', *JBL* 95 (1976) 97-11; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1984) 2-50; C. Burchard, *Der driezehnte Zeuge. Traditions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Lukas Darstellung der Frühtage des Paulus* (FRANT 103; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 40-51.

3 See Acts 9.4; 22.7; 26.14, the recurring question, "Saul, Saul why do you persecute me?" supports Luke’s familiarity with the issue.

4 Hill (Hellenists and Hebrews) attempts to debunk the idea that the Greek speaking Christian Jews in Jerusalem were ideologically distinguishable from their Hebrew counterparts, and dismisses the notion that the persecution in Acts was selective in nature. For a critique on Hill’s position see Pate, *Reverse of Curse*, 429-434.


the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the letters. We should at least consider whether any links between Paul and the Stephen group may shed some light on the subject of the present inquiry.

5.2.1. The Common Threads in Paul and Luke

Building on the above possibilities, we proceed to look at the common emphasis that Luke and Paul make concerning Paul’s ‘former life’ as a persecutor.

First, Paul and Luke agree linguistically that Paul was involved in activities that are described by the verbs \( \epsilon\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\upsilon \) and \( \epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon \). \textit{You have heard, no doubt, of my earlier life in Judaism. I was violently persecuting (\( \epsilon\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\upsilon \) Gal. 1.13; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6 cf. Gal. 1.23; 1 Tim. 1.13)\textsuperscript{10} the church of God and was trying to destroy it” (\( \epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon \) Gal. 1.13, 23; Acts 9.21). What is interesting is that Luke only ever uses these terms \( \epsilon\iota\omega\kappa\omicron\upsilon \textsuperscript{11} \) and \( \epsilon\iota\rho\omicron\theta\omicron\omicron\upsilon \textsuperscript{12} \) in relation to the

---


\textsuperscript{9} M.A. Seifrid (Justification by Faith. The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme [NovTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 155) criticises that viewpoint by pointing out that, elsewhere in Paul, the word involves the ideas of physical harm (Gal. 5.11; 6.12; cf.6.17) and mistreatment of others (Rom. 12.14; 1Cor.4.12, 15.9; 2 Cor. 4.9, Gal. 4.29).

\textsuperscript{10} The term ‘destroy’ (\( \alpha\iota\nu\mu\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\upsilon \textsuperscript{12} \)) occurs in Acts 8.3 for the activity of persecution of Paul.

---


8 Scholars who recognise Luke’s editorial problem over Acts 8.1-3 do not, however, deny its historicity. See for example, Burchard, Der dreizenhnte Zeuge, 48.


10 In classical Greek, the term \( \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon \) is used for ‘persecute’, ‘drive to extremities’. See LSI, 529.

11 The verb \( \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omega \) is the one found in the words of reproach which Jesus addresses to Paul on the road to Damascus (Acts 9.4, 5; 22.7, 8, 26.14, 15). This verb (Lk. 11.49, 21.12, 2 Cor. 4.9; 10-11, 11.24-25; 2 Tim. 3.11-12; Matt. 5.12, 23.30, 35) cannot exclude physical violence. Paul uses the term in relation to (a) persecution of the believers (Rom. 12.14; Gal. 4.29; 6.12); (b) for Paul himself (1 Cor. 4.12; 2 Cor. 4.9; 12.10; Gal. 5.11); Paul was persecuted by Jews, Gentiles and false Christians (2 Cor. 11.26) but it was persecution at the hand of the Jews to which he referred most frequently (Rom. 15.31; 2 Cor. 11.24, 26; Gal. 5.11; 1 Thess. 2.14-16) suggesting that he found this hardest to bear. B.R. Gaventa (From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament [Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1987] 25) downplays the violence intimated by the word \( \delta\iota\omega\kappa\omega \).
persecution of Stephen and the life and activity of Paul (Acts 7.52, 9.4; 9.5; 22.4; 22.7,8; 26.11, 14, 15). Further, when compared with other New Testament writers, Paul and Luke dominate the usages of these terms. Such a commonality can only underline Luke’s familiarity with Paul’s persecution, and possibly his relationship with the group around Stephen.

Second, in Paul’s retrospective view (Gal. 1.23), he reports that in Judea a statement was being circulated concerning him after his conversion that “he who once persecuted us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy”. The term “the faith” here clearly means the Christian message. It had become characteristic of the new movement to which he now belonged. It was this ‘faith’, presumably as that which most threatened ‘Judaism’, which had aroused his persecuting zeal.

The implication is that ‘faith’ in the preaching of the early Christians, possibly the group around Stephen at least, had already come to be perceived by a zealous Jew like Paul as a significant threat to the traditional identity makers of Judaism. Sources from which we might infer the likelihood of such an opposition to ‘faith’ would include their message of faith in the ‘Righteous One’ (Ω δικαιοσύνη; on the one hand (Acts 6.14; 7.52 cf. 26.9), and criticism of the Torah (Acts 6.13, 14) and/or temple (Acts 6.13; 7.48–50) on the other.

See discussion in Burchard, Der dreizehnte Zeuge, 40, 42; Hengel, Pre-Christian Paul, 274ff; Niebuhr, Heidenapostel aus Israel, 35ff., 60ff; Riesner, Paul’s Early Period, 64; Haacker, Paulus, 79ff.

The term οὗτος occurs 10 times in Paul and 9 times in Acts. In Matthew it occurs 5 times. ἱπποθενος, however, occurs only in Acts and Galatians.


It is necessary to point out that Paul also uses ποριτζ in Galatians in an absolute sense in 3:23, 25 to mean the content of the Christian gospel and in 6:10 as part of a descriptive phrase for Christians. (See 2 Cor. 1.19; 4.5; Phil. 1.15; Gal. 1.16, proclaiming Messiah [Acts 8.4]).


Third, both Paul and Luke agree that Paul's persecuting activity was directed against ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ. However, the brevity in the description about the location and the objects of the persecution in Paul (Gal. 1.13, Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 15.9) and again in Luke (Acts 8.1) have led to diverse scholarly suggestions.

(i) Paul's persecution was confined to Damascus and the objects of his persecution were Gentile Christians. However, it has to be noted that there is no geographical connotation in Gal. 1.13-17 to indicate that the place of Paul's persecution of the church (vv. 13-14) is to be identified with Damascus.

(ii) Others argue that the ἐκκλησία that Paul persecuted was comprised equally of both Hellenist and Hebrew Christians. The argument is built on the fact that ἐκκλησία in Paul's testimony statements (Gal. 1.13, 23; Phil. 3.6; 1 Cor. 15.9) reflects his post-conversion perspective in which the community of faith as a whole is intended, not merely one segment. The difficulty with this position is that it assumes that the early Christian community was monolithic in its nature and downplays any differences in particular, in that it disregards the Lukan description of the conflict between the Hellenists and the Hebrews (Acts 6.1ff.). Further, critical scholarship has yet to come up with any more viable explanation for Acts 11.19 than Luke's presentation of the events.

(iii) A number of scholars equate the ἐκκλησία that Paul persecuted the group surrounding Stephen as indicated by Acts. Hengel and others have put forth the

---

20 Luke is specific about the locale of the persecution, which is Jerusalem (Acts 8.1f.).
22 See discussions in Seifrid, *Justification by Faith,* 156.
23 See Hultgren, 'Paul's Pre-Christian Persecution of the Church', *Selfrid,* *Justification by Faith,* 156.
24 According to Seifrid (*Justification by Faith,* 157-61), Galatians 1.23 refers to a group besides just Greek speaking Jewish Christians in Jerusalem; it includes other Jewish Christians in the Holy City and in Judea as the object of Paul's persecution as well.
25 The general consensus is that the persecution of early Christianity was not a universal and categorical phenomenon but was focused more selectively on specific segments and individual cases. For treatments of the topic, see D.R.A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967) 1-79, 2-3; P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: CUP, 1969) 43-47; S.T. Katz, 'Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70.C.E.: A Reconsideration', *JBL* 103 (1984) 43-76; Hengel,
view that this was the group Paul persecuted; not the church as a whole, but only the Greek-speaking Jewish ἐκκλησία in Jerusalem who might be the first to believe that it was they who were the true people of God.

Such a notion is supported by the use of the term ἐκκλησία in both Paul (Gal. 1.13; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6) and Luke (Acts 8.1). In the LXX ἐκκλησία frequently was a translation for the Hebrew הִמֶּפ, which reflects the common designation of Israel as the הִמֶּפ, the congregation of YHWH (Num. 16.3; 20.4; Deut. 23.1-8; 1 Chr. 28.8).

It is highly probable that the term ἐκκλησία originated with the Hellenists. There are two possible reasons for this suggestion:

(i) It is possible to argue that the Hellenists who were formerly part of contemporary Diaspora Judaism used ἐκκλησία as a self-designation for their new gatherings. They would have avoided the use of συναγωγή, since synagogue was the house of Torah and thus symbolic of the Torah based religion against which they had reacted.

(ii) Alternatively, the Hellenist view, particularly their rejection of the Temple as the focal point of God's presence and ἐκκλησία as the newly reconstituted congregation of Israel, could provide sufficient reasons for Paul to persecute this selective group. It is plausible that the Hellenist circles understood the ἐκκλησία as the new temple, the reconstituted congregation of YHWH in the Spirit (Acts 6.13; 13.13; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6).

---

26 Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 1-29; idem, Pre-Christian Paul, 68-69; Kim, Origin of Paul's Gospel, 44-50; Dunn, Partings of the Ways, 70.
27 Paul uses the term ἐκκλησία in his letters predominantly in a local sense. However, in his reference to the persecution of Christians Paul always uses ἐκκλησία qualified by τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gal. 1.13; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.6).
28 For a non-religious usage see (1 Sam. 17.47; 2 Chr. 28.14; Ps. 26[LXX 25],5). Josephus uses ἐκκλησία frequently (some forty-eight times, of which eighteen are LXX quotations), always of a gathering. These vary in character; for example, religious, political and spontaneous assemblies are mentioned (Josephus Ant. 4.8.45; J.W. 1.33.4; 1.33.8). Philo employs the term some thirty times, all but five of which are in quotations from the LXX.
29 However, LXX translators did not always maintain consistency in the translation of הִמֶּפ. For example, Num. 16.3 refers to συναγωγή; Deut. 23.1-8 uses ἐκκλησία ξυρίου. Interestingly the Hebrew term הִמֶּפ is a term for Israelite community which is never translated as ἐκκλησία. See discussions in I.H. Marshall, 'New Wine in Old Wine-Skins: The Biblical Use of the Word 'Ekklesia", ExpT 84 (1973) 359-64.
31 For further discussion see, Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 44-54; Dunn, Partings of the Ways, 60-71.
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7.44-50; 1 Cor. 3.16-17; 6.19; 2 Cor. 6.16; cf. Acts 15.10ff; Eph. 2.21). Luke's emphasis on the fullness (πληρης) of Spirit among the group surrounding Stephen (Acts 6.3, 5, 8; 7.55; 8.6, 13, 39; 11.24; 13.9; 52) strengthens this assumption. Thus, it would seem legitimate to hold the view that both Paul and Luke saw the persecuted ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ as being in continuity with Israel as the people of God, here represented by the Hellenists.

The point that emerges here is that Paul persecuted the church which he actually encountered, and that there could be Greek speaking Diaspora Jews with whom he had some kind of interaction or relationship. Their message might have motivated Paul’s zeal and a deep-seated concern that the group surrounding Stephen was seriously undermining the Jewish faith and identity.

Though there are differences of emphasis and focus in Luke’s presentation of Paul’s persecution, the evidence of commonality in Paul and Luke provides us with enough support to proceed in our discussion. The differences are not so glaring as to lead to the kind of redactional conclusions posited by scholars. Whether we posit epistolatory dependence or sources from Luke’s personal knowledge of Paul, there is sufficient reason for us to suggest that the link between Paul and Stephen was not just a redactional creation of Luke, but that an earlier tradition was available for Luke in relation to Paul’s persecution activities. With that plausibility we can take more seriously Luke’s detailed narrative of Paul’s role in the persecution of the church, beginning with him in the Stephen episode as a 'young man' (εραυνας) responsible for guarding the coats of the witnesses (7.58).

5.2.2 The Synagogue(s) in Jerusalem - the Point of contact for Paul and Stephen

It is important for our purpose to hold together Paul’s Pharisaic background and his persecution activities, as always maintained by Paul in his letters (Gal. 1.13-14; 1 Cor. 15.9; Phil. 3.5-6). Paul’s involvement in the Pharisaic-scribal milieu of the first century CE would not contradict the picture that Luke presents concerning Stephen.

32 Horn, ABD 3:268.
33 See Dunn, ‘Paul: Apostate or Apostle of Israel?’, 261.
34 See discussion in Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 33-44.
35 However, this position is not uncontested. See Seifrid, Justification by Faith. 157.
36 The contradictions are built on Luke’s side of the presentation, particularly in claiming the lack of integrity between Acts 6.11-14 and 7.2-53. This is normally used as a point to undermine Paul’s involvement in Stephen episode. See Richard, Author’s Method, 222, 287.
37 Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 4; J. Roloff, Die Apostelgeschichte (NTD; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981) 114.
In Luke's presentation, Stephen was a Hellenist (Acts 6.8-8.4; 9.1-2; 11.19-30; 12.25-13.3ff), who belonged to the Greek-speaking Jewish group, settled in Jerusalem. They were part of the synagogue community in Jerusalem, and were converted to the new Christian faith. In Jerusalem they formed a congregation of their own for linguistic and perhaps theological reasons, which separated them from the 'Hebrew' Christians. They were possibly led by a group of 'Seven' (Acts 6.5) including Stephen, who was killed because of his pneumatic activity and preaching among the Diaspora Jews. Paul may have been involved in the martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 7.58).

According to Luke, Stephen's initial activities began in and around a synagogue in Jerusalem, called the synagogue of Freedman (Acts 6.9) and comprising


Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and others from Cilicia and Asia. The synagogue(s) in Jerusalem could possibly have been the point of contact and of friction between Stephen and Paul. The following factors are important for such an assumption.

First, Luke recognises an extensive Jewish Diaspora presence in Jerusalem, from Cyrenian, Alexandrian, Cilician and Asian communities, and this we find confirmed by both literary and archaeological evidences.

Second, there were synagogues in Jerusalem, at least in an institutional form, catering to the needs of the Diaspora communities. In spite of some scepticism about the presence of synagogues in first century C.E. Palestine, a majority of scholars agree that Luke was generally well informed about the topography of Jerusalem, and so in all probability the allusions to synagogues are not just a

43 It is interesting to note that the synagogue bore the Latin name Libertinis instead of the Greek 'ουτελευθεροις, and so it seems likely that its members descended from the Jews who had been captured and enslaved by the Roman general Pompey in 63 B.C.E. (cf. Philo Leg. 155). M.J. Olson, 'Freedmen, Synagogue of the', _ABD_ 2.855.


46 That Jews of Cyrene frequented Jerusalem is attested in Mark and Luke as well as Acts (Mk.15.21; Lk.23.26; Acts 2.10; 11.20). Paul is referred to as hailing from Cilicia, and his sister's son also may have lived in Jerusalem (Acts 23.16).

47 Greek-speaking Jews were living in Jerusalem as early as the reign of the 2nd Ptolemy (260-258 BCE). See evidence from Zenon papyri in M. Rostovtzeff, _Social and Economic History of Roman Empire_ (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957). See discussions in Sevenster, _Do You Know Greek?,_ 146.


49 Sanders, _Judaism Practice and Belief_, 198-202.


51 A significant number of scholars view the synagogue as widespread by the first century C.E., both in the Diaspora and in the land of Israel. See S. Safrai, 'The Synagogue' in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), _The Jewish People in the First Century_ (CRINT 1.2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976) 908-44; Schürer, _History of the Jewish People_, 2:423-54; L.I. Levine (ed.), _Ancient Synagogues Revealed_ (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1981).
misguided belief, but an accurate depiction of the pre-70 period. Further, Luke’s account does not contradict other literary evidence (Mk. 12.38-40; Matt. 23.6/Lk. 20.47 = Q; Philo, Prob. 81; Prov. 64). Thus the literary and epigraphical references to Palestinian synagogues indicate that Stephen and possibly Paul could have been part of a synagogue or synagogues in Jerusalem, which catered to the needs of pilgrims from abroad. Two corollary arguments are to be noted.

First, that the synagogues of this period served as gathering places for the reading and exposition of scripture needs hardly to be defended. The literary, epigraphic and archaeological evidence all support this feature. Reading from the Torah and prophets was part of a synagogue’s functions. Further, a leader (Philo, Hypoth. 7.11-14) or other member of the congregation (Mk. 6.1-5; Acts 17.1-9) would interpret the scriptures by employing various midrashic techniques.

Second, there is little to recommend the view that the synagogues served as a Pharisaic institution during the Second Temple period. The earlier sources on the Pharisees mention nothing in particular about them in relationship to synagogues (J.W. 2.8, 166; Ant. 18.3, 12-15). It was not uncommon for Pharisees to frequent

---

52 Philo mentions the Essene συναγωγαί (plural) in B.J. 1.78-80, 5.145; Ant. 13.311, 15.371-379).
55 The Theodotus inscription found in Jerusalem supports the argument: οὐκ οὖν οἷς τὸν συναγωγέας εἰς αὐτούς καὶ εἰς τὸ διὰ τὴν εντολὴν.
56 For example, CIJ 2.1404; Josephus, Ant. 16.43-45, Ap. 2.175; Philo, Somn. 2.123-129; Lk. 4.16-30; 2 Macc. 15.9; 4 Macc. 18.10; Jn. 1.45; Matt. 5.17, 7.12, 11.13 [Lk. 16.16 = Q] Lk. 4.16-21 22.40). The discovery of the Ezekiel scroll, a fragment of Sira, Jubilees and the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice indicate that passages from these writings may also have been read in the Palestinian synagogues. See Y. Yadin, 'The Excavation of Masada 1963/64', Israel Exploration Journal 15 (1965): 81-82. Reading of Scripture as a custom arose on the Sabbath as an assembly time for instruction in the Law (See Neh. 8.9). In front of the Temple (1 Esdr. 9.38; Josephus, Ant.4.209-210), Scriptures should be read and studied on the Sabbath (Josephus, Ap. 2.175; Philo, Opif. 128; Acts 15.21). See Binder, Into the Temple Courts, 399 ff.
58 In past scholarship, the synagogue is seen to have been an institution taken over and dominated by the Pharisees, even if not founded by them. See R.T. Herford, The Pharisees (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1924) 88-103; L. Finkelstein, The Pharisees: The Sociological Background of their Faith (Philadelphia: JPSA, 1938) 568-69. Such a position stems from an uncritical reading of the rabbinic literature and the Gospels of Matthew and John (Matt. 23.2; Jn. 9.1-34, 12.42).
the synagogues of the period of our discussion, but they did not dominate them then as they began to do after the fall of Jerusalem. 59

Building on this synagogue culture, Paul, as a pre-Christian Pharisee, would have been part of the synagogues in Jerusalem. On the basis of his background as a 'zealous' Pharisee, in keeping and studying the Torah as well as scribal traditions, it is possible to assume that Paul could possibly have been a Torah interpreter in these synagogues. 60 Such an assumption is supported by Paul's own familiarity with the synagogue milieu in his letters. (i) The term ἀναγνώστης in 2 Cor. 3.14 indicates his awareness of the public reading of Torah (cf. Acts 13:15). 61 (ii) Similarly, Paul's acquaintance with rabbinic interpretative techniques is well recognised (Rom. 5.12-21; 2 Cor. 3.1-4.6 cf. Rom. 3.21). 62 As a Torah teacher Saul could have recognised an obligation on his part to interpret Torah for Greek-speaking Jews. 63 Thus one can assume that Paul was a qualified Torah interpreter in the synagogue(s) of Jerusalem. 64 It is in this context that we can place Stephen's pneumatic activity.

---

59 See Binder, Into the Temple Courts, 399.
60 Hengel, Pre-Christian Paul, 27, 57; Pate, Reverse of the Curse, 132-33; Riesner, 'Synagogues in Jerusalem', 206.
63 See Hengel, Pre-Christian Paul, 58. However, we are not limiting Paul's teaching activity only to the Greek-Speaking Jewish synagogues of Jerusalem, since his concerns Pharisee may also include ritual purity among Jews in Jerusalem.
64 Donaldson (Paul, 270; 278ff.). See also Bornkamm, Paul, 12; Schoeps, Paul, 64 219; D.R.A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (Cambridge: CUP, 1967) 12 argued that the pre-Christian Paul took an active part in the instruction of Gentile proselytes. He infers that Paul had at one time 'preached circumcision' (Gal. 5.11) as his proselytising activity in his pre-Christian life. Such a proposal should be discounted for the following reasons: (i) in its context, Paul argues against the Judaizers, who insisted that Gentile converts should be circumcised. Paul uses the term (περιτομή) simply as a way of referring back to his previous life as a Jew (Dunn, Galatians, 278-279). (ii) The argument that Paul engaged in evangelistic activity among the Gentiles prior to his conversion runs counter to the evidence of Second Temple Judaism. (See discussions in S. McKnight, A Light among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991]; M. Goodman, Mission and Conversion: Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994]). A plausible argument is that Paul could have shared the concern of the author of Jubilees (15.25-34) that the Jews of the Diaspora should retain their pride in their nationhood and refrain from concealing the obvious effects of circumcision (περιτομή – 1 Cor. 7.18 – see J. Aston, The Religion of Paul the Apostle [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000] 97). Furthermore, it is not far fetched to say that the Pharisees' efforts to gain adherents among other Jews could possibly have been an interest for Paul too (cf. Matt. 23.15; Josephus Ant. 20.44-46). Other than these suggestions, we do not have any evidence to demonstrate Paul's involvement among the Gentiles in his pre-Christian career, and we can probably say that Paul prior
5.3. Stephen’s Pneumatic Activities

Central to the Lukan portrayal of Stephen is his activity as a Christian pneumatic (Acts 6.3, 5, 8; 7.55) in and around the synagogues of Jerusalem. However, it has to be admitted that the past scholarship has not given any great importance to Stephen’s pneumatic experiences, particularly in relation to the initial opposition towards Stephen or to accusations that are brought against him or even to his martyrdom. Two preliminary issues need to be highlighted before turning to the pneumatic experiences of Stephen.

First, in most contemporary discussions on Stephen it is assumed that it was his teaching/preaching that resulted in his martyrdom and Paul’s involvement and later in a selective persecution of the church. Such a focus has resulted from the complex relation that exists between the accusations in Acts 6.11-14 and the speech in Acts 7.2-53. Thus, both the scholars who find a link between the opponents’ accusations and Stephen’s speech and those who deny any such links, generally agree that it was Stephen’s teaching/preaching (7.2-53) that led to his martyrdom. A sample of opinions that have dominated the discussions as to the reasons for Paul’s involvement in Stephen’s martyrdom is as follows: (1) the Law criticism of the Stephen circle; (2) the confession of a crucified Christ; (3) the enthusiasm of the early church, which led to political problems over fears to his conversion was active in ensuring Torah fidelity among others Jews or proselytes, and not among Gentiles as such.


57 Bruce, Acts of the Apostles, 126-128.

58 Hill, Hellenists and Hebrews, 54ff.


60 Kim, Origin of Paul’s Gospel, 44-48.

regarding the relationship between Jews and Romans;73 (4) the temple and the cult
criticism of the Hellenists;74 or (5) some combination of these motives.75 What are
significantly underestimated in these discussions are Stephen’s pneumatological
experiences, in that they might have contributed to a certain tension among his
opponents, especially Paul.

A second issue of relevance to our discussion is whether the Spirit references
within the Stephen narrative are in fact Lukan. Luke portrays Stephen as a
Christian pneumatic (Acts 6: 3, 5, 8, 10; 7.55), a factor that has been played down
in past scholarly treatments.76 It is often assumed that the Spirit references within
the Stephen narrative are products of Luke’s editorial interest,77 either to maintain
Stephen’s apostolic credentials78 or to heighten the martyrological motives.79 The
argument is that the rise of conflict is described in a stereotyped Lukan language -
'many signs and wonders among the people' (v.8; 5.12, cf. 4.30). Such a position
does not do justice to the activities of other Hellenists like Philip, who evidently
enjoyed similar pneumatic experiences (Acts 8.6,7, 13, 29, 39).

One should not dismiss the high concentration of Spirit references in the
Stephen episode as merely redactional. According to Luke, Stephen was a man
"full (πλήρης) of faith and Holy Spirit"; his arguments/teachings were with
wisdom and the Spirit; as a Spirit-filled interpreter Stephen accused his audience of
"opposing the Holy Spirit" (Acts 7.51); and finally through the Holy Spirit Stephen
is granted a vision of heaven (Acts 7.55-56). A similar concentration of Spirit texts
is found in Luke’s description of Jesus’ ministry in the power of the Spirit (Lk.
3.22; 4.1, 14; 18; 10.21; cf. 5.17).

In Luke, those who are favoured with God’s dynamic presence are said to be
either “filled with” (πνευματιζόμενοι - Lk. 1.15; 1.41; 1.67; Acts 2.4; 4.8; 4.31; 9.17)80 or

---

77 Räisänen, 'The 'Hellenists', 172.
79 Räisänen, 'The 'Hellenists', 172ff.
80 In non-pneumatic usage the term πνευματιζόμενοι describes being filled with ‘awe & wonder’, (Lk. 5.26; Acts 3.10), ‘anger’ (Lk. 4.28; 6.11; Acts 5.17; 13.45) and ‘confusion’ (Acts 19.29).
“full of” (πλήρησις Acts 6.3, 5; 7.55; 11.24; 13.9; 52) the Spirit. For Luke, the experience of being ‘filled (πλήρησις) with the Spirit’ includes: joy (Lk. 1.15, 44), prophetic exhortation (Lk. 1.67), inspired speaking, including speaking in tongues (Acts 2.4; 4.8, 31), and reception of the Spirit (Acts 9.17). Such references describe experiences of either Jews or Jewish Christians in general.

However, the term “full” (πλήρησις)81 of the Spirit is used in relation to ‘great wonders and signs’ (Acts 6.8); ‘wisdom and authority’ to speak (Acts 6.10; 11.23; cf. 13.46; Lk. 4.32, 36), ‘vision of Jesus’ (Acts 7.55) and ‘joy’ (Acts 13.52). Two aspects need to be noted. (i) It is interesting to note that almost all the uses of the term in Luke occur either in the context of synagogue preaching/ministry (Acts 6.3, 5; 7.55 and 11.24) or placed immediately before a synagogue preaching/ministry (cf. Lk.4.14-15; cf.4.1). (ii) With the exception of Jesus, the term occurs only in relation to Diaspora Jewish Christians or their activities among the Gentile Christians (who were referred to as μαθηταί - Acts 6.8, 10; 13.52).82 A plausible deduction is that the usage was distinctive of a source, perhaps the Antioch source.83

5.3.1. Stephen the Christian Pneumatic

Stephen is depicted as “full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom” (Acts 6.3).84 Luke thus places Stephen along with other pneumatics (Acts 6.3, 5, 8; 7.55; cf. Lk. 4.1; Acts 11.24), particularly in Hellenist circles. Stephen’s pneumatic experiences include, miracle, spirit inspired wisdom, inspired speech, and heavenly vision.

5.3.1.1. Signs and Wonders

According to Luke, the result of Stephen being ‘full of grace and power’ was that he performed ‘great wonders and signs’ (Acts 6.8b cf. 5.12). Luke does not describe what the sign and wonders were that Stephen performed ἐν τῷ λαῷ.

---

81 The usage may depend on Wis. 1.7, πνεύμα κυρίου πεπληρωκεν τὴν ὁλοκομμένην (“the Spirit of the Lord has filled the universe”). The words πλησθῆσεται πνεῦματος are found in LXX of Prov. 15.4, but in an entirely different sense, having nothing to do with God’s Spirit. The other similar usage in found in Sir. 24.25, where the Torah fills men with wisdom.
These may have included various exorcisms and healings (cf. Acts 8.7). It is highly probable that the 'signs and wonders' which Stephen performed created either interest or concern εν τῷ λαῷ, and particularly among the Hellenist communities.

One reason for friction might have resulted from the Hellenist attitude to the Temple and its cult. At least in certain circles the Temple was still a locus of miracles. The propagandists for the Maccabean party insisted that the temple, even after its desecration and repurification, was still sacred, that a sacred fire still burned on its altar, that the voice of God could still be heard in its inner precincts, and that it was still the site of miracles (2 Macc.1.10-2.18; cf. Josephus Ant. 13.10; cf. t. Sotah 36a; Yoma 21a). Supporters of the Herodian temple also told miracle stories: Josephus Ant. 15.11.7 (paralleled by Ta'anit 23a) lists ten aspects of temple life which where considered 'miraculous'. If that is the case then it is probable that the crowd who listened to Stephen, especially the men from the synagogue of the Freedmen who had a special interest in the Jerusalem temple might have raised their eyebrows regarding the implications of Stephen's performance. Since we don't have enough information, this may be a possible explanation for their dispute with Stephen.

5.3.1.2. Stephen and Charismatic wisdom

Luke presents Stephen as a person gifted with charismatic wisdom. Once again the text does not provide us with enough information regarding the nature of Stephen's wisdom. What is evident is that the disciples in Jerusalem chose Stephen to be one of the seven because he was full of Holy Spirit and of wisdom. This may possibly indicate not just inspired speaking, but also ability for leadership and teaching. The charismatic wisdom of Stephen is further demonstrated in the argument (συζητεω) of the men from the synagogue of Freedmen, who were
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85 See Rengstroff, 'Σημείων, TDNT, 7: 200-269.
86 To be near the Temple was the reason they returned to Jerusalem. See discussions in Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? 17.
87 It is interesting to note that had Peter's performance of miracles taken place within the precincts of the temple (Acts 3.2ff; Acts 5.12), it might not have created problems, because of the sacredness attached to the temple.
90 The term συζητεω is used to express forceful differences of opinion without necessarily having a presumed goal of seeking a solution (Mk. 9.14; Acts 28.29; cf. 18.15; Jn. 3.25). Mark uses the term in relation to Pharisaic and scribal arguments. See Mk. 8.11; 9.10; 14, 16; 12.28. Luke uses it in relation to disciples (Lk. 22.23; 24.15), in Acts in relation to the Hellenists (Acts 6.9; 9.29).
unable to cope with the wisdom and the Spirit with which he was speaking (Acts 6.10).

The association of the Spirit and wisdom is not infrequent in Israelite and early Jewish literature (Exod. 31.3-4; cf. 35.31-32; Deut. 34.9; Isa. 11.2; Pss. 17.37; 1 Enoch 49.2-3; Wis. 1.6, 7.7, 22, 23; 9.17). Apart from this longstanding association, it is difficult to ascertain which of the above-mentioned aspects explains Stephen’s Spirit experience.

However, what is plausible is to place Stephen’s charismatic wisdom experience in the context of the συζητεῖν (enquiry/dispute) of Diaspora Jews. It is probable that the synagogue-oriented contenders were familiar with Torah reading, interpretation and active participation in the process of interpreting the scripture.

In such a context Stephen’s charismatic wisdom becomes evident to his contenders as that of a teacher of Torah as explained by Ben Sira. Ben Sira expected that the pious scholar might find himself ‘filled with the Spirit of understanding’ in and through his diligent study of the law (Sir. 39.6). As a result he would pour forth words of wisdom and ‘mediate God’s secrets’, revealing instruction in his teaching, (Sir 39.7-8). However, the text does not provide us with enough clues on the issue.

What is plausible is that if Stephen’s opponents thought in these terms, then Stephen’s message would have become a challenge to any Torah teacher of the day.

---

91 Lk. 21.15.
92 In Greek rhetoric ἀποδείκτικα was a technical word for a compelling conclusion to be drawn from a reasoned argument (Plato Tim 40 E; 4 Macc. 3.19 cf. 3 Macc. 4.20). In the Graeco-Roman world rhetorical skill required diligent training. See, for example, Crassus, who in Cicero’s De Oratore 1.115 stresses the priority of natural ability and admits that training will improve it. In contrast, Philo (Vir. 212ff) attributes Abraham’s rhetorical skill and physical transformation not to training but to possession by God’s Spirit, which entered his virtuous soul. In the Jewish tradition of speech the object is to persuade through divine authority rather than by modes of natural proof. For Paul the compelling proof of his message was not in his rhetoric but in the demonstration of Spirit and of power (1 Cor. 2.4) an aspect for which Paul might have been indebted to the Hellenists.
93 Various sources indicate that members of the congregation were not passive participants in this process. The exchanges in the synagogues were presented as being quite animated and often heated. Thus Acts presents Paul as constantly “arguing” (διαλέγομαι) in the synagogues (Acts 17.2, 17.17, 18.4; 18.19, 19.8; 20.7, 9; 24.12, 24.25) and states that Apollos “spoke boldly” (παραψήφισεν ἐξ ζομακί) before the congregation in Ephesus (Acts 18.26). Within these accounts, sometimes members of the congregation argued back (Acts 18.6); at other times they expressed their approval (Acts 17.11) or disapproval (Mk. 6.2-3). Occasionally they became enraged and cast the speaker out (Lk. 4.28-29). It is clear from contemporary literature that the process of interpreting scripture was a community affair. In his descriptions, Philo refers to the members of the congregation participating in the discussion (Hypoth. 7.13; Somn. 2.127).
including Paul, who was conceivably part of the hostile crowd. In that case, people like Paul might have questions regarding the credibility of Stephen’s experience and teachings. What is significant with Stephen’s Spirit experience is that it is not limited to a Spirit of wisdom, but includes also, according to Luke, power, signs and wonders. Here then the issue is between a qualified scribe and a non-qualified pneumatic interpreter. Paul could have strongly resisted any challenge raised by Stephen and the Hellenists (Gal. 1.1; 2 Cor. 11.5; 12.11f.; 1 Thess. 2.3-6). This could have caused considerable friction.

5.3.1.3. Stephen’s Charismatic Preaching and Vision

According to Luke, Stephen’s defence before the Sanhedrin was inspired by the Spirit (Acts 6.8; 7.55) – a Spirit inspired retelling of Israelite history.

In a Pharisaic-scribal milieu, any success by other teachers might have threatened their hoped-for monopoly. The natural response would have been to challenge what Stephen was saying, particularly in areas where they sensed vulnerability.


As a result, scholars using these methods disagree with one another about sources and linguistic features, and because of this few agree as to the meaning of what Luke eventually put together. Thus, some say out that Luke has taken over a ‘history sermon’ en bloc and tailored it for his purposes with additions (Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, 289; Barrett, Acts of the Apostles, 1: 324ff.). Other commentators are even prepared to dismiss the speech as entirely Lukan redaction, believing that the account makes better sense without it (Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 20; Koester, Introduction to the New Testament, 90). They conclude that Stephen’s speech is a defense of his position (F.F. Bruce, Men and Movements in the Primitive Church, Studies in the Early Non-Pauline Christianity [Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1979] 52ff.), a model of early Christian apologetic to Hellenistic Judaism, (Kilgallen, Stephen Speech, 87-95) a (non-Pauline) Hellenistic Jewish Christian view of the Bible, or history (Barrett, Acts of the Apostles, 1:336 ff.).

Luke portrays Stephen’s pneumatic credentials in his speech, which is prefaced by the twofold description of Stephen as “full of the Spirit and of wisdom” (Acts 6.3) and “full of faith and of the Holy Spirit” (6.8) and concludes with Stephen’s ecstatic climax (θεοποιητός in the Spirit (7.56).

According to Luke, Stephen was self-conscious about his role as a Spirit-inspired preacher. This is evident from the following observations. (i) His Spirit inspired speech retells the Israelite history prior to the building of the Temple. (ii) His Spirit-inspired criticism of the Temple as ‘made with hands’ (χειροποιητός), emphasises the lack of restriction of the presence of God in Israelite history either as to land or as to building, and cites references most critical of abuses of the Temple cult (1 Kgs. 19.10, 14; Isa. 1.12-17; Jer. 7.1-34; cf. 4 Ezra 1.32-37). (iii) His inspired accusation that the Council’s members were ‘always resisting the Holy Spirit’ has parallel usages in Hebrew scripture. The ‘stiff necked’ (cf. LXX Exod. 33.3, 5; 34.9; Deut. 9.6, 13.), the ‘uncircumcised in heart’ (Lev. 26.41; Deut. 10.16; Jer. 4.4; 9.26; Ezek. 44.7, 9), and those ‘resisting the Holy Spirit’ (Num. 27.14; LXX Isa. 63.10; Lk. 12.10; Acts 3.23; 5.1-11) continue and climax the ongoing history of their fathers who persecuted the prophets (1Kgs. 19.10, 14; Neh. 9.26: Jer. 26.20-24). 99

96 In the period of our concern, Pharisees were certainly members of the Sanhedrin, and Paul, as a Pharisee, would have been present at times. See CD 10.6-10; IQSa 1.6-16 (Schürer, History, 2.210).

97 Max Turner’s classification ‘charismatic expository address’ is helpful here. Turner makes a distinction between a) charismatic revelation, b) charismatic infusion of wisdom, c) prophetic speech, and d) charismatic expository address. Stephen’s speech can be classified as a ‘charismatic expository address’. He has further pointed out that the Spirit is not explicitly portrayed as the power of charismatic expository address or ‘preaching’ in Judaism. He has convincingly argued that Luke did not get his view from Judaism; but rather that the Spirit was widely regarded as the power of authoritative preaching in Hellenistic-Jewish Christian circles (1 Thess. 1.5; 1 Cor. 2.4; 2 Cor. 11.4; Rom. 15.19; cf. Jn. 3.34; 6.62-63; 14-14; Heb. 2.4; 1 Peter 1.12). This would further enhance our argument that Luke depended on reliable sources for the Stephen episode and its possible links with Paul’s persecution. See discussion in idem, ‘The Spirit of Prophecy and the Power of Authoritative Preaching in Luke-Acts: A Question of Origins’, NTS 38 (1992) 75; idem, Power from on High, 95.

98 It starts with the patriarchs (Acts 7.1-17), Moses and the time in Egypt (vv.20-36) and in the desert (vv.37-44). It touches upon the time of Joshua (v.45) and of David (v.45), Solomon (v.47) and the prophets (v.52); but then immediately moves to Jesus (v.52) and his rejection. God’s self revelation to the patriarchs (Εἰς τὸν αἶμα, 7.2, 30, 35, 44, 55), promise and fulfilment (7.5, 17), an emphasis on God’s presence outside the Temple (47-50) and the consistent rejection of God’s message and the prophets (51-51) are the major themes of Stephen’s speech. See discussion in Neudorfer, ‘The Speech of Stephen’, 281ff; Dunn, Partings of the Ways, 65ff; Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 44-54.

Finally, Stephen “full of the Holy Spirit” (7.55) is granted a vision of heaven (7.55-56). Stephen shares the privilege of prophets and visionaries and not least that of Moses himself, in that he sees the glory of God (Exod. 33.18-22; Isa. 6.1-4; Ezek. 1.28), here the ‘Son of man at the right hand of God’ (7.55-56). The above pneumatic experience of Stephen had an impact on the Greek speaking Jewish contenders including Paul (7.54, 57). The implication of Stephen’s Spirit inspired retelling of Israelite history probably created further friction, particularly on Paul’s convictions of the Spirit in relation to interpreting Torah, traditions of the ancestors (Acts 6.11, 13, 14) and his convictions about the Temple.

5.4. Stephen’s Spirit Activity and Paul

It is important for us to recognise Stephen’s Spirit activities and their impact on Paul. A few observations need to be made here.

First, Stephen’s Spirit experiences might have caused friction, in terms of Paul’s assumptions about the Holy Spirit. Paul’s own understanding as a Spirit bearer would probably have come into question, particularly in his study and practice of Torah and traditions, and this may have inflamed Paul’s desire to be involved in persecution.

Second, the combination of the motifs of wisdom, spirit, and signs and wonders in Stephen’s pneumatic experience expresses the Hellenist Christians’ pneumatic ideals. These notions are reflected in Paul’s earliest letters. For him miracles were performed and were empowered by the Spirit and associated with his preaching (1 Thess. 1.5; 1 Cor. 2.1-5; 6.19 (cf. Rom. 15.19; 1 Cor. 1.22; 2 Cor. 12.12).

Third, as noted above, Stephen’s inspired criticism of the Temple as ‘made by hand’ (Χειροποιημένος) seems to indicate that within Hellenist circles, the Church was already spoken of as the new temple, a reconstituted congregation of Israel in the Spirit (Acts 6.13; 7.44-50). Paul subsequent conviction concerning this is evident in 1 Cor. 3.16-17; 6.19; 2 Cor. 6.16 (cf. Eph. 2.21).

5.5 Conclusion:

What emerges from our discussion on Paul’s ‘former life’ as a persecutor of the church is that the aspects that triggered persecution in relation to the Stephen circles do have links to the Spirit understanding of Paul. This is shown by building on the

---

100 Horn, ABD 3: 268-69.
likelihood that Luke was familiar with Paul's persecution activities, particularly his involvement with Stephen's martyrdom. The synagogues in Jerusalem were possibly the point of contact between Stephen and Paul. Stephen's pneumatic activities, which included signs and wonders, charismatic wisdom, inspired preaching and vision, might have created friction among the Jewish Diasporians in Jerusalem, who were familiar with the activities and interpretations expected of a qualified teacher of the Torah, like Paul. Stephen's activities, which included both teaching and pneumatic activities, incited Paul to become involved in active persecution of the church.
Chapter 5

The Pre-Christian Paul's Convictional Background - Conclusion to Part 3

In Part 3 we have attempted to uncover Paul's pre-Christian convictions on the Spirit, particularly evolving from his own self-perception as a Pharisee in relation to the traditions of the law and as a persecutor of the church, within the conceptual background that was current in the first century.

As a Pharisee, Paul presumably knew various strands on the nature and effects of the Spirit that were prevalent in the first C.E. We have argued that Paul's pre-Christian convictions were probably particularly close to three strands of thoughts on the Spirit. These include the availability of the Spirit to those who 'zealously' study and practice Torah and maintain purity in obedience to Torah. Further, Paul may also have been familiar with the idea that God will vindicate in resurrection through the Spirit those who show fidelity to the Torah in the present. These strands fit well with Paul's own self-description as the one who was ζηναγος for the Law and the ancestral traditions.

As a Persecutor of ἔκκλησιος, Paul's self perception throws further light on the immediate concerns of the anticipation of the Spirit. We argued that it was the synagogue that provided the context for Stephen's pneumatic activity, which may well have resulted in friction between Paul and Stephen. Paul might have been surprised at Stephen's pneumatic activities, including, signs and wonders, wisdom, inspired preaching and visions. These pneumatic phenomena could well have challenged Paul's pre-Christian understanding of the Spirit, particularly his role as a Torah interpreter, and this may have led him to become involved in the persecution of the church.

To the question whether Paul expected bestowal of Spirit upon the Gentiles, there is nothing we can possibly draw from Paul's Pharisaic background or persecuting activity. It is probable that Paul's immediate concerns were not future oriented; rather his background suggests a present concern, particularly on the role of the Spirit in maintaining the covenant community's practice and obedience to the law. Even the anticipation of the Spirit in the resurrection depended on one's present fidelity to the law. Most of these inferences are inevitably speculative, but it remains intriguing that such belief regarding the Spirit may have been part of his pneumatology. The key point for us, however, is that his subsequent conviction that the Spirit had been bestowed on Gentiles (without them becoming proselytes) cannot be traced back to his pre-Christian, Pharisaic past with any significant degree of probability.
Part 4

PAUL AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

Introduction to Part 4

In the previous sections of our study, we have examined the pre-Christian Paul’s expectation of an outpouring of the Spirit from a conceptual and convictional point of view. In the conceptual background, evident in both biblical and post-biblical literature, we have argued that, the promise of the Spirit in the age to come is given only to the covenant community, particularly with an increasing trend in terms of understanding the Spirit as enabling obedience to the law, in the present as well as in the future. That is to say, we have seen that neither the Hebrew Bible nor post-biblical Jewish literature allow us to infer that Paul’s conceptual world included a perspective that would expect outpouring of the Spirit apart from Law or apart from membership of the covenant community.

Such a finding is further strengthened by our study on the convictions of the pre-Christian Paul himself. We have demonstrated that various strands might have influenced Paul’s past life as a Pharisee and a persecutor. We have argued that Paul as a Pharisee may well have been inclined to the idea that the Spirit plays a key role in the study and practice of the Torah. Purity and fidelity to the Torah in observance and practice in the present world will lead to a final vindication from God. We have also noted that such a strong conviction might have led to Paul’s involvement in the persecution of the group around Stephen.

This brings us to the key concern of our thesis, which is, how can we account for Paul’s Christian conviction that God has poured out the Spirit upon the Gentiles? Or when did Paul begin to believe that Gentiles are eligible for the Spirit of God, apart from the Law? Or a broader question, how did Paul or the early church come to recognise that the Gentiles stood equal with them in their status for the reception of the Spirit? For our purpose the issue is looked at from two levels.

First, the importance Paul gives to the Damascus event, particularly his call as an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.4-11; 1 Cor. 15.8-10) is an essential point (1 Thess. 1.5f; Gal. 3.1-5; cf. 1 Cor. 2.4f.) of interest for our study. Second, it is also crucial for us to grasp the early churches, particularly the Hellenist Christians and the group around Peter and James’ understanding of the bestowal of the Spirit upon the

---

1 Elsewhere in Rom. 1.16; 2 Cor. 4.4-6; cf. 3.16; Rom. 15.18; Eph. 6.17; Acts 10.44-48; 11.15-18, 15.8.
Gentiles as valid for their full incorporation to the new community (Gal. 2.7-10; Acts 15.1-29).

Thus the task of this section is (i) to examine Paul’s Damascus experience, particularly in relation to his call as an apostle to the Gentiles and its relationship to the understanding of the Spirit, (ii) to investigate the early church’s convictions concerning the Spirit particularly in the period prior to the Jerusalem conference, which obviously includes the period in Paul’s life between his conversion and his association with the church in Antioch; this will (iii) then help us to identify a possible answer for our enquiry on Paul’s initial thoughts on the Spirit.
Chapter 6

PAUL’S CONVERSION/CALL AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

6.1 Introduction

The Damascus event\(^1\) for Paul was an experience of the Spirit.\(^2\) What is disturbing for the present research is Paul’s silence on the role of the Holy Spirit in his autobiographical statements, particularly when he refers to his conversion/call experience. Passages like Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.4-11; 1 Cor. 15.8-10, which are generally considered, as referring to his ‘past’\(^3\) do not attach any direct significance to the experience of the Spirit.

Such a dilemma is further evident from Luke’s information regarding Paul’s Spirit experience at Damascus in the Book of Acts. For example, it is only in Acts 9.17 that we find a subsidiary reference to the Holy Spirit when Luke describes Paul’s meeting with Ananias in Damascus.\(^4\) Surprisingly, Luke’s later references to Paul’s conversion story

---


3. For example see discussions in Haacker, Paulus, 13-14; Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 93-104.

in Acts 22.3-21 and 26.9-23 do not acknowledge the role of the Spirit in his conversion experience.

However, such parsimonious documentation of the Spirit in relation to the Damascus experience need not undermine the significance of the subject for our enquiry. The reason for this silence on the Spirit may be that our information about Paul’s Damascus event is rather scanty, and that references to it are conditioned by contextual emphases or rhetorically organised composition.

What is explicit in his letters is Paul’s emphasis on the experience of the Spirit at the beginning of all Christian conversion – by implication, both his converts’ and his own. Recently, Gordon D. Fee has pointed out the importance of looking at the Pauline texts, where he reminds his converts of their conversion, and in which he invariably refers to the role played in it by the Spirit. Passages like 1 Thess. 1.4-6; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5; cf. 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 6.11; 2 Cor. 1.21 support such an argument. A significantly important passage that may provide valuable information about Paul’s Damascus experience is 2 Cor. 3.1-4.6, where Paul refers to his own experience of the

5 On the three accounts, see C.W. Hendrick, ‘Paul’s Conversion/Call: A Comparative Analysis of the Three Reports in Acts’, JBL 100 (1981) 415-432. Hendrick explained the variations found in the three accounts of Saul’s conversion/call on the basis of source-analysis. However, D. Marguerat (‘Saul’s Conversion (Acts 9, 22, 26) and the Multiplication of Narrative in Acts’ in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), Luke’s Literary Achievement: Collected Essays (JSNTSS 116; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995) 127-155.) has argued for ‘functional redundancy’, which produces ‘expansion’, ‘truncation’, ‘change of order’, ‘grammatical transformation’ and ‘substitution’. As a result these accounts do not indicate contradictions ignored by Luke but represent a significant literary strategy designed by Luke. What is striking in the three accounts, whether they represent variations within the source or functional redundancy is that the Holy Spirit does not have any role!

6 See Fee, ‘Paul’s Conversion as Key to His Understanding of the Spirit’, 166-67.

7 The texts (Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.4-11; 1 Cor. 15.8-10) are throughout, although in different ways, interlaced with controversies, polemics and apologetics, and they have both main and secondary functions to fulfil. In such a context, reference to Paul’s experience of the Spirit would not have served any particular purpose within the argument.

8 See discussions in Marguerat, ‘Saul’s Conversion’, 127-155.

9 See, Fee, ‘Paul’s Conversion’, 166-183. According to Fee, the passages in which Paul does this are of two kinds: one, the “passages where the Spirit is mentioned in a presuppositional manner” (1 Cor. 2. 4-5; 6.11; 1 Thess. 1.5-6, 9-10; 2 Thess. 2.13-14), and two, “the passages where the Spirit is highlighted as being crucial to the argument” (2 Cor. 3.3; Gal. 3.1-5). He also highlights numerous “confessional” texts in which, while affirming the saving event, Paul indicates himself together with his readers as recipients of the Holy Spirit, including Gal. 3.13-14; 4.4-7; Rom. 8.15-16; 2 Cor. 1.21-22; and Rom. 5.1-5 (p. 177-81). See also J.D.G. Dunn, Theology of Paul the Apostle (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) 419-425.

10 For example, the Spirit experience is basic to his reminding the Thessalonians about the reality of their conversion (1.4-6, 9-10). In 2 Thess. 2.13-14 Paul specifies the beginning of his converts’ Christian life in terms of the reception of the Spirit. While admonishing the Galatians (Gal. 3.1-5 cf. 4.4-7) Paul very clearly points to the experienced reality of the Spirit at their conversion. In 1 Cor. 2.4-5 too, the experience of the Spirit at the time of their conversion is presupposed. Further, in 1 Cor. 6.11 where Paul reminds the believers that their salvation comes “in the name of our Lord Jesus,” it is also effected in their lives “by the Spirit of our God”.
Spirit at Damascus. These indirect references to the Spirit experiences at conversion provide us with sufficient grounds to further our enquiry.\(^{11}\)

The above-mentioned assumption (that is, that the Pauline letters take for granted the underlying significance of the experience of the Spirit at all conversions) leads us to presume that he himself experienced the Spirit at Damascus.

The objective of this chapter is to place Paul’s Damascus event in relation to the experience of the Spirit. In order to achieve this purpose, we must, first, examine Paul’s conversion, from his former life as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church (Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.4-11; 1 Cor. 15.8-10) to his life in Christ (Gal. 1.10-24; 2.16; 3.26, 27; Phil. 3.2-11; 2 Cor. 5.17; Rom. 5.10; 6.3; 8.1,2; 15.16). Second, Paul’s explicit statements of the purpose of his call to be an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1.15, 16; Rom. 1.5, 13; 15.16-19; Acts 9.15), particularly as the one who was sent to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, should inform our enquiry on his conviction that God has poured out his Spirit upon the Gentiles (1 Thess. 1.4-6; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5 cf. 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 6.11; 2 Cor. 1.21).

Before attempting to assess what effect Paul’s conversion had on his thinking about the Holy Spirit, we need to discover what the existing scholarly orientations are in understanding Paul’s Spirit experience? How would past scholarship perceive the relationship between the Spirit and the Damascus experience? And how does contemporary scholarship view the impact of the Spirit at Damascus on Paul’s theology of the Spirit?

6.2. Scholarship, Spirit and the Damascus experience of Paul

In spite of Paul’s emphasis on the subject and the consistency of the general treatment of the Spirit experience at conversion in his writings, past scholarly investigations have conspicuously disregarded the importance of the topic. Two presuppositions might have contributed to this. Firstly, several assume that Paul’s few references to his Damascus experience are contextually determined and have little to do with the content of his gospel or his theology.\(^{12}\) Secondly, even the opposite supposition,
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\(^{11}\) See Fee, *Empowering Presence*, for detailed exegesis of the passages.

\(^{12}\) Earlier interpreters simply passed over the Damascus experience altogether. For example Bornkamm (‘Revelation of Christ’, 90-103) justifies his dismissal of the Damascus experience because he believes that Paul spoke of his conversion “surprisingly seldom.” He (Paul [New York: Harper & Brothers, 1971] 16-25 [22]) sees Galatians 1.11-17 and Phil. 3.2-11 as the only two places where Paul refers to the Damascus experience, and Paul does so only to defend his “call” to be a preacher of the gospel and never in an attempt to lay claim to a “revelatio specialissima.” Other interpreters like, Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Mysterien-Religionen*; A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (London: Adam
that Paul's experience at Damascus is vital to the understanding of the content of his gospel and theology, subordinated the discussion of Paul's Spirit experience to other theological motifs.

6.2.1. The Damascus experience as Irrelevant:

The contention that references to Paul's experience at Damascus were contextually determined and have little to do with the content of his gospel or his theology reflect a larger trend in Pauline scholarship — namely to read Paul's life and thought against a presupposed Hellenistic and/or Jewish grid.

To suffice an example, recently, F.W. Horn offered sophisticated version of the above position where he investigates the horizon of early Christian pneumatology by scrutinising the pre-Pauline formulas, motifs and traditions in their relation to the historical origins of early Christianity, and how Paul's theology of the Spirit is rooted in this. Horn suggests that Palestinian Judaism conceived the Spirit of God as a power enabling end-time conduct, whereas Hellenistic Judaism understood the Spirit primarily as the substance of the new beings.

Horn's investigation assumes an influence of the Hellenistic notion of πνεῦμα as substance and the Jewish notion of πνεῦμα as function in the Pauline letters. One would expect Horn to investigate the Hellenistic notion of πνεῦμα as a substance for a new being in relation to Paul's own Damascus experience. However, Horn's methodological inhibition stops him from enquiring into every notion of early Christian experience of the Holy Spirit. For him, those experiences are either later creations of
the editors of the New Testament sources, or they are completely exceptional.\textsuperscript{19} Thus the Damascus experience does not offer any substantial material for Horn’s discussion.

By focusing solely upon Paul’s background, be it Jewish or Hellenist, one should not neglect the formative power of Paul’s Damascus experience in its influence on Paul’s theology and mission.

6.2.2. Damascus Experience as relevant

Most of the recent works on Paul consider the significance of the Damascus experience in relation to the content of his gospel or his theology. But, in spite of the recent importance given to Paul’s experience of conversion, the treatment of the Spirit experience of Paul at Damascus by interpreters is somewhat surprising.

A dominant line of thought among those who consider the importance of the Damascus experience for Paul’s theology is the assumption that Paul had undergone a radical transformation in his theology immediately as a result of conversion - what he opposed before is what he came to embrace subsequently and immediately.

In this scheme, one approach is that Paul persecuted the earliest Christians for claiming that the crucified Jesus was the expected Messiah who inaugurated ‘the Age to Come’. Consequently the Christological fact of Jesus’ Messiahship is the first thing that his Damascus road experience brought home to him.\textsuperscript{20} Others suggest that even before Paul’s conversion the Hellenists had posed the alternatives: salvation through Christ as against salvation through the law. This was why Saul the Pharisee persecuted them so fiercely out of zeal for the law (Phil. 3.6). Paul’s conversion therefore was conversion to this understanding of salvation.\textsuperscript{21}

Yet others have emphasised that Damascus revealed the divine intention (Rom. 1.5) to incorporate the Gentiles into the people of God by faith and to claim Paul for a world mission.\textsuperscript{22} Interpreters have also highlighted the fact that Damascus revealed Jesus as the


\textsuperscript{20} Menoud, ‘Revelation and Tradition’, 131-141.


\textsuperscript{22} Munck, \textit{Paul and the Salvation of Mankind}, 1977; Dunn, ‘A Light to the Gentiles’, 89-107. For Sanders (\textit{Paul and Palestinian Judaism}, 441-442; idem, \textit{Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People}, 5, 47) at Damascus Paul experienced two fundamental convictions: (i) salvation for all including Gentiles; (ii) His own call to the Gentiles. He recognises that these convictions are not the self-evident corollaries to belief in the resurrected Jesus. However, pre-Christian Paul experienced dissatisfaction about the expulsion of Gentiles. But Paul came to understand his mission as fulfilment of the expected eschatological ingathering of the Gentiles.
Lord of glory, whose radiance intimated the very presence of God and the eschatological glory to come.  

Interestingly none of the above-mentioned interpretations provide any tangible discussion on the role of the Spirit experience at Damascus. The Spirit experience becomes subsidiary to the variegated interests in soteriology, Christology, missiology or doxology.

A clear example of such proxime accessit is presented in Kim’s recent arguments on the flesh-Spirit and law-Spirit antithesis in Paul. For Kim the ‘overwhelming experience’ of the Spirit at Damascus is seen within the two dialectical elements of Paul’s Damascus revelation: (i) Paul’s realisation that Jesus crucified under the curse of the law is the risen Lord exalted by God, and (ii) his zeal for the law turning out to be sin. According to him, the flesh-Spirit and law-Spirit antithesis developed out of Paul’s reflection on Ezek. 36-37 in the light of his Spirit experience at his conversion/call. Paul’s conversion/call reinforced the negative side of the law. Thus for Kim, (a) the impact of the Spirit experience on the Damascus road was for Paul to see the fundamental problem of the law, thus reducing Paul’s pneumatology within the constraints of Christological and soteriological conclusions. b) By using the Damascus experience to express Paul’s ‘full blown’ theology of the Spirit, Kim confuses the event with its interpretation. Nobody knows in Kim’s scheme of thought what happened to Paul in relation to his experience of the Spirit, because he functionally ignores any development in Paul.

---

24 It is discussed only as a subsidiary to other theological interests. For example, Hengel and Schwemer (Paul, 41) makes the point that decisive shifts in the earliest community were connected with revelations, visions, dreams and other ‘prophetic-ecstatic’ experiences were a consequence of its possession of the Spirit, and were regarded as an eschatological fulfilment of Joel 3.1-5. The problem here is that Hengel does not go beyond such a suggestion.
26 For Kim, in the light of Paul’s Spirit experience, he could now see that his Pharisaic zeal for the law was really a blind zeal (2 Cor. 3.16-18; 4.6), a ‘heart of stone’ (Ezek. 11.19; 36.26) and a man of the flesh. He then began to see the problem of his fellow Jews in the light of his own experience (Rom. 9.31; 10.2).
27 Kim, Paul and the New Perspective, 157-164.
28 Horn (Das Angeld, 309-13; 364; ABD, 3:272ff.) who believes that Paul came to develop his Spirit-law and Spirit-flesh antitheses only in his struggle against his Jewish Christian opponents. See Dunn, (‘A Light to the Gentiles’, 98ff.) for his critique of Kim’s claims about the immediate impact of the Damascus road Christophany on Paul’s theology. See also Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 82ff.
Scholars who have worked their case on the basis of the Lukan account (Acts 9.17) have focused on a different question where the significance of the debate was over determining the position of Acts on when and why the Holy Spirit is given, either at the time of conversion or at some subsequent time. There are those who argue that the Spirit is given subsequent to conversion and 'salvation'; while others advocate a conversion-initiation pattern in which conversional repentance/faith is crystallised in baptism, and the Spirit is received in connection with the whole process. Such discussions have not contributed to the understanding of Paul’s experience of the Spirit at Damascus, but rather exposed interpreters’ prior conclusions on the subject.

Thus scholars have appropriated Paul’s Spirit experience at Damascus in very different ways. The options include: ignoring the Spirit experience at Damascus in favour of Hellenistic or Jewish backgrounds; transforming the Damascus experience into a complete religious experience which serves as a catalyst for Paul’s theology, and on the way reducing the experience of the Spirit to a footnote to other variegated theological interests; or making it serve a clear apologetic agenda in justifying a particular way in which the Spirit operates in the Damascus experience of Paul.

However, a broader perspective on the Damascus experience does offer a way forward. The significant number of references in Paul to the general experience of the Spirit at conversion (1 Thess. 1.4-6, 9-10; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5; cf. 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 1 Cor. 6.11; 2 Cor. 3.1-4.6) directs us to re-evaluate the assumptions regarding the Spirit experience in Paul’s own conversion. Such a re-evaluation recognises Paul’s background, not seen in isolation from the Damascus event, but rather going hand in hand with his Spirit experience at Damascus. Likewise, Paul’s Spirit experience at Damascus should not be drowned in the undertow of various other theological interests,

29 The mention of the Holy Spirit in this account is not taken up for extended discussion by many commentators. For example, Conzelmann, Acts and Maddox, Purpose of Luke-Acts, have completely ignored the Holy Spirit in this passage.


but rather stands key to both his conversion and his later reflection on pneumatological matters.

6.3. The Holy Spirit in the Damascus Experience of Paul

It is generally agreed that Paul’s conversion/call took place when he was on his way to Damascus in the course of his persecuting activities (Gal. 1.17; cf. 9.3; 22.6; 26.12). What is significant for us is that both Pauline and Lukan accounts are unequivocal in their presentation that a Christophany took place as part of a visionary and revelatory experience(s). Two necessary elements of the experience are to be emphasised: (a) the visual and (b) the auditory aspects of the encounter.

First, Paul consistently refers to his experience in the form of a vision in a wide range of usages: “Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?” (ἐχείδηκα 1 Cor. 9.1); “he appeared to”...

---

33 Scholars have paid extensive attention to two aspects of Paul’s Damascus Road encounter, particularly to the significance of the terms ‘conversion’ and ‘call/commission’. For example, K. Stendahl (“The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West’, HTR 56 [1963] 199-215; Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and other Essays [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976] 7) has asserted that Paul’s experience was not a conversion, but a vocation to apostleship. It is clear, though, that Paul’s own estimation of his Damascus experience was that it entailed a radical transformation of his values (Gal. 1.10-24; Phil. 3.2-11). See also Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, 11-35. Gaventa (From Darkness to Light, 40) prefers to see the Damascus experience as involving radical reorientation or transformation. Segal has demonstrated sociologically that Paul’s belief in Jesus as Messiah provided his entrance into a new group, a reconstruction of reality on the apostle’s part (Paul 72-114, 285-300). Walter (‘Paul and the Early Christian Jesus-Tradition’, 77) rightly notes that Paul gives himself and his churches an identity independent of Judaism, one that constituted the consummation of Jewish hope but which included Gentiles as well - Gal. 4.21-31; Rom. 9.23-26; 1 Cor. 10.32. At the same time it is important to recognise that in labelling the Damascus experience as “conversion” we should not minimise its prophetic call/commission character either, especially with Gal. 1.11-17, Jer. 1.5-11; Isa. 6.1-9. See also Dunn, ‘A Light to the Gentiles’, 89-107; K.O. Sandnes, Paul - One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle’s Self Understanding (WUNT 2/43; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1991) 58-76.

34 The event took place in or near Damascus, as would seem to be confirmed by ἔπεισεν in. Gal. 1.17. See Lüdemann, Early Christianity, 114. See also discussions in Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, 35ff.; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, 328; Dietzelbinger, Die Berufung des Paulus, 21f.; Hengel and Schwemer, Paul, 36-38.


me" (ὡθη καμοι, 1 Cor. 15.8); “a revelation of Jesus Christ”, (ἀποκαλυψεως Ἡσου Χριστου Gal. 1.12); “to reveal his Son in/to me” (ἀποκαλυψαι τον υιον αυτου εν εμι) Gal. 1.16); “beholding the glory of the Lord,” (κατοπτριζομενοι 2 Cor. 3.18); “has shone in our hearts to give the light (φωτισμον) of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ (προσωπον Ἡσου) Χριστου 2 Cor. 4.6). These references are supplemental to the narrative of the vision in Acts, and especially, on the two essential points viz. that Paul saw a great light and that he saw Jesus Christ, they accord with Paul’s allusions (Acts 9.3, 17, 27; 22.6,11, 14; 26.13).

Second, the auditory aspect of Paul’s conversion points to his identification of God’s purpose in the revelation of Christ to him, as being that he should proclaim the gospel to the Gentiles (Gal. 1.15, 16; cf. Rom. 1.5, 13; 15.16-19; Acts 9.15; 22.6,11, 14; 26.13). Although Paul does not mention specifically that he heard his commission from Christ on the Damascus road, various semantic constructions like, “that I might preach him” (Ἰνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αυτον Gal. 1.15), “sent to preach” (ἀπεστειλέν

37 The Greek ὡθη (vv.6, 7, 8, 9: ‘was seen’) is frequently employed in the Bible (LXX) of the appearance of angels or divine beings in dreams or visions (e.g. Gen. 12.7; 35.1; 48:3; Judg. 6.12; 13.3; cf. Matt. 17.3 = Lk. 1.11; 22.43). Numerous times in the LXX where ὡθη is employed to refer to God’s appearances (For e.g. Gen. 26.24; 35.9; 48.3; 2 Chr. 3.1; 1 Kgs. 3.5 = 2 Chr. 1.7; 1 Kgs 9.2 = 2 Chr. 7.12). See C. Leaney, ‘Theophany, Resurrection and History’, SE 5 = TU 103 (1968) 101-113. It is interesting to note that several references in LXX indicate that ἢ δόξα κυριου is the subject of ὡθη. See Exod. 16.10; Lev. 9.23; Num. 14.10; 16.19; 17.7; 20.6; cf. 1 Enoch 39.4, 6, 10, 40.1; 52.9; 69.29; 100.4; 4 Ezra 7.33; 13.32.

38 Scholars have argued for a subjective genitive interpretation, i.e., the gospel as revealed by Christ. See Longenecker, Galatians, 32; F.F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1982) 93. A number of scholars take Ἡσου Χριστου (v.12) as an objective genitive and so understand Jesus Christ as the content of the revelation. The reason is mainly because of v 16a (see also 2:20a) where Paul says that God’s purpose in calling him was “to reveal his Son in me (ἀποκαλυψας τον υιον αυτου εν εμι) so that I might preach him among the Gentiles”. So Burton, Galatians, 1921) 41ff; Betz, Galatia, 64; Dunn, Galatians, 53.

39 There are two main interpretations. (a) The εν εμι is revelation as subjective – “within me.” Betz, Galatians, 64; Bruce, Galatians, 93; Longenecker, Galatians, 32. This view appeals to Galatians 2.20 (εν εμι Χριστους); 4.6 (εις τας κορδας ημων κραζουν), and the inward reality of Christian experience there portrayed as support of a similar reading of Gal. 1.16. (b) εν εμι is a simple dative with reference to an objective appearance, that is – “to me”. For example, W. Baird, ‘Visions, Revelation, and Ministry’, 656; Rowland, Open Heaven, 376; Kim, Origin of Paul’s Gospel, 55-56; Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery, 136.

40 In these passages the indications are that Luke wishes us to understand that it was a vision that Paul experienced. In Acts 26.19 he reports Paul describing what he has seen as an ἤπτασια (vision).

41 Paul is unambiguous that neither his conversion nor his vocation to apostleship was the result of human action (Gal. 1.2, 11-12). See Burton, Galatians, 37-38 for discussion of the precise meaning of κατα άνθρωπον. Acts 26.15-18 may indicate that Luke saw no contradiction between direct revelation and human mediation. See Lohfink, Conversion of St Paul, 86-87; Gaventa From Darkness to Light, 42-92.
The nature of vision in the Damascus experience consistently indicate that he saw something, a vision, and that he heard something, an audition, by which he received the Gospel. It is here that we need to look into the role of the Holy Spirit.

The details regarding visionary experience, particularly ‘what kind of seeing?’ or ‘what did Paul see?’ need not concern us here. The focus of our enquiry will be on: (i) how Paul saw what he saw (the nature of his visionary experience) and (ii) how he heard what he heard (the nature of his call experience)? To put it another way, could these experiences be attributed in any measure to the Spirit? By focusing on the issue our ultimate intention is to see how that had affected Paul’s attitude to the Spirit.

6.3.1. The Nature of Vision in the Damascus Experience

To further our case we need to see Paul’s visionary experience against the background of the religious and cultural heritage of the time.

6.3.1.1. Merkavah Mysticism

There has in recent years been a greater willingness among scholars to stress the importance of the apocalyptic-mystical dimension in Paul’s thought. 42 Alan F. Segal 43


43 According to Segal, (Paul the Convert, 1990) Paul should be understood within the grid of Jewish mystical-apocalypticism. For him the influence of Ezekiel 1, Yawheh’s man-like appearance of יבשא forms the most immediate background for understanding Paul’s conversion. Segal argues that Paul describes his conversion by use of mystical-apocalyptic language. For example ‘form’, ‘image’, ‘light/’ darkness’, ‘glory’ and ‘being in Christ’. According to Segal, the chief angel of God, God’s man-like יבשא appeared to Paul, and Paul through mystical ecstasy was transformed into the image of the resurrected Christ. Paul now offers this process of transformation for all who believes in Christ. However,
and others have attempted to understand Paul as a visionary who underwent a mystical conversion akin to the experiences found in the Jewish mystical traditions, in particular to that of merkavah mysticism. It has been argued that the throne-theophany tradition of Ezekiel in Jewish apocalyptic, Qumran and Wisdom literature, which later developed into the merkavah mysticism of rabbinic Judaism, provides important background for Paul's thought, and particularly for his reflection on the Damascus event. Scholars have demonstrated that such relationships have informed Pauline passages like 2 Cor. 2.14; 3.18-4-6 and 12.1-10.

Segal evidently shows a tendency to confuse Paul's actual conversion experience with the story of a later heavenly journey in 2 Cor. 12. See note 53.

See Kim (Origin of Paul's Gospel, 137ff., 252-56; idem, Paul and the New Perspective, 165ff.). According to Kim, 'Paul's conception of Christ as the έλκων τοῦ θεοῦ (image of God) is rooted in the Damascus event. Paul saw the exalted Christ in glory as the έλκων τοῦ θεοῦ on the road to Damascus and inferred that his vision was basically of the same order as those of Ezekiel and other seers whose experiences followed a similar pattern.' Hengel ("Sit at My Right Hand!" The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110.1", in Studies in Early Christology (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995) 119-225) has also focused on the merkavah experience of Paul, arguing that the apostle bears witness to an early Christian tradition based on Ps. 110.1, that the crucified Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, was raised and seated "at the right hand" of God, that is enthroned as a co-occupant of God's own "throne of glory" (Jer. 17.12), located in the highest heaven. Hengel suggests that Paul presupposes the merkavah throne-chariot at many points in his extant writings (Phil. 2.9; 2 Cor. 5.19; 12.2-4; Rom. 14.10).

G. Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism (London: Thames & Hudson, 1955) 40-79 argues that merkavah mysticism was a development stretching from the first century BCE to the tenth century CE. P.S. Alexander, on the other hand, ('Comparing Merkavah Mysticism and Gnosticism: An Essay in Method', JJS 35 [1984] 1-18 [8,12]) argues that any solid evidence for the existence of merkavah mysticism as a distinctive system comes from not earlier than the third century CE.

For example, it is widely admitted that I Enoch especially is patterned after the merkavah vision of Ezekiel 1.1-3.15. See discussions in H.S. Kvanvig, 'Henoeh und der Menschensohn, Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7', SJT 38 (1984) 101-33.


Sir, 49.8.


G. Scholem, ('The Four Who Entered Paradise and Paul's Ascension to Paradies', Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1965] 1-19), maintained that Paul was indeed familiar with merkavah mysticism. He argues that in 2 Cor. 12.2-4,
Common to all the *merkavah* traditions is the glory of God’s presence on the heavenly throne, which is inspired by Ezekiel (1.26-28). It focuses on God as one who is seated on ‘the throne of Glory’. In an ecstatic experience the visionary achieves direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence, the manner of experience ranging from dream/vision to ecstatic trance, from angelic encounter to descriptions of actual journeys to the heavenly realm.

What is significant for us is that Paul’s descriptions indicate that he underwent actual visionary experiences similar to that of the authors and/or preservers of Jewish apocalyptic, Qumran or Wisdom literature. For example, in Gal. 1.5 when Paul describes his conversion experience, he uses the phrase ἧ δόξα (v.5). This seems to be confirmed by Gal. 1.12, 15-17, verses that draw on Paul’s encounter with the risen, glorious Christ on the road to Damascus. Verse 16 brings clarity to the concept; ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί - God revealed his son, the glorious, crucified one seated on the divine throne – to Paul (cf. 1 Cor. 2.6-16; 9.1; 15.1-8). Thus, although Paul does not use the term ‘mystery’ in Galatians, that concept seems to be operative in 1.4-5, 12, 16, especially since the term, ἀποκάλυψις, which he does use, is a technical one that encompasses mystic experience.

Paul’s rapture into Paradise or the third Heaven should be understood against the background of the Rabbinic story of the ‘four who entered Paradise’. However, Schäfer (‘New Testament and Hekhalot Literature’, 19-35) has questioned such an interpretation. See also A. Goshen-Gottstein, ‘Four Entered Paradise Revisited’, *HTR* 88 (1995) 69-133. It is now generally allowed that in 2 Cor. 12.2-4 Paul was talking about a *merkavah* experience he had had fourteen years previously. C.C. Rowland, (‘The Parting of the Ways: The Evidence of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Mystical Material’, in J.D.G. Dunn [ed.], *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D.70-135* [WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992] 213-37, [226]) points out that ‘Paul’s Trance-vision in the Temple (Acts 22.17)’ constitutes first century evidence.


Concerning the works comparing 2 Cor. 12.1-10 with Jewish *merkavah* and/or Jewish Hellenistic mystical ascent texts, see discussions in W. Baird, ‘Visions, Revelations, and Ministry. Reflections on 2 Cor. 12.1-5 and Gal. 1.11-17’, *JBL* 104:4 (1985) 651-52. However, we will be following Dunn’s (*Jesus and the Spirit*, 213-214) distinction between Paul’s Damascus experience, the revelation of Christ and that of the ecstatic experience in 2 Cor. 12.1-4.

See I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980) vii. There are two strands in the Jewish mystical tradition. One of these, *Ma’aseh Bereshit*, concerns the work of creation. This strand of the tradition originates in a meditation on the first chapter of Genesis. *Ma’aseh Merkavah*, the second strand, originates in a meditation on the first chapter of Ezekiel (also Isaiah 6 and Dan. 7).

It is evident that various reports of visions and revelations are grounded in the experience of the authors and/or preservers. For example, *1 Enoch* 14.13, 14, 21; 21.2; 22.4, 7; 36.3).

See Morray-Jones ‘Paradise Revisited’, Part.1, 184 who maintains that the vision of God’s *kabod*, including the mystical practice of ‘heavenly ascents’ was inherited from apocalyptic circles, although in
In 2 Cor. 3.18, Paul says that Christians behold τὴν δόξαν κυρίου as in a mirror and are 'transformed' (μεταμορφώθηκαί) into 'his image' (τὴν εἰκόνα). Paul saw the δόξα of God in the face of Christ" and so perceived Christ as the εἰκόνα of God (2 Cor. 4.4-6). In 2 Cor. 4.6, when Paul says that he preaches that Jesus is Lord and that God "has let this light shine out of darkness into our heart to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ", he is describing his own conversion and ministry. The use of φῶς (light) and σκότος (darkness) is a common feature in the Jewish mystical tradition. The semantic line of argument leaves us with the distinct probability that Paul's experience at Damascus was nothing short of a mystical experience wherein Paul saw Jesus as exalted to the throne of glory.

Although Paul's language betrays strong Jewish mystical affinity, what is puzzling for our discussion is that in the Second Temple Jewish literature ascensions to God were the prerogative only of the most pure/worthy, made after the adept went through several ritual preparations, including fasting, cleansing and meditation. Also importantly, angelic mediations were a key to heavenly ascension.

Such preparations include a strict diet, which might account for a particular disposition for receiving visions - in Ezek. 2.8-3.3; 4 Ezra 9.24-25. Other aspects of visionary preparation is a period of intense prayer (4 Ezra 9.25; cf. Dan. 9.3), meditation upon Scripture (Dan. 9.23), and fasting (4 Ezra 5.13; cf. 6.35); 2 Bar 5.7; cf. 20.5, 11; 21.1; 47.2; Dan. 9.3; 10.2-3). In the Hekhalot writings the throne-vision could be achieved only by 'one who is worthy' (HR 15.1). The mystic should prepare himself by undergoing spiritual exercises through fasting and keeping every positive and negative commandment (HR 15.1, 2; 20.4 - Synopse 198-99, 228).

apocalyptic the vision of God is nowhere regarded as an unqualified goal to be pursued as it is in merkavah mysticism. See Kim, Origin of Paul's Gospel, 137ff.
See Segal, Paul the Convert, 58-71.
It is interesting to note that the term ηστερέω occur 23 times in the whole of New Testament but not once in the Pauline corpus.
See also Apoc.Abr. 9.7; 12.1.
Those who were 'worthy' practised ascent in trance to God's heavenly throne by reciting hymns and magical formulae, and by invoking the angels. (HR 19-22 = Synopse 219-36). In Hekhalot writings we find the Jewish mystics underwent a rigorous programme of fasting, ritual immersions and incantations as well as the careful preparation of seals to ensure successful progress through the various heavenly palaces, free of attack from hostile angels, in order to attain the vision of the merkavah. According to Ma'aseh Merkavah, the merkavah mystic should fast for 40 days and his morsel should be eaten with salt only (Synopse 560-562). Further the Hekhalot, offer detailed instructions concerning the techniques to be practised by the would-be visionary if he wants to be sure of a successful rapture (Gruenwald, Merkavah Mysticism, 99).
Such preparations were often followed by angelic mediation. In most of the Jewish mystical literature angelology is a feature in merkavah mystical practice, where angelic mediation is needed to see God’s glory. The angels possess the ‘keys’ for heavenly ascent and descent and for contemplating the merkavah and hence the revelation of their secret conditions on the merkavah. For example 4Q403.1.2-16; 1 Enoch, (39.3, 4, 5; 71.1, 10-14); 2 Enoch (1.3-5; cf. 19.1); Apocalypse of Abraham (10.3-8); Testament of Abraham (A10) and the Hekhalot literature (Synopse §§ 103, 161, 184-185).

What is interesting for our enquiry is that none of the sources informing us about Paul’s conversion (Gal. 1.13; Phil. 3.4-11; 1 Cor. 15.8-10; cf. Acts 9.10ff; 22.3-2; 26.9-23) indicate any such ritual preparations or angelic consort accompanying Paul in mediation to the throne of Glory. What is also increasingly clear is the comparatively paucity of references to the Spirit in the Jewish mystical experiences.

6.3.1.2. Merkavah Mysticism and the Spirit

There are a few references to the role of Spirit in mystical experience. Ezek. 1, which is key to the mystical explications of later Jewish mysticism, indicates the role of Spirit in his vision of Divine Chariot. The prophet is under the control of נוֹּח and in number of instances he is described as being picked up by a נוֹר and wafted away to another location. In Ezek. 1 נוֹר is described as coming from the north, bringing with it a fiery cloud out of which emerges the prophet’s inaugural vision of the ‘glory of the Lord’.

62 It is frequently recognised that far-reaching developments in pneumatological thought took place in the Second Temple period, particularly the increased importance of angels. The angels compensated for God’s distance by acting as divine agents, especially as mediators of revelation. See, Elliot, Survivors, 394.


64 Other Jewish literature during the 1 C.E. and early 2 C.E. reflects the interests in angelology in relation to merkavah experience. Enoch was carried from the earth by whirlwinds and was set ‘into the ultimate ends of the heavens’ (1 Enoch 39.3), where he saw the faithful Israel dwelling with the holy angels (4, 5) and later he saw God, the Head of days, who existed with numerous angels and archangels (71.1, 10-14). However, in 2 Enoch, Enoch’s ascent to heaven took place under the guidance of the two angels who appeared to Enoch in human form (2 Enoch 1.3-5; cf.19.1); they led him through seven heavens until he saw God at a distance in the seventh heaven. The Apocalypse of Abraham describes (in the present form is Christian, though originally Jewish), how the angel, Jaoel sent by God to escort him in the ascent to heaven (10.3-8). In the Testament of Abraham, it is the archangel Michael who takes him on a chariot of Cherubim to heaven (A10). See Gruenwald, Merkavah Mysticism, 49, 60, 66-67; Elior, ‘Mysticism, Magic ad Angelology’, 9.

65 In Ezek. 3.12, 14 he is picked up and carried off to the exiles at Tel Abib. In Ezek. 8.3 he is picked up between heaven and earth and borne away to Jerusalem. The additional comment, “in divine visions,” (בעזרת מעשים), suggests that the experience is not to be interpreted literally. The prophet appeared not to have left the room.
Similarly, the temple vision in Ezekiel is framed by the references to the locomotion of the prophet by the Spirit (Ezek. 8.1; 11.24). In the Qumran texts the Holy Spirit is used synonymously with angels who were part of the heavenly consort where they do not have any function in relation to the mystical experience (4Q403.1.2; cf. 4Q405.20.2-21-22.10). A brief description of the appearance of the throne of Glory and its attendant spirits can be deduced.

However, 1 Enoch 71 attests a description of how Enoch is ‘carried off’ in spirit, and guided by hand by the archangel Michael. Enoch is caught up in a merkavah vision, which portrays a multitude of angels standing before the ‘glory of the Lord of the Spirit’ (1 Enoch 40.1-2; cf. Dan. 7.10). It was the Lord of the Spirits who was sitting upon the throne of his glory (1 Enoch 62.2). The fluidity between the usages of ‘spirit’ and ‘angels’ in the literature cannot help us to argue for the role of the Spirit in the mystical experiences of mystics. Thus the reference to the relation between the Spirit in the mystical experiences of the visionary is not quite clear.

On the one hand Paul’s general emphasis on the role of the Spirit at conversion and on the other his descriptions of his own conversion experience in terms of actual mystical visionary experience pose further questions on the issue. How shall we explain the intricacy that is involved in the question?

As noted above 2 Corinthians 3.1-4-6 may possibly offer an answer to our question. In this passage Paul refers to his experience of the vision of τὴν ὧν ὁ θεός ἔλεη ἄρσεν κυρίου as an experience of the Spirit. To this passage we turn our attention, particularly to 2 Cor. 3.17, 18 and 4.6.

66 Of the several figures employed by Ezekiel to describe Yahweh’s control over him perhaps the most graphic is the portrayal of the hand of Yahweh coming upon him. Variations of hand occur repeatedly in the book (Ezek. 1.3; 3.14, 22; 8.1; 33.22; 37.1; 40.1). “Hand” is here used metaphorically of power, the overwhelming force with which God operates (cf. Deut. 4.34; 5.15; 6.21; 1 Kgs. 18.46 Ps. 136.12). In Ezekiel the “hand of Yahweh” gains complete mastery over his movements (Ezek. 3.2; 33.22) and transports him back and forth to distant places (Ezek. 8.1ff.; 37.1; 40.1ff.). For the full discussion of the expression in its ancient Near Eastern context see J.J.M. Roberts, ‘The Hand of Yahweh’, VT 21 (1971) 244-251.

67 Scholars have generally recognised the complexity involved in the pneumatology of the scrolls. See A.A. Anderson, ‘The Use of ‘Ruah’ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM’, 1962, 293-303; Montague, Holy Spirit, 117ff; Elliot, Survivors of Israel, 400.


69 However, it interesting to note the vision of the throne of God in both Isaiah (ch.6) and Daniel (ch.7) is not linked with the Spirit. But the activity of the Spirit is indicated in Isaiah where he refers to the יתנ upon the ‘anointed’ one and in Daniel who is called יתנ עליה קדישיה 4.8, 9, 18; 5.11, 12, 14).

70 See page 161.
Chapter 6

6.3.1.3. Paul’s Revelatory Experience and the Spirit (2 Cor. 3.1-4.6)

Paul’s clearest reference to his own mystical-revelatory experience at Damascus and the role of the Spirit in this experience occurs in 2 Corinthians 3.1-4-6. 71 Paul builds his argument here in the context of his defence of his apostolic ministry. 72 The texts indicate that Paul’s opponents questioned variously his authority to preach, the content of his preaching and the way in which he conducted himself (2 Cor. 2.16, 17; 3. 4, 5, 6, 12; 4.1, 16; 5.6, 8; cf. 10.1-2). While the identity of Paul’s opponents in 2 Corinthians is a hotly debated issue, 73 there can be little doubt that the content of the arguments was Jewish, that it possibly emerged from Corinth, 74 and that it at least in this case featured the revelation of God to Moses at Sinai.

The key to Paul’s argument is built around Moses’ Sinai revelatory experience (LXX Exod. 34.29-35). Paul employs the Sinai experience to contrast the revelation of God’s Ἡχός to Moses (LXX Exod. 19; 24; 33-34) with the revelation of God’s δόξα to himself in the Christophany (2 Cor. 3.11, 18; 4.4,6). It is highly probable that the contrast, which emerges in the text between himself and Moses, in terms of the glory of the


73 It is not completely evident who the opponents of Paul were. It has been suggested that the opponents were Judaizers; the same Jewish Christians in Galatia (2 Cor. 11.4-6 with Gal.1.6-9). A few interpreters claim that the opponents are Jewish Christian Gnostics: their identity is pneumatic in the Gnostic sense (W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth [trans. J.E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971]); R. Bultmann, The Second Letter to the Corinthians (trans. R.A. Harrisville; Minneapolis; Augsburg, 1985). Others consider Paul’s opponents to be Hellenistic Jewish Christians. More concretely they would have been itinerant missionaries who preached in Asia Minor and Greece (J.H. Schulz, Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority [SNTSMS 26; Cambridge: CUP, 1975] 173; Georgi, Opponents, 1-26, 317-18; C.K. Barrett, ‘Paul’s Opponents in 2 Corinthians’, NTS 17 (1970/71): 233-54). Some want to distinguish between “super-apostles” = Jerusalem apostles (11.5 and 12.111) and “false apostles” = early Christian missionaries who referred to the authority of Jerusalem and may have been sent by Jerusalem (11.13) who questioned Paul’s legitimacy. See E.E. Ellis, ‘Paul and his Opponents’ in Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity (WUNT 1/18; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1978) 80-115; Martin, ‘Opponents’, 279-89.

74 Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 297.
former and present covenants, is in some way in response to his opponents. These opponents might have cast doubt on Paul’s claim about his visionary experience and as minister of the new covenant of Spirit. For them he was vastly inferior to the glorious figure of the mediator Moses of the Sinai covenant.

By comparing and contrasting the two visionary experiences of δόξα Paul seeks to legitimize his apostolic authority and establishes his superiority by placing his διακονία within the framework of the end time expectation of the Spirit over against the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai.

In 3.5 Paul argues that his apostolic authority and competency (τεκνία) comes ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ - a phrase parallel to other references to Paul’s Christophany (cf. Rom. 1.1, 5; 12.3; 15.15; 1 Cor. 1.1; 3.10; 9.16-17; 15.9-10; 2 Cor. 5.18; 10.8; 13.10; Gal. 1.11, 15; 2.7-9; Eph. 1.1; Col. 1.1). Paul goes on in 3.6 to state emphatically that it was God who “qualified” him (τεκνία).

Paul recognises that Moses’ reception of the law was attended and thus legitimised by God’s δόξα (τοῦ θεοῦ) (2 Cor. 3.7, 9, 11). It was by means of the appearance of God’s glory that the covenant was established. Paul counters that his visionary experience too was attended by God’s δόξα and thus legitimised his stewardship of the gospel (2 Cor. 3.8, 9, 11, cf. 4.4, 6). The ministry of the new covenant is characterised by the Spirit - the giver of life (v.6). The former revelation lacked Spirit and therefore led to condemnation and death. Paul counters his opponents’ position by arguing that their authority, rooted in the revelation of God to Moses that lacked the Spirit, is inferior to his. Paul writes (2 Cor. 3.10): “Indeed, in this case, what once had glory (τὸ δόξασμενον) has come

---

75 Scholarly opinions vary regarding the character of 3.7-18. Georgi (Opponents, 270-71) argue that beneath 3.7-18 as it now stands, is an independent literary unit which can be studied for Paul’s redactional additions. R.P. Martin, (2 Corinthians [WBC; Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986] 58-59) forcefully criticises such a “document” theory and instead views it as a “synagogue sermon” which Paul preached on some previous occasion. J.A. Fitzmyer, (“Glory Reflected on the Face of Christ (2 Cor. 3.7-4.6) and a Palestinian Jewish Motif”, TS 42 [1981] 630-44) also understands the passage as reflecting a “sermon” rather than a “document”. By appealing to the motif of “reflecting glory” in 1QH 4.5-6, 27-29, 1QSb 4.24-28, and 1QS 2.2-4, Fitzmyer confirms the midrashic precedent and historical context for Paul to include such a “sermon” in his letter.

76 It is generally assumed that Paul is referring to Ezek. 11.19; 36.26 and Jer. 31.31-43 (LXX chap.38). The antithesis in 2 Cor. 3.3 b and c recalls biblical texts on the eschatological renewal by the Spirit over against the giving of the Law on Mt. Sinai. See C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians (BNTC; London: A&C Black, 1973; 109; Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 226; Fee, Empowering Presence, 304-306.

77 Paul seems to employ the method of arguing ‘from the lesser to the greater’ a minore ad maius, corresponding to the rabbinic Qal-Wachomer method. See C.K. Stockhausen, Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant (AnBib 116; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989. For general discussion see H.L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash (New York: JPSA, 1959) 94; Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, 34.
to have no glory (οὐ δεδόξασται) at all, because of the glory that surpasses it (ὑπερβαλλούσῃ δόξῃ).

Thus Paul claims that his revelatory experience was completely different from the experience which attended Moses’ reception of the law, because his experience has the Spirit.\(^78^\)

Central to our discussion is the second, relational argument in vv.14-18, which again is built from the same revelatory experience tradition, but with a difference in emphasis. Here Paul is concerned with the results of Moses’ action of veiling, and the consequence of the Israelites’ response to this veiling in beholding τὴν δόξαν κυρίου.

While defending his own διάκονια, Paul turns to the phenomenon of unbelief on the part of the Israelites in the past and of his Jewish contemporaries in the present. The Jewish failure to respond to the Christian gospel in Corinth, and particularly to Paul’s preaching of it,\(^79^\) might have been used by the opponents to argue their claim that Paul’s διάκονος is invalid and inauthentic. Paul counters their position by arguing both that the unbelief of his Jewish contemporaries is foreshadowed in Scripture, in the obduracy of the Israelites in the days of Moses, and also that the Moses-story also foreshadows conversion to belief.

Key to his argument is the experience of Moses’ turning to the Lord: whenever Moses turned to the face of the Lord, he lifted his veil.\(^80^\) The radiance of Moses’ face had dazzled the Israelites, so he placed a veil over it when he came out to speak.\(^81^\) Paul links and develops the ‘veil’ experience to his contemporary Judaism, in that the veil is

\(^78^\) According to Hafemann, (Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel, 20-21; 33-35; 143-47) the opposition between letter and Spirit is based not on the nature of the two covenants, but on the difference in the ministries of the two covenants, which is that the letter is the OT law brings about death because of the absence of the Spirit, while its counterpart is the law obeyed by the power of the Spirit of the new age. Paul maintains that Christians are required to keep the stipulations of the Mosaic law who, through transformed hearts by the Spirit, experience the eschatological fulfilment of the new covenant (Jer. 31.31-34; Ezek. 36.25f.). Contra to the views of Kim (Origin of Paul’s Gospel, 214) and Thielman (Paul and the Law, 201-02).

\(^79^\) Chrysostom, PG 61 col.445 (NPNF XII) 311. See discussion in Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 297.

\(^80^\) Paul’s creative use of the original text is very clear. In Exod. 34.24-35 we read, when Moses came down from Sinai with the tablets of the law his face shone, and the Israelites were at first afraid to approach him (v.29-32). When he had given them the commandments he put on a veil (v.33). This he removed when he entered the Tent of Meeting where God spoke with him, and whilst afterwards he communicated God’s message to the Israelites (v.34). He then resumed the veil until he went into the tent again (v.35). To prove this Paul consciously alters LXX texts.

\(^81^\) Jewish interpreters appear to have accepted this interpretation; at any rate they rarely seem to have felt that the veil required any comment. See Pes.R.10.6; and Midrash ha Gadol to Ex. 34.33. See also Ps.Phil. A.B.12.1.
what actually prevents the true meaning being understood whenever the Torah is read in the synagogue.\(^{83}\)

Paul argues that this veil remains in operation when 'the old covenant' is read (ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης - v.14 cf Acts 13.15; 1 Tim. 4.13) and cannot be removed except by Christ. Paul goes on to state emphatically that the veil remains in the reading (ἀναγνώσκω - v.15) of Moses.

Scholarly consensus indicates that Paul is referring to the written expression (cf. Rom. 10.5, 19)\(^{84}\) of the Sinai covenant.\(^{85}\) It is highly probable that Paul is drawing his readers' attention to contemporary synagogue life, where synagogues served as gathering places for the reading and exposition of scripture.\(^{86}\)

Further, it may be observed that in the world in which Paul received his Jewish education and his Pharisaic vocation, (Gal 1.14; 2 Cor. 11.22; Phil. 3.5; cf. Acts 23.6; 26.5) Scripture was interpreted by men whose principal concern was the Torah. Contemporary Jewish writings indicate that the inspired Torah teacher was the locus of present day divine revelation, especially by his exegesis of the Torah. A proper revelation of divine secrets was possible through a qualified and inspired exposition of the Law (39.2ff). In the Qumran circles, the author of the Hymns himself was primarily an inspired interpreter of Scripture (1QH 16.9; 7.23-25; cf. 1QH 4.5-6; 5.11; 7.6f; 82 The verb ἀναγνώσκω simply means 'read' in the ordinary sense of the word. There is a variant here. The reading ἅλωκα καὶ ἀναγνώσκω has the best support (P\(^6\) καὶ A B C P \(\Sigma\) 33. 104. 1175 pc Or Did). Some witnesses (D F G 0243) omit καὶ, probably resulted from haplography (since the following word begins with AN).

\(^{83}\) It refers to the public reading of Torah (Acts 13:15) where ἀναγνώσεις "reading," translates the Hebrew קבש (Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript, 67-70). Scholars are of diverse opinion concerning ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη. Many think that this expression is equivalent to the Old Testament. See R.V.G. Tasker, The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (TNTC; London: Tyndale Press, 1958) 66.

\(^{84}\) Here Moses is seen as writing and uttering the passages from the Pentateuch, which are quoted there, just as he is the law-giver whose utterances in the whole of the Pentateuch are read in the synagogue.

\(^{85}\) Since ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη occurs only here in the whole of New Testament it is possible that it refers to the written expression of the Sinai-covenant, i.e., the Pentateuch. See V.P. Furnish, II Corinthians, (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1984) 209; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 69. However, L.L. Belleville, (Reflections of Glory. Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1-18 [JSNTSS 52; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1991] 232) argues that the contrast between καλύπτεις διαθήκης in v.6 and παλαιὰς διαθήκης in v.14 suggests that Paul is not thinking in terms of old and new written documents, and the contrast between 'letter' and 'spirit' does not encourage one to think in terms of the entirety of God's revelation prior to the advent of Christ. It is important to realise that the verb 'is read' is a present subjunctive passive.

\(^{86}\) Torah reading was part of the synagogue functions. For example Josephus Ant. 4.209-210; 16.43-45; Ap. 2.175; Philo, Somn. 2.123-129; Opif. 128; Lk. 4.16-30; Acts 15.21; cf. Neh. 8.9; 1 Esdr. 9.38). See J. Heinemann, 'The Triennial Lectionary Cycle', JJS 19 (1968) 41-48; Binder, Into the Temple Courts, 399 ff.
1QMic 5; 1QS 11.3-4; 1QpHab. 2.8;).

Like Moses, he had beheld God's marvels and had been granted a much more central role in the uncovering of the 'hidden things' and of the 'mysteries'.

It is possible to argue that Paul was referring to his own pre-Christian activities in the life of a synagogue where he read and expounded the Scripture. In those circles it was natural to attribute the change wrought in Moses, not so much to his close encounter with God, but to his first-hand acquaintance with the divinely-given Law: it was this that gave him a radiance such that people hardly dared to look at him. Paul may be exposing the myth of 'glory' being associated with the reading and exposition of the Torah in the synagogue, which his opponent were possibly referring to, in the light of his own revelatory experience at Damascus. Paul then goes on to appropriate the Sinaitic revelatory experience to defend his and the Corinthian Christians' conversion experiences. For him, such reading or inspired exposition of the Scripture in itself does not bring conversion to the Lord and thus does not contribute to beholding τὴν δόξαν κυρίου.

Paul brings an interpretative modification to Exod. 34.34 in v.16 by taking a simple statement about Moses, that whenever he turned towards the Lord, the veil was removed, as a valid description of what happens when anyone 'turns' (ἐπιστρέφει) toward the Lord who is also Spirit. As Moses turned to Yahweh so the way of redemption for the contemporary Jew is to turn to the Spirit. Although Paul sees the remedy in following the example of Moses in coming before the Lord, he goes on to state that 'this Lord' to whom the Jew now turns is not Yahweh of old, but rather the Spirit of the new covenant. The Spirit is the essential characteristic and the transforming power of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3.3, 6). It is the Spirit, as the Lord (Exod. 34.34), who removes

87 In the Hodayot there are repeated mentions of the author receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit (1QH 13.18-19; cf.1QH 2.18).
88 See. Sota 9:15: When R. Aqiba died, the glory of the Torah came to an end.... When Rabban Gamaliel the Elder died, the glory of the Torah came to an end, and cleanmess and separateness perished.
89 This becomes explicit in the Midrash, Exod. R. 33.1; 47.5.
90 See discussions in E. Wong, "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3.17a) ETL 61 (1985) 49-53.
92 Belleville, Reflections, 261-267 for a detailed substantiation of this interpretation.
'the veil' of misunderstanding that blinds Judaism. The Spirit effects such an end precisely by enabling the revelation of Christ.

Paul speaks about the result of turning to the Spirit - freedom (ἐλευθερία). A possibility is that Paul is referring to the freedom of experience to 'behold' the glory, which was hindered by the reading of the old covenant in the synagogues. This is now possible through the Lord, the Spirit. Paul is suggesting that, as Moses unveiled his face when he entered the tent to speak with Yahweh, so Christians have the same direct access to the Lord and this happens through the Spirit.

Having spoken of turning to the Lord when the veil is removed, he now has the freedom to behold the glory of the Lord as in the Spirit all are being transformed into the same image, from one degree of glory to another, because this is again effected by the Spirit. Paul builds his argument by using the middle form κατοπτρίζωμενοι which means (2 Cor. 3.18) 'to behold as in a mirror'. If the κύριον refers to God, and τὴν δοξάν κυρίου to Christ, it would look as though the mirror signifies the...

94 Turner, Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts, 118.
95 Recently, Hafemann, (Paul, Moses and the History of Israel,) argued that one is to expect and depend upon the gift of the Spirit as the power of God which enables one to fulfil the law (197-209). However, the text does not seem to support Hafemann's argument. Further, in other contexts where the believer's conformation to Christ (transformation) is mentioned, the process is directly or indirectly connected with the operation of the Spirit (Rom. 8.9-10, 14-17; Gal. 3.27; 4.6; 1 Cor. 12.13).
96 Scholars have argued that Paul is thinking of freedom in the sense of παράνομον as minister of the new covenant, or as freedom from slavery to the law of Moses, and from the destiny of sin and death which goes with it. See Plummer, Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, 104; Barrett, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 123-4.
97 See discussion in Lambrechts, Second Corinthians, 55. Thrall (Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 275) offers a link with Gal. 4.21-31.
98 Most commentators maintain that Paul is referring to all believers (Hermann, Kyrios und Pneuma 55; Plummer, Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, 105; Kim, Origin of Paul's Gospel, 231). Munck, (Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, 60) maintains that Paul is referring to Israel's true glory at the end of the world, but there is not contextual basis for the shift.
99 The verb is a hapax legomenon in the New Testament. The issue is complicated by the factor that κατοπτρίζω does not occur in the LXX or elsewhere in the NT. It is not found in the Septuagint or in Greek writers before the Christian era (Philo. Leg. 3.101). The deponent middle sense is most probably transitive: to behold the glory as in a mirror. In Hellenistic Greek the active form of -πτρίζω (and its compounds) means 'to show in a mirror', 'to produce an image in a mirror'; the passive, 'to be mirrored'; and the middle, 'to produce one's own image in a mirror'; or transitively, 'to behold oneself in a mirror. See LSJ, s.v. The alternative translation 'reflect as a mirror' the glory of the Lord is less probable. The argument is build on the fact that, it is with Moses that Christians are compared, and what is emphasise in both Exod. 34.30, 35 and 2 Cor. 3.7 is the splendour of his face, i.e., his reflection of the divine glory. See Fischer, Corinthians, 316; F.F. Bruce 1 and 2 Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 193; Belleville, Reflections, 281; Plummer, Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians, 97.
100 Wong, "The Lord is the Spirit", 65; R.P.C. Hanson, 'The Second Epistle to the Corinthians' (London: SCM Press, 1962) 43; Barrett, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 124; G. Kittel, κατοπτρίζωμαι, TDNT, 2: 696; Martin, 2 Corinthians, 71.
101 It is sensible to suppose that we have this same reference to the glory of God. There are various opinions concerning the phrase τὴν δοξάν κυρίου. Some maintain that Paul is speaking of the glory of...
Spirit (Wis. 7.25-26).\textsuperscript{103} This would fit well with Paul’s argument. The final phrase of v.18 καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος supports our argument since καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος is generally taken to denote agency or cause.\textsuperscript{104} Also both texts closely link the concept of the unveiled face with the divine agency. Paul goes beyond the Exodus text (as he does in 17) and interprets this agency in terms of the work of the Spirit, thereby closely linking the Spirit to the life of the Christian. Paul’s point is that as the unveiling of the heart of Jews is the work of the Spirit, so also the unveiling and glorifying of the Christian is the Spirit’s activity, that is a conversion and transfiguration through the vision of God’s glory. Transformation takes place as from the Lord, the Spirit. The agent of transformation, of glory, is the Spirit.\textsuperscript{105}

In his appeal to the Damascus experience as a revelation of divine δόξα, Paul answers criticisms and launches his defence against his opponents. By rooting his

...
apostolic authority in the Damascus experience, particularly as the beginning of the ministry of the Spirit, Paul both legitimizes his apostolic authority and the content of his preaching, and demonstrates the inadequacy of his opponents. For him the experience of the superior revelation of τὴν δόξαν κυρίου is through the Spirit which is lacking in Moses' revelatory experience of δόξα.

It is significant for us to recognize here that Paul was directly answering a contextual issue – the opponent's criticism of the authenticity of his apostleship. Paul retrospectively uses his own experience at Damascus in the light of the Sinaitic revelatory experience to counter his opponent's arguments. Thus it can be argued that the language of 'turning to the Lord, the Spirit' of Paul's Corinthian converts precisely because it is his own Spirit-inspired preaching that brings about faith in Christ (Gal. 3), and vindicates his ministry in a way that makes letters of recommendation unnecessary. And they see the glory of God in the face of Christ, and are transformed.

However, such a retrospective perspective can also inform us as to the actual experience of the Spirit at Paul's conversion. Two points are to be noted:

First, Paul's reference to τὴν δόξαν κυρίου in 2 Cor. 3.18 is a reference to his Christophanic experience at Damascus. This is supported by its links to 2 Cor. 4.4, 6 where τὴν δόξαν κυρίου is equivalent to τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 2 Cor. 4.4 and 'the gospel of the glory of Christ' to 'the glory of God in the face of Christ' in 2 Cor. 4.6. For Paul δόξα and εἰκών are similar concepts. In 2 Cor. 4.4 the εἰκών of God is Christ. He is thus the glory of the Lord as he is the image of God. In 2 Cor. 4.6, however, the glory, which in 2 Cor. 4.4 is attributed to Christ, is more exactly described as 'the glory of God in the face of Christ'. It is thus highly possible that Paul is thinking of his own experience of conversion in which the risen Christ appeared to him clothed in divine splendour (2 Cor. 4.6 cf. Phil. 3.21).

Crucial to our argument is 2 Cor. 3.18 and 4.4, 6, which suggest that he is referring to his own experience of Christophany. Grammatically, the aorist tense of εἰκόνει points to one specific moment in the past. Linguistic parallels show that the shining of a heavenly light was a characteristic of his experience according to the narratives in Acts (9.3; 22.6; 26.13). It is noticeable that there are linguistic parallels between Acts and 2 Cor. 4.6: the φωτισμός of 2 Cor. 4.6 may be seen as parallel to the φῶς of Acts (9.3; 22.6, 11; 26.13), which is connected with δόξα (Acts 22.11), and words of the λαμπρ-
group occur in both contexts (Acts 26.13 twice). There is substantial support for the view that Paul alludes to the event of his own conversion and call to apostleship. By doing so, we are not limiting Paul’s ‘unique experience’ (1 Cor. 15) to ‘yet another Spirit-experience’ rather it highlights the nature of Damascus road experience which Paul attributes only to the Spirit.

Second, the idea of Jewish unbelief and conversion to the Spirit as the agent of transformation is almost unique in Paul. It can probably be argued that Paul is familiar with parallel references in the contemporary Jewish literature on individuals’ transformation by the Spirit (1QH 5.11; 7.6f.; 16.9; cf. 1QS 11.3-4; Philo Mos. 2.271; Virt. 217-218) but not in a way directly similar to that of 2 Cor. 3.17.

In the light of our discussion on 2 Cor. 3.1-4.6 (cf. 1 Thess. 1.4-6, 9-10; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5; 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 6.11) we are left with the distinct probability that Paul experienced the Spirit at Damascus. In which case it is likely that the Damascus experience shook Paul’s pre-Christian Pharisaic convictions about the Spirit. Given Paul’s Jewish convictions about the centrality of Torah, especially his role as an interpreter who had first hand acquaintance with the divinely-given Torah, the Christophany event, which he believe happened through the agency of the Spirit could have induced Paul to re-evaluate his past convictions. For him the messianic event in the Spirit provided a new revelation beyond and outside the Torah.

The revelation of Jesus as the exalted Son of God (Gal. 1.15-16) brought a new authority that is superior to his previous convictions about the Torah. Thus, for him the revelation of the gospel, the “law of Christ” (νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ - Gal. 6.2; cf. 1

---

110 Barrett, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 135; Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 317.
111 It is possible to argue that the author of Acts may thus reproduce a tradition deriving originally from Paul himself, phrased in the kind of language used in 2 Cor. 4.6. This tradition was understood as referring to the apostle’s conversion-vision. It would be this experience to which 2 Cor. 4.6 refers.
112 It is important for us to recognise that Paul believes that the Damascus road experience as something unique (1 Cor.15) and that it has similarities to the appearances to the apostles and other around the first Easter.
113 For example, in Philo, we see Moses’ appearance changed both in outward appearance and mind and filled with the Spirit.
114 The point can also probably be argued in line with interpretative influence in terms of the similarity of 2 Cor. 3.16 to the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan. Although in the original context it was ὁ χύριος whose voice was heard in the Tent of Meeting, in contemporary Jewish literature particularly in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan there are references to the Spirit in passages concerned with Moses’ encounter with Yahweh. It was the Spirit’s voice that spoke with him, according to the targumic understanding of Num. 7.89 (McNamara, Palestinian Targum, 184, 187). If Paul was familiar with this kind of exegetical tradition, he might have understood the Exodus text as containing an allusion to the activity of the Spirit in Moses’ own day.
Cor. 9.21) and the "word of the Lord" (λόγῳ κυρίου, 1 Thess. 4.15; 1 Cor. 7.10; 9.14; 11.23; cf. 2 Cor. 12.9) have become the highest authority.  

A corollary to the above conviction is the notion of 'freedom' the beholders of the δόξα now have. Since freedom of experience to behold the δόξα was previously hindered by the reading of the Torah, which was accessible only to the qualified scribe, now as Christian believers it is possible through the Lord, the Spirit (2 Cor. 3.17-18 cf. Gal. 2.4; 5.1-5). It is thus a new community that is gathered under the revelation of Jesus in the Spirit.

In sum, Paul's Damascus experience probably transformed his pre-Christian convictions regarding the role of the Spirit and the significance of an experience of the Spirit.

6.3.2. The Nature of 'Call' in the Damascus experience

Significant for Paul's Damascus experience was his conviction that he was called to the Gentiles. That leads us to the second aspect of our enquiry which is how Paul heard what he heard (the nature of Paul's calling)? What is important for our discussion is the relationship between and the nature of his conviction as an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1.15-16; 1 Cor. 9.1; 15.8-11; Acts 9.15; 22.15; 26.16-18) and how that should inform our enquiry on his conviction that God has poured out his Spirit upon the Gentiles. There are various possibilities.

6.3.2.1. A Call like a Merkavah Mystic

A possibility is to argue with John Bowker who links Paul's call to that of Ezekiel's experience. By comparing the story of Paul's conversion with the Jewish tradition of four who entered pardes, Bowker finds common ground in the two traditions to Ezekiel 1. He pictures Paul journeying to Damascus and reflecting 'on the road', like the four rabbis, on Ezekiel's vision. Key to his argument is, immediately after the vision (Ezek. 1) the prophet clearly heard the voice of the Spirit speaking to him: 'Son of man, I send you to the people of Israel' (2.2-3).

---

115 As a result Paul could think of two distinct and contrary aspects, of death and life (2 Cor. 3.6), Moses and Christ (2 Cor. 3.7ff.). See discussions in Bockmuehl, Revelation and Mystery, 149.
116 G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, 14; Gruenwald, Merkavah Mysticism, 86ff.
117 There are four versions of the story available in the rabbinic literature (ShSR1.4; t.Hag. 2.3f., j.Hag. 77b; Hag. 14b). See Rowland (Open Heaven, 309-312) for further discussion.
118 In the original version of the story, argues C. Morray-Jones (Paradise Revisited', 268), 'the term pardes is used without explanation as a technical term for the Holy of Holies in the highest heaven, where the glory of God resides'.
119 See discussion in Morray-Jones 'Paradise Revisited', 268.
120 Bowker, "Merkabah' Visions", 157-73.
Chapter 6

According to Bowker, it is possible that Paul, in the process of merkavah contemplation, reflected on the voice of commission to Ezekiel in ch.2, where prophet Ezekiel was sent to the impudent, stubborn and rebellious people (2.3-7). Bowker points out that Paul too was in pursuit of transgressing Jews, but Paul’s reflection on Ezek. 2 reversed his attitudes, and the Paul was dramatically convinced in the vision that it was not the Christians who were the rebellious people, but the Jew and therefore the ‘word of God’ should be for all men. However, such a proposal does not do justice to Paul’s convictions on two accounts. (a) Unlike Ezekiel, Paul saw his task as being not primarily to confront Israel with its sin but to convert the Gentiles. (b) Paul’s vision was not the chariot of God, but the revelation of the Son of God (Gal. 1.13).

6.3.2.2. A Call like the Teacher of Righteousness

An interesting parallel to Paul’s calling would be that of Teacher of Righteousness, the leader of the Qumran sect. It can be argued that if the leader was the author of some of the hymns in Hodayot (cf. 1QH 9.29-30) he was called from his mother’s womb to obey God commandments. In 1QHa 7.18, the righteous one is set apart from the womb of his mother to give heed to God’s covenant (1QHa 17.30; cf. 1QS 8.1; 4Q259.3.1; 4Q265f4i.4). Although there are similarities between Paul’s use in Galatians and that in Qumran literature, ‘the call’ here is not followed by a word of commission to the Gentiles—a commission that is unlikely to come from the Qumran sect.

6.3.2.3. A Call like a Prophet

An emerging interest among scholars in recent years is to relate Paul’s vision/commission to experiences of the Old Testament prophets. Here Paul’s

121 Bowker, “’Merkabah’ Visions’, 172.
discussion of the revelation he received (Gal 1:15) is couched in the language of OT prophetic calls. In Gal. 1.15 Paul states that he was set apart from his mother’s womb (ἐκ κοιλαίς μητρός μου) and that he was called (κολέσσας) through God’s grace. These are elements in Paul’s call that corresponds with the prophetic writings.

The repetition of the key terms cannot be coincidental. Hence, scholars have demonstrated that the very nature of Paul’s conversion invites comparison with the prophets, particularly Jeremiah and Isaiah.

6.3.2.3.1. A Call like Jeremiah

There are scholars who argue that Paul’s call recalls Jeremiah. Thus Jer. 1.4-5 refers to his being chosen before the prophet was born for a mission to the Gentiles. Jeremiah indicates that the Lord knew him before he was formed in the womb (πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλαῖ) and that the Lord consecrated him before he was born (πρὸ τοῦ σε ἐξελθεῖν εκμητρακ). Linguistically, Jeremiah’s call offers similarity to that of Paul. Jeremiah was also called to be a “prophet to the nations” (Jer. 1.5) only in terms of his oracles, specially his word of judgement concerning the nations (Jer. 46-51), and against Egypt (Jer. 46.3-12), Babylon (Jer. 50.1-51.58) and Damascus (Jer. 49.23-27). However, it is difficult finally to relate such a call narrative to Paul’s,

---

124 Recently, Sandnes (Paul – One of the Prophets? 59ff.) investigated the common features associated with the call and ministry of the prophet in the Old Testament and post-biblical Judaism and Gal. 1 15-16. He demonstrates that the basic structure, call, election, revelation, commission and definition of target group correspond to the basic structure of the commission texts of the Old Testament prophets. He builds his case from K. Baltzer’s (Die Biographie der Propheten [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1975]) study of Gattung, particularly the literary form that is used in Old Testament to depict the call of the prophets. Sandnes employs Baltzer’s terminology to link Gal. 1.15-16 to the call narratives: “Einsetzungsbericht” consisting of “Berufungswort”, “Einsetzung”, “Dienstanweisung” “Zuständigkeitsbereich”.

125 ἐν τοῖς ἔθεσιν finds parallel in Jeremiah (Jer. 1.5). See Kim, Paul and the New Perspective, 101; Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 56; Stuhlmacher, Das Paulinische Evangelium, 72-73.

126 What is of most interest to us is the fact that Acts 26.12-18 uses vocabulary from prophetic call narratives. Acts 26.16a (But rise and stand upon your feet) = Ezek. 2.1 (stand upon your feet); Acts 17a (Delivering you from the people and from the Gentiles) = Jer. 1.8 (I am with you to deliver you); Acts 26.17b (to whom I send you) = Jer. 1.7 (to whom I send you).

127 R.E. Ciampa, The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2 (WUNT 2/102; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998) 111-18; Sandnes, Paul-One of the Prophets? 61-65. Just as the prophets received revelations and visions of God and/or heaven, particularly in connection with their call to prophetic office (Isa. 1.1; 6.1–13; Ezek. 1.1; 8.4; Obad. 1; Nah. 1.1; Hab. 2.2), so also Paul received revelations and visions (1 Cor. 15.8; 2 Cor. 12.1–4; Gal. 1.12, 16; 2.2; cf. Acts 9.3–9; 22.6–11; 26.13–20). See discussions in C.A. Davis, ‘Paul, as a Prophet’, DPL.


(i) since his ministry to the Gentile was not of judgement but of hope; (ii) nor provide us sufficient argument for the nature of Paul's Spirit experience in the call.

6.3.2.3.2. A Call like the Servant of YHWH

Scholars find parallels to the servant song of Isa. 49 (= Gal. 1.15), which begins with the words "The Lord called me from the womb" (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς μου ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομά μου, LXX 49.1), and ends with the commission to the Gentiles (49.6): "I will give you as a light to the Gentiles" (εἰς φῶς ἔθνων). Following observations strengthen our assumption.

First there are other linguistic and thematic parallels between Galatians and Deutero-Isaiah. For example, δοξάζω Gal. 1.24 = Isa. 49.3; the use of κενοῖς Gal. 2.2b = Isa. 49.4a. Further, when writing of his missionary calling elsewhere Paul alludes to the same prophet, always either quoting or alluding to texts from the part of the book of Isaiah that lays most stress on the part the Gentiles are to play in God's plan (Rom. 15.20-21 = Isa. 52.15; cf. 2 Cor. 6.2 = LXX Isa. 49.8).

Second, theologically, the significance of the call of the ἵνα in Isaiah is that the ἵνα would be the instrument of YHWH's restoration of Israel (49.5-6). Since the nations were included within the activity of YHWH's salvation, Israel and the chosen servant of God are the "light to the nations" (Isa. 42.6; 49.5f.; cf. 51.4), and would bring salvation to the ends of the earth (49.6b), which is not to be understood as an active call to mission. Rather, Israel (44.1-5) and servant of God (42.1; cf. 60.1-3) possess the power of attraction, possibly through the Spirit that works outwardly in an enticing fashion (Isa. 55.4). Thus is it possible to relate Paul's call to that of the 'servant of YHWH' in Deutero-Isaiah.

Through such a line of argument then there is a possible link one can make, in relation to the commissioning of the servant of YHWH and the Spirit endowment upon the servant. Recently, Seyoon Kim has drawn attention to Isa. 42.1 (cf. 61.1-3) and

---

131 Scholars have already noted Paul’s acquaintance with Deutero-Isaiah. See 40.13 = Rom. 11.34; 1 Cor. 2.16; 40.26-28 = Rom. 1.20; 43.6 = 2 Cor. 6.18; 43.18-19 = 2 Cor. 5.17; 44.25 = 1 Cor. 1.20; 45.9 = Rom. 9.20; 45.14 = 1 Cor. 14.25; 45.23 = Rom. 14.11; Phil. 2.10-11; 48.13 = Rom. 4.17; 49.4 = Phil. 2.16; 49.8 = 2 Cor. 6.2; 49.10 = Rom. 9.16; 49.13 = 2 Cor. 7.6; 49.18 = Rom. 14.11; 50.8 = Rom. 8.33; 51.1 = Rom. 9.31; 51.5-6 = Rom. 1.17, 3.21; 51.7 = Rom. 2.15; 51.8 = Rom. 1.17; 3.21; 52.4 = 2 Cor. 6.17; 51.5 = Rom. 2.24; 52.7 = Rom. 10.15; 52.11 = 2 Cor. 6.17; 52.15 = Rom. 15.21; 1 Cor. 2.9; 53.1 = Rom. 10.16; 53.3 = Phil. 2.7; 53.5 = Rom. 4.25, 51; 53.5-6 = 1 Cor. 15.3; 53.11 = Rom. 5.19, Phil. 2.7; 53.11-12 = Rom. 5.15; 53.12 = Rom. 4.24, 1 Cor. 15.3; 54.1 = Gal. 4.27; 55.10 = 2 Cor. 9.10. See Sandnes, Paul-One of the Prophets? 62.
related Paul’s calling to that of ‘the servant of YHWH. In Deutero-Isaiah the Lord puts his Spirit upon the Servant, thus empowering him to carry out his mission of delivering God’s saving judgement to the Gentiles and thus to be a bearer of light and salvation to them as well as being a covenant to Israel. 133

Although Kim overburdens Paul’s call with linguistic and theological parallels from Isa. 42, 134 he offers a helpful link to our discussion on Paul’s call to the Gentiles and the Spirit. According to Kim, 2 Cor. 1.21-22 offers an evidence for Paul’s understanding of his apostolic commission in terms of God’s ‘anointment’ with the Holy Spirit. 135 Such an argument is possible.

In 2 Cor. 1, Paul defends his behaviour of not having come to Corinth as he had promised. But at stake still more than his own integrity is his apostleship. He defends himself on the basis of theological principle. 136

Paul argues that the cancellation of his planned visit to Corinth was not an insincere decision born of “earthly wisdom” (σοφία σοφική 1.12) or “earthly planning” (σάρκα βουλευόμενη 1.17). Paul builds his theological argument on two levels. First, Paul argues that God, whose word, he and his colleagues (21a, b, 22) preach, is a faithful God, because God has faithfully fulfilled all His promises in and through his Son Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 1.18-20). Second, Paul’s authority as an apostle is based in God’s own authority as attested by the outpouring of the Spirit. 137

In the context of such an argument, Paul speaks of God having “anointed us” and “sealed us” and “given us the down-payment of the Spirit in our hearts.” With the use of term χρίσασε Paul is possibly referring to his apostolic commission on the Damascus road. The grammatical point suggests that Paul is referring to the initial moment at which he and probably his readers became Christians. The first verb βεβαιώθη is in the present tense and the following verbs χρίσα and σφαραγίζον are in aorist tense – indicating a single act in the past. 138 However, for us the question is whether Paul was

133 Kim, Paul and the New Perspective, 107-127
134 Kim, Paul and the New Perspective, 101-127. For example, εὐδοκήσας (Gal. 1.15) = Isa. 42.1(with the help of the witness Codex Q); κολέσας and καὶ τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (Gal. 1.15-16) = ἐκκλέσας and ἐκκλήσα (Isa. 42.1, 6); εὐθείως to Arabia (Gal. 16) = ἦς and ἦς ( Isa. 42.11as a reference to Arabia).
135 Kim, Paul and the New Perspective, 117-121.
137 Hafermann, Paul, Moses and the History of Israel, 97-98. See also S. Olson, Confidence Expressions in Paul: Epistolatory Conventions and the Purpose of 2 Corinthians (Ph.D Diss. Yale University, 1976) 136.
138 Montague, Holy Spirit, 185-86.
referring to his apostolic call or to the conversion experience of all believers in general. The former seems to be the case.

First, the use of ημαξί in v.21 is important for our discussion. On the one hand ημαξί may possibly refer to all believers,¹³⁹ which would include both Paul and his associates. But Paul is specifically making a separation between the usages of ημαξί and υμῖν in 1.21a. The ημαξί in 21a refers to Paul, Silvanus and Timothy (ημῶν 1.18); and υμῖν refers to all believers at Corinthians. In this case Paul is referring to ‘anointing’ (χρίσασος) and ‘sealing’ (σφραγιζω)¹⁴⁰ and ‘guarantee’ (ἀρραβών)¹⁴¹ in exclusive terms.¹⁴²

Second, a unique use of χρίσασος (anointing) in 2 Cor. 1.21 is helpful for furthering our argument. Scholarly interpretations vary: χρίσασος is used as a reference to the baptismal pouring of water and refers to God’s acceptance of the baptised into the eschatological community of saints;¹⁴³ or it refers to the bestowal of the gifts of the Spirit upon believers for ministry;¹⁴⁴ or all believers are consecrated at baptism to kingship, to share in Christ’s reign.¹⁴⁵ However, such interpretations are not really warranted. The verb χρῖτω is used in the LXX of consecration to high office through

¹⁴⁰ The term σφραγιζω (seal) is a commercial reference – to mark property, to prove identity, to provide a legal guarantee or to safeguard against violation. See LXX Est.3.10; 8.8; Dan. 6.18; 12.9; Isa. 29.11; Jer. 32.10; 39.44; Job 9.7; 14.17; 37.7; Wis. 2.5; Tob.7.14. See discussions in G. Fitzcr, ‘σφραγιζω’, TDNT 7: 939-43; R. Schippers, ‘σφραγιζω’, NIDNTT 3: 497. As religious imagery, it refers to divine ownership and protection. The biblical idea that a protective mark may be set upon the righteous to save them from destruction (Ezek. 9.4-6; cf. Isa. 44.3-5; Rev.7.2-8) is significant (Bousset Kyrios Christos, 295-96). In the rabbinic writings the ‘seal’ of circumcision was a sign of the covenant, of membership of God’s people (Exod. R. 19 (cf. Rom. 4.11). The Spirit as the ‘seal’ of God’s ownership is a familiar metaphor in the New Testament (Eph. 1.13; 4.30; Jn. 3.33). In 1 Cor. 9.2 Paul uses the term in relation to the authentication of his apostleship. In the present passage too, Paul’s uses the metaphor of the Spirit as a seal to prove the reliability of his apostleship and thus a reference to his calling. For other Pauline use see Rom. 15.28; Eph. 1.13; 4.30; cf. Rom. 4.11; 1 Cor. 9.2; 2 Tim. 2.19.
¹⁴¹ The term refers to another commercial and legal term for a payment, which obligates the contracting party to make further payments (cf. Gen. 38.18). See Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 158; Fee, Empowering Presence, 293. However, in its common usage as a contract for services, the term ἀρραβων also places responsibility on the one who receives it. Thus the recipient will perform the service under the obligation to fulfil the contract. See A.J. Kerr, ‘APPABΩΝ’, JTS 39 (1988) 92-97. If Paul is defending the reliability of his apostleship then we need to understand ἀρραβων in line with the above notion
¹⁴³ E. Dinkler, ‘Die Taufterminologie in 2 Kor 1,21f.’, in Signum Crucis: Augsütze zum Neuen Testament und zur christlichen Archäologie (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1967) 107. See also Lampe, Seal of the Spirit, 3-7, 61, 62 143 and recently, Horn, Das Angeld, 391. See Dunn, (Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 131-134) for criticism of this position.
¹⁴⁴ Thrall, Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 155.
anointing with oil (Exod. 29.7; Lev. 8.12; 1 Kgs. 9.16; 15.1, 17; 16.12) and for the anointing of the Messiah with the Spirit (61.1-3). In the New Testament, apart from its reference to Paul, it is used only in relation to Jesus Christ himself, who is anointed (Lk. 4.18; Acts 4.27; 10.38; Heb. 1.9), with the gift of the Spirit. If Paul is referring to “us” as faithful disciples of Christ then the verb is used here in a restricted sense – to the Christian apostles. By using the term χρίσμα Paul indicates his belief that he shares the vocation and mission of Christ. By affirming his authority in terms of anointing by the Spirit, which is received at Damascus, Paul is proving his reliability and commitment to the Gentile congregation at Corinth.

Though the thematic link between Paul’s call and that of the servant of YHWH is clear, the reference to χρίσμα in 2 Cor. 1.21 offers a linguistic parallel not to the passages in Isa. 42/49, but rather to the messianic text in Isa. 61.1. We may probably conclude that the nature of Paul’s ‘call’ experience indicates that he related his experience to that of the servant of YHWH (Isa. 42.1; 49.1-6), and especially to the role of the Spirit in empowering him as a light to the Gentiles.

In support of this position we may consider Paul’s use of χρίσμα in Gal. 1.15. Paul describes the beginning of his apostolic career as a “setting apart” (αἱρεῖσθαι) from his mother’s womb (Gal. 1.15) and a calling through God’s grace (διὰ τῆς χρίσματος αὐτοῦ) for the task of mission to the Gentiles.

---

146 Since the terminology is restricted to Luke, it may reflect Jesus tradition found in Pauline churches. See Fee, 1 Corinthians, 546-47.
147 See Fee, Empowering Presence, 292.
149 The above conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that Paul at least on three other occasions cite texts on the servant of YHWH them in explicitly with reference to his own apostolic mission (2 Cor. 6.2; Rom. 15.20-21; cf. 10.15,16).
150 Contra Kim, (Paul and the New Perspective, 121) attempts to linguistically link 2 Cor. 1.21-22 with Isa. 42.1 and 61.1.
151 See K.L. Schmidt, ‘ἀφορίζω’, TDNT 5:454-55. In the LXX, ἀφορίζω the term refers to (a) the setting aside as holy in contrast to the unholy (e.g. Lev. 20.25) (b) the ‘setting apart’ of the first born (e.g. Exod. 13.12), (b) of offering the first fruits (e.g. Num. 15.20; cf.4Q423I: 4), (c) of consecrating the Levites to the divine service on behalf of Israel (e.g. Num. 8.11). In the Rabbinic traditions the phrase is well attested but used in isolation. See Gen. R. 63.6; Num. R. 10.5, cf.3.8; t. Sota, 11b; 45b; t. Yoma 82b-83a; b. Yoma 82b. See Acts 13.2 where the Holy Spirit asks the Church to set aside (ἀφορίσασθε) Saul and Barnabas for the work of the Spirit has prepared for them (Act 13.2; Rom. 1.5).
152 Paul may possibly be referring to his recognition of an “effectual dedication that occurred at Damascus in the actual call to apostleship.” See E. Best (‘Acts 13:1-3’, JTS 11 [1960] 344-48 [347]) emphasises the parallel in language with Num. 8 and the narrative in which ‘the Levites’ are set apart to a professional ministry to God. See also Meyer, and Freed, ‘Is Paul also Among the Prophets’? 40-53; Donaldson, Paul, 254-55.
The motif of God overcoming the insufficiency of the one called is a typical feature in the prophets' call-narratives in the Old Testament. For example, in the accounts of Moses (Exod. 3.11), Isaiah (Isa. 6.5), Jeremiah (Jer. 1.6) and Ezekiel (Ezek. 1.28-2.2) being called to deliver YHWH's word, the prophets had to overcome their insufficiency by what is in effect God's covenantal grace. Only subsequent to the overcoming of his insufficiency, was he able of being God's messenger.

Building on the above conclusion, Sandnes has pointed out that the reference to χάρις in Gal. 1.15 is a reference to God's forgiving of Paul for his prior life as a persecutor of the church. According to him, without God's forgiving grace Paul was completely inadequate to be a preacher of the gospel. Interestingly the text (Gal. 1.15) does not support Sandnes' suggestion, but rather presents χάρις as a dynamic experience "of being grasped and engraced by God". Paul could possibly be referring to his own conviction of an endowment of the Spirit as the sufficiency from God for the Gentile mission.

Such an assumption is strengthened by the use of τῆς χάριν τῆς δοθεὶσαν μοι in Gal. 2.9, when Paul uses the phrase to indicate that the Jerusalem apostles duly recognised his call to the Gentiles (cf. Gal. 3.3).

Further, the same expression τῆς χάριν τῆς δοθεὶσαν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ is used in Rom. 15.15, when Paul summarises his Gentile mission up to the time of his writing to the Romans. He speaks of "what Christ has accomplished through me to win the obedience of the Gentiles by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Spirit, so that from Jerusalem and as far around as Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel" (1 Thess. 1.5;

---

154 Hafemann uses the phrase "sufficiency-in-spite-of-insufficiency-as-a-result-of-the-grace-of God" to describe the call of the above mentioned prophets (Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel, 51).
155 Sandnes, Paul – One of the Prophets?, 64.
157 See Dunn, Theology of Paul, 322.
158 The reference here is to the whole apostolic ministry (Dunn, Roman 2: 859).
159 See parallel use in 2 Cor. 12.12 - κατευργάσατο
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Gal. 3.5; 1 Cor. 2.4; 2 Cor. 12.12). A conviction that he is a Spirit-empowered apostle of Christ has its roots in the Damascus experience.

It is significant for us note the use of ἀφορίζω in Paul’s reference to his calling. Scholars have pointed out that the word alludes to Paul’s pre-Christian conviction as a Pharisee (שננה) who had set himself apart for the law. While thinking as a Pharisee Paul realises at Damascus, that it is only in Christ and through the empowerment of the Spirit that he has become truly ‘separated’ for the Gentile mission. To conclude, by juxtaposing the terms ἀφορίζω and χάρις in Gal. 1.15, Paul possibly understood his call to the Gentiles as an empowerment for his mission.

6.4. Conclusion

In the present study, we have argued that for Paul the Damascus event included an experience of the Spirit. Paul’s letters emphasise the experience of the Spirit at the beginning of all Christian conversions – by implication, in both his converts’ and his own (1 Thess. 1.4-6; 2 Thess. 2.13-14; Gal. 3.1-5 cf. 4.4-7; 1 Cor. 2.4-5; 1 Cor. 6.11; 2 Cor. 1.21).

While defending his apostolic authority, Paul provides us with information about his thoughts on the role of the Spirit at his conversion (2 Cor. 3.1-4-6; 2 Cor. 1.21). His argument indicates that in his pursuit of the church in Damascus (Gal. 1.17) he confronted the ‘glory’ of God in the ‘face’ of the risen Christ (2 Cor. 3.1-4.6). For him the significant aspect of his conversion experience was the revelation of the ‘glory of

161 While defending his convictions Paul uses the phrase τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι to convey the while explains his call to the Gentiles, a call that the Jerusalem apostles duly recognised. What is interesting is the exact phrase τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ is used in Rom. 15.15 to indicate his calling to the Gentiles.

162 Baumgarten (‘The Name of the Pharisees’, 411-428; idem, ‘The Pharisaic Paradosis’, HT 80 (1987) 63–77.) noted that an evident claim of the Pharisees was to be the party of ἀκριβεία of scrupulous exactness in their observance of God’s laws, has suggested that behind the name “Pharisee” may lie the Hebrew πιρος, “specifiers” (i.e., of the correct understanding of the divine requirements). In Rom. 1.1 Paul says that he has been set aside (ἀφορισμένος) for the gospel of God, and thus “serving the gospel of God.” See Schmidt (TDNT 5: 454) who considers that ἀφορισμένος is the translation of Hebrew פָּרִיש and Aramaic פָּרִיש of which פָּרִישָׁא is the transcription.

163 The picture that emerges from Paul’s letters concerning the role of the Spirit in his conversion/call experience is similar to traditions in Acts. What is significant for our purpose is, it is only after the mention of the gift of the Spirit (πνεύματος Οὐράνου) that Paul receives his call as an ‘elect instrument’ (σκεύος ἐκλογής Acts 9.15, 16) to carry the name before the Gentiles. Further, both authors use the imagery of light and darkness, applying it both to Paul’s own blinding and recovery of sight and the light dawning upon the Gentiles (Gal. 1.15-17; Acts 9.1-18; Acts 22.6-16; 26.13-18). It is almost certain that Paul experienced the Spirit during the Damascus event and the nature of the experience is related to his revelation of Jesus as Lord and his commission to the Gentile. Thus, the experience is both a conversion-initiation experience (Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 73-78) as well as an empowering for mission (Menzies, Development, 260-63).
God', which he experienced through the Spirit. By specifically referring to the contrast of the fading glory of the 'old covenant' and the obduracy of the 'reading of the Torah' with the new freedom of 'beholding' τὴν δόξαν κυρίου through the Spirit (2 Cor. 3.14-18), Paul indicates a new understanding of the Spirit.

The Damascus experience compelled Paul to move beyond his narrowly defined perception of the Spirit. His likely pre-Christian belief that divine enlightenment, particularly by the Spirit of God, was necessary for the study of Torah and that only someone who was filled with the Spirit could adequately interpret the words of Holy Scripture becomes insignificant in the light of his new understanding of the Spirit. The Damascus experience enabled him to see a superior revelation outside Torah.

Further, for Paul, his experience of the 'glory of God' at Damascus was an entrance into relationship with God that was entrance into life in the sphere of the Spirit. Paul might well have understood this in relation to the nature of the newly constituted covenant community.

For Paul such a revelation in the Spirit may have been significant for his conviction that he was called to preach to the Gentiles. Paul's language of mission, and particularly prophetic/Isaianic servant of YHWH element, reinforces the point that he understood his calling as becoming endowed with the Spirit for the mission to the Gentiles. The Spirit-empowered nature of Paul's calling at Damascus as reflected in his autobiographical references (Gal 1.15-16a) indicates his acquaintance with the prophetic traditions, and also provides him with a conviction he is anointed with the Spirit to preach the gospel to the Gentiles.

Did Paul's Damascus experience offer him the possibility of expecting the outpouring of the Spirit upon Gentiles without Torah observance? One cannot decisively say so. But it is highly probable in the light of our discussion that Paul's experience of Spirit at Damascus would make him open to accepting what he came to believe in his early mission – that the Spirit was indeed coming upon Gentiles apart from the Law (Gal. 3.3).
Chapter 7

THE EARLY CHURCH, THE SPIRIT AND GENTILES

7.1 Introduction

In the previous section we have argued that the Damascus event was for Paul an experience of the Spirit. We have also demonstrated how Paul’s Spirit experience may well have changed his prior conclusions on the activity of the Spirit, from an understanding of the Spirit as bringing revelation from within the Torah, to a concept of the Spirit bringing revelation from without and beyond Torah. And that revelation—the revelation of the ‘glory’ of God in the ‘face’ of the risen Christ (2 Cor. 3.1-4.6) is now available through the Spirit to all those who turn to the Lord (2 Cor. 3.16).

The schema for this chapter is set by the following. Did Paul go to the Gentiles anticipating that the Spirit would be poured out upon them apart from the Law? A corollary question would be, did the early church look forward to the bestowal of the Spirit upon Gentiles apart from Torah observation when they began their mission among them? These two questions are significant for understanding the dynamic of the Spirit in the early church and in Paul’s mission.

We will start by explaining the second of them, since it helps us to determine in what sense the early church had concluded that God has given the Spirit to the Gentiles, making them part of the eschatological community even as Gentiles. Then we will analyse Paul’s understanding in the light of the early churches’ conviction regarding Gentile acceptance and the Spirit.

7.2. The Early Church and the Spirit upon the Gentiles

So, did the early church expect the coming of the Spirit upon the Gentiles when they began their mission among them? The answer to the question depends upon an

---

1 Our interest is not to distinguish the historical and theological differences within early Christianity rather the focus is on the outlook of the early church on their experience of the Spirit and its relevance in the incorporation of the Gentiles into Christian community. For diversity of opinions concerning the understanding of the Spirit in the early church see: M. Goguel (The Birth of Christianity [trans. H.C. Snape; New York: Macmillan, 1954] 113–114) who argues that the evolution of primitive Christian pneumatology was a product of the Hellenistic community. E. Kasemann (‘Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie’, Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970] 2: 82–104) on the other hand regards the Palestinian Jewish Christians as pneumatically determined entity. Recently, Horn, ABD 3:268–71) makes out the difference between Palestinian Jewish Christian and Hellenistic Christian pneumatologies.
intriguing incident in the life of the early church – the Jerusalem council (Acts 15; Gal. 2.1–10).²

According to Luke it was Cornelius’ experience of the Spirit that was counted as the first (πρῶτης — Acts 15.14) example of the Spirit being poured out upon the Gentiles. Associated with the Cornelius incident is Luke’s reference to the consensus in the early church, particularly in the groups surrounding Peter and James, that considered the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Law as valid for their full incorporation into the new community. Paul also uses this conclusion in his argument against his opponents (Gal. 2-3).

7.2.1. The Jerusalem Council

There is an increasing trend among scholars toward considering the Jerusalem council as a historical event.³ An overwhelming majority identifies the reference to the Jerusalem council in Acts 15 with Paul’s account in Gal. 2.1–10,⁴ and this accord is not just limited to the historicity of the gathering alone but extends also to the authenticity of the arguments deriving from the Jerusalem church itself.⁵

The common scholarly consensus has several features: (i) both Galatians 2.1–10 and Acts 15.1–30 agree in subject matter, and deal with the question of Gentile Christians having to observe circumcision; (ii) both agree on the opponents, who were recognised as Jewish Christian legalists (Gal. 2; Acts 15.1); (iii) both agree over the participants involved: Paul and Barnabas on the one hand, and Peter and James on the other (Gal. 2.1, 9; Acts 15.2); (iv) both accounts reach the same conclusion in favour of a law–free mission to Gentiles (Acts 15.19; Gal. 2.6–7); and (v) significantly for our purpose, both Paul and Luke agree that the Spirit endowment is

---

² Our concern is not to harmonise the Pauline letters with Acts or to argue for or against the authenticity of Acts or to highlight the issues concerning the interrelation between, Jerusalem council, the Antioch incident, and the Apostolic Decree but to indicate the significance of pneumatological interest involved in the acceptance of Gentiles apart from Law. See discussions in N. Taylor (Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem. A Study in Relationship and Authority in Earliest Christianity [JSNTSS 66; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992] 96–97) on the question of the reliability of the Acts and Galatians in relation to the Jerusalem council.


determinative of the full affiliation to the new community of both Jews and Gentiles (Acts 15.5–9; Gal. 3.1–5).  

Concerning the subject matter, it can be inferred from both Acts 15 and Gal. 2.1–10 that the question of circumcision of the Gentile Christians and their incorporation into the eschatological community was the crucial problem at the Jerusalem council (Acts 15.1; Gal. 2.3, 4). However, it is also important for our point of view to observe that it was the obvious manifestation of the Spirit upon the Gentiles which settled the argument on both occasions (Acts 15.8, 9, 12; Gal. 2.6–9, 10; 3.1–5).  

---

6 However, we cannot overlook the differences between Gal. 2.1–10 and Acts 15.1–30. (a) According to Galatians Paul's involvement was due to private revelation but in Acts 15.2–3 he is a public representative of the Antioch church, probably because Paul's concern to present himself as independent of the authority of the Jerusalem apostles. (b) The non-mention of a famine relief mission to Jerusalem (Acts 11.29) is probably informed by the same motif; or similarly, perhaps the trip did not assume polemical importance for Paul and his opponents. (c) The Judaizers in Galatia did not mention the decision of the Apostolic Council. Interestingly Paul drew on Apostolic decree in Galatians 2.11–15 – Peter's and Barnabas' actions were inconsistent precisely because they went against the council at Jerusalem. (d) The reported outcomes are very different. Four specific commandments are binding on them (15.19–20). But Luke adds an additional decree requiring observance by the Gentile believers of "abstaining from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what has been strangled and from fornication" (15.29). The major problem with identifying the conferences of Gal. 2.1–10 and Acts 15 is that the so-called Apostolic Decree is incompatible with Paul's account (Gal. 2.6). It is probable that the association of the Apostolic Decree with the Jerusalem conference is anachronistic, and that it was in fact a later formulation; a view that enjoy wide scholarly support. See M. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (trans. H. Greeven; London: SCM Press, 1956) 96–107; Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity, 115–117; Dunn, The Incident at Antioch', 160. For discussion on the matter concerning the date and the subject matter of Apostolic decree see discussions in P.J. Achtemeier, The quest for Unity in the New Testament Church: A Study in Paul and Acts (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987) 54–55; Haenchen, Acts of the Apostles, 468; A. Weiser, 'Das 'Apostelkonzil' (ApG 15.1–35): Ereignis, Überlieferung, lukanische Deutung', BZ 2 (1984) 145–167. It is enough to note simple that the Apostolic decree reflects an attempt on the part of the churches in Antioch and Jerusalem to come to terms with the phenomenon of mixed table–fellowship.


8 On the one hand it is important to note that the pneumatological issues surrounding the Cornelius episode and the Jerusalem council have been subsumed under the scholarly concentration on the circumcision issue. See for example, Kraus, Zwischen Jerusalem und Antiochia, 76ff. On the other hand, scholarship has focused its attention only on the issue of the nature of the gift of the Spirit granted to believers. Thus (a) Dunn, (Baptism in the Holy Spirit, 81) and Brunet (A Theology of the Holy Spirit: The Pentecostal Experience and New Testament Witness [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970] 196) have
The emphases on the manifestation of the Spirit on both occasions (Acts 15 [cf. Acts 10; 11]; Gal. 2.1–3.5) are worth noting. Acts 15.8 refers to “giving (δίδωμι) them (Gentiles) the Holy Spirit”; Acts 10.44 and 11.15 mention that “the Holy Spirit fell (ἐπιτίπτω) on all”; Acts 10.45 indicates “the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out (ἐκχέω) even on the Gentiles”. Likewise in Gal. 3.2 Paul wrote that the Galatians had received (λαμβάνω) the Spirit and in Gal. 3.5 he refers to God who supplies (ἐπιχορηγέω) the Spirit. With such an overwhelming list of Spirit references on the question under discussion it can be argued that in the early church (and particularly the group around James and the Pharisaic believers) the endowment of the Spirit upon Gentiles caused a dawning recognition that culminated at the Jerusalem council. This aspect comes into clear view in both Paul’s and Luke’s descriptions of the events.

7.2.1.1. The Key Arguments at the Jerusalem Council

According to Luke, in the council the speakers present two kinds of argument. First, Peter argues that the miraculous charismatic phenomena (the Spirit coming upon the Gentiles accompanying the conversion of the first [πρῶτος – Acts 15.14] Gentile converts) constituted a declaration by God that Gentiles are acceptable to him as Gentiles (15:8–9). Paul and Barnabas support this argument by referring to the work of the Spirit in their Gentile mission (Acts 15.12).

Second, as a complement to Peter, Paul and Barnabas, James interprets both the messianic age, when Davidic rule is restored to Israel, and the Temple, which God will build, as representing the eschatological people of God. God will build the eschatological Temple as the place of his presence on earth, so that all the Gentile nations may seek him; and they will do so, it is implied, apart from becoming Jews (15.15–19).

argued that the gift of the Spirit is the sign for the Gentiles' conversion-initiation, which is God's gift of repentance unto life. (b) Stronstad (The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke [Peabody: Hendrikson, 1984] 67) and Menzies (Development, 267) have contended that the Spirit is the second blessing for the missionary enterprise. See also Turner, Power, 387; Shelton, Mighty in Word and Deed, 131–133.

9 See Borgen, 'Jesus Christ, the Reception of the Spirit, and a Cross-National Community', 220–235.

10 See Rom. 11.8; 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; 1 Thess.4.8; 2 Tim. 1.7; cf. Acts 5.32; 15.8.

11 Rom. 5.5.

12 Rom. 8.15; 1 Cor. 2.12; 2 Cor. 11.4; Gal. 3.2, 14 cf. Acts 2.33, 38; 8.15, 17,19; 10.47; 19.2.

Recently, scholars have brought to light the importance of James’s comment in Acts 15.14–18. Historically we cannot ascertain whether James actually said this at the council, but it is agreed that the speech does reflect the view of the Jerusalem leadership. With this in mind we would like to proceed in the following directions.

It is important to recognise that the text of Acts 15.16–18 is a conflation of prophetic texts, referring to the building of the eschatological Temple (Hos. 3.4–5; Jer. 12.15–16) and the conversion of nations (Jer. 12.15–16; Zech. 8.22; Isa. 45.20–23) in the messianic age (Amos.9.11). The whole point of juxtaposing these particular texts is to show that the prophets have predicted that in the age to come both the restoration of Davidic rule to Israel and the Temple which God will build are to be identified with the eschatological people of God, so that all the Gentile nations may seek his presence there.

What is especially interesting is that such a conclusion, which is about the eschatological pilgrimage of Gentiles in the end time, is used to prove the limits of table-fellowship, particularly concerning unclean foods (Lev. 11.1–23; Deut. 14.3–21; Lev. 17–18) and ritual purity. The discordant themes that emerge from the text — with Peter, Paul and Barnabas on the one hand advancing their Spirit experiences...
among the Gentiles as the reason for their full acceptance, while James on the other declares that God building the Temple means God building his eschatological people — are both used by Luke to present a case for minimal requirements for the entry of Gentiles into Christian community.

Our interest lies in the relation between the Spirit experience of the Gentiles and the reference to God’s community as the eschatological Temple.20 Had this been recognised from the inception of the church, or was it a dawning realisation culminating at the Jerusalem council? At its most fundamental, the Lukan account of the Jerusalem council depicts that a certain quarter, at least, of the early church experienced a gradual recognition that the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles meant their inclusion as Gentiles in the eschatological Temple. This is made obvious by Luke’s repeated use of the Cornelius episode.

7.2.1.2. The Note of Amazement (Acts 10.36–43; cf.11.4–18; 15.7–11)

It is worth observing the note of amazement that is recorded in Luke’s narration of the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Gentiles,21 chiefly within the Pharisaic/circumcision group.

First, Luke reports that the circumcised believers from Joppa were surprised (ἐκστασις) at the coming of the Spirit upon Gentiles. According to Acts, Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, preached the gospel about Jesus (10.36–43) to Cornelius and his household.22 Cornelius was a Roman centurion in Caesarea23 and “a devout

20 Scholars have noted the early church’s understanding of itself as the eschatological Temple. See C.K. Barrett, ‘Paul and the “Pillar” Apostles’, in J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (eds.), Studia Paulina (Haarlem: Bohn, 1953) 1–19; Bauckham, ‘James and the Jerusalem Church’, 441–450. However, the significance of the Spirit experience in the Gentile mission and its resultant conclusion that God is building an eschatological Temple is a neglected area in the scholarship.


man who feared God", and represents the kind of person "in every nation" (ἐν πάσῃ ἔθνει) acceptable to God (10.35). It was his conversion that occasioned the first dramatic outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon "the Gentiles" (τὰ ἑδυνή 10.45).

Luke captures the surprise of circumcised believers from Joppa in terms of εξίστημι — an expression that is used elsewhere in respect of the falling of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2.7, 12). The believers (πιστοί) are described as ἐκ περιτομῆς. Except in 11.2, the expression is not used elsewhere in Acts. Paul, however, uses the term in Gal. 2.12 and Titus 1.10 (cf. Col. 4.11). The reference is here to a party, contending for the obligation to observe the Jewish Law including circumcision, who were seized with amazement when they saw that "the gift of the Holy Spirit has been poured out even on (ὅτι καὶ ἐπί) to the Gentiles (τὰ ἑδυνη)". Peter's decisive question is equally built on the amazement of the believers from Joppa: "Can anyone forbid water for baptising these people who have received the Holy Spirit as we also have (ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς)?" (Acts 10.47).

Second in Peter's retelling of the story comes the point that God has granted "to the Gentiles" (τοῖς ἑθνεσιν) repentance that leads to life (Acts 11.18). Peter

---


25 According to him, the term is used of godly Jews in the LXX (Exod. 18.21; Job 1.1, 8; 2.3; 4 Macc. 15.28); Josephus (Ant 12.284; 14.308; Ap.2.140); Joseph and Aseneth (4.9; 8.5–7; 20.18; 23.9; 28.4; 29.3). The term is also used by pagans of those Gentiles who were considered pious and devout.


defends before his Jerusalem accusers (who are ἐκ περιτομῆς) the dramatic confirmation of the Spirit (11.15) upon the Gentiles, and invests the coming of the Spirit with an even more unexpected and decisive effect (11.16); and what is important here is the parallel he draws between this outpouring and the original outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost. God has given (ἐδωκεν) the gift of the Spirit to the new Christians just as (ὦς καὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ) he gave it to “us” when we believed (πιστεύσασιν 11.17 cf. 2 Thess. 1.10; Mk. 16.17). The Jerusalem group was silenced (ἤσυχαζον) and glorified God. In Acts 15.5, Peter further narrates the incident to the Pharisaic believers in Jerusalem. He restates the theme with its theological significance, and the audience's (παρασημο) response is similarly referred to as ἐσθίεσαν (15.12). The sense of amazement in the repeated tradition of Acts indicates that in the Jerusalem church, at least, the circumcision party did not expect a universal endowment of the Spirit, or any outpouring of the Spirit beyond the boundaries of Israel.

This leads us to a related question: how did the early church understand the Pentecost event? The following aspects need to be noted in relation to the original Jerusalem community's experience of the Spirit. (i) Even in Luke's account of Peter's theological explanation of the coming of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the universality of the outpouring is limited to the gathered members of the people of

---

28 Maloney, 'All that God had Done with Them', 76.
31 It is often supposed that James, the brother of the Lord, has close affinities with the Pharisees' outlook. See M. Hengel, 'Jacobus der Herrenbruder – der erst 'Papst'?’, in Glaube und Eschatologie, 71–104.
33 Such as view is in line with our earlier discussion on Paul's Pharisaic background. See pages 115–127.
God (Acts 2.1–4).\(^{36}\) (ii) The modification/addition of μον in v. 18 after δούλοις and δούλας, effectively makes those upon whom the Spirit came were God’s own servants. The argument here has nothing to do with whether or not the Spirit was given in stages to those who were already in the community; rather, Luke’s interest is to report the early community’s belief that the πᾶσας καταρχαί of Peter’s Joel quotation means, not humankind in general but the covenant community which is now restored under the Messiahship of Jesus.\(^{37}\) It seems possible to conclude that Luke is faithfully following the Hebrew Scriptures (Joel 3.1–5; Isa. 32.15ff; 44.1–5) where the Spirit endowment is promised to the covenant community.

We may probably assume that the occasion of the coming of the Spirit was in itself not a great concern for the Jerusalem leadership, because as good Jews: (a) they considered the event on the day of Pentecost as the coming of the eschatological Spirit upon the restored Israel; and as a corollary, (b) they also might have anticipated that the Gentiles would come and share in salvation, as proselytes and possibly as recipients of the Spirit. This understanding of events would not seriously have threatened their pneumatological expectations; what did introduce a considerable element of shock and surprise was the Gentiles receiving the Spirit as Gentiles.

In sum, according to Luke’s presentation, the early church, or rather the circumcision party and particularly the Pharisaic section of the Jerusalem church, did not expect the outpouring of the Spirit upon Gentiles.\(^{38}\) For them the outpouring of the Spirit upon Gentiles was a dawning recognition, which probably culminated at the Jerusalem council following the reports from Peter, Paul and Barnabas.

---

\(^{36}\) Phrases like Ἀνδρεῖς Ἰουδαῖοι, Ἀνδρεῖς Ἰσραήλ, Ἀνδρεῖς Ἀδελφοί support our argument. In Acts 2.39 the phrase ‘to all that are far off’ refers to the Diaspora in mind. The words are found in Isa. 57.19 (Acts 2.39 πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν; cf. Isa. 57. τοῖς μακράν). The same idea is evident in Acts 22.21, where Paul is sent far away (μακράν) to the Gentiles. See Zehne, *Peter’s Pentecost Discourse*, 124 who note the use Paul makes use of the term τοῖς μακράν in contrast to τοῖς ἐγγύς (Eph. 2.14–17) to depict the fulfillment of Isaiah’s prophecy, preaching peace to both and bringing the Gentiles into the commonwealth of Israel.


\(^{38}\) See Horn, *ABD*, 3:270.
7.2.1.3. The Common Consensus (Gal. 2.1–10) 39

Paul’s account of the events in Gal. 2.1–10 parallels Luke’s. 40 The precise issue at Jerusalem Council 41 and Galatia 42 were clearly not the same, but Paul uses the deliberations at the Jerusalem council 43 to make his case. From Paul’s perspective both disputes were fought in defence of the same principle — the equal standing of Jewish and Gentile believers on the basis of the Holy Spirit in the eschatological community. 44

The significance of the passage will become apparent as consideration is given in turn to the key elements in Paul’s narrative: the nature and the intent of the visit (Gal. 2.1–2, 3–5) and the apostolic agreement (Gal. 2.6–10).

Paul’s visit to Jerusalem along with Barnabas and the Gentile convert Titus was κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν (Gal. 2.1–2). 45 It was not so much a case of seeking belated approval, 46 or discussing innovations in doctrine and discipline, 47 but rather “to submit for consideration and opinion without any connotation of religious authority.” 48 Thus ἄνωτηθημι in Gal. 2.2 means that Paul had come to Jerusalem to consult with and gain the cooperation of the Jerusalem apostles for the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles (Gal. 2.2b).

39 We will be adopting the South Galatia theory, which does not oppose our equating Galatians 2.1–10 with the Apostolic council of Acts 15. For a helpful summary of the debate over whether the destination of Galatians was North or South Galatia, with convincing evidence for the latter, see Longenecker, Galatians lxiii–lxx. See also Bruce, ‘Galatians Problems 2. North or South Galatia’, 243–66; Hemer, Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History; cts, chp.7; J. Scott, Paul and the Nations. The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the destination of Galatians (WUNT 84; Tübingen: Mohr–Siebeck, 1995) and recently Breytenbach, Paulus und Barnabas.

40 Most scholars tend to prefer Gal. 2.1–10 as more trustworthy than Acts. However, in view of Paul’s apologetic purpose evident in the presentation of events it is not necessary to consider it as more authentic tradition than that later incorporated into Acts. See Betz, Galatians, 81; Holmberg, Paul and Power, 14; F.B. Watson, Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles (Cambridge: CUP, 1986) 53–56.

41 See, Burton, Galatians lxi; Betz, Galatians, 112; Dunn, ‘The Incident at Antioch’, 148ff.

42 See Barclay, Obeying the Truth, 45–52; Longenecker, Galatians, lxxviii.

43 For discussions on the non–Pauline traditions in the passage see Betz, Galatians, 96–97.


45 This much disputed phrase does not merely denotes (i) a revelation specific to this event (Bruce, Galatians, 108), (ii) nor Paul’s was answering a charge that he had been summoned to be reprimanded (R. Bring, Commentary on Galatians [Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961] 76.). (iii) or as the first occasion on which Paul informed the Jerusalem apostles of his revelation on the way to Damascus concerning his circumcision free gospel to the Gentiles (G. Howard, Paul: Crisis in Galatia. A Study in Early Christian Theology [SNTSMS 35; Cambridge: CUP, 1979] 38ff.). Rather, the visit was in accordance with the origin and subsequent apostolic outworking of God’s disclosure of his Son in him.

46 Stulmacher, Das paulinische Evangelium, 87; Betz, Galatians, 86.


48 Dunn, ‘The Relationship between Paul and Jerusalem according to Galatians 1 and 2’, 108–128
Paul asserts that he and the Jerusalem apostles arrived at an agreement concerning their respective missionary tasks. The agreement in terms contributed nothing to the way Paul viewed the Spirit's activity among the Gentiles, which suggests that far from imposing any requirements upon Paul, the Jerusalem leadership showed considerable theological discernment and conviction in recognising that God's grace was operative in his Gentile mission in a manner analogous to its outworking through Peter's activities.

That διδόκωντες εἴναι τι came to this conviction is evident in Paul's argument in several ways. (i) The perfect passive verb πεπίστευμαι (“I was entrusted”) is used to describe Jerusalem leadership's recognition of the authenticity of both Paul's mission and Peter's. (ii) The term ἐνεργέω is characteristically used to describe both Paul's Spirit-empowered mission to the Gentiles (Gal. 3.5; 1 Cor. 12.6, 11) and Peter's to the Jews (and Gentiles. Acts 2.14ff.; 3.12ff.; 9.32; 10.1–11.18; 15.7–9). (iii) The aorist participle ἴδοντες (“having seen”) is paralleled by the aorist participle γνώντες (“having known”) of v.9a, and both participles combine to give the reason for the Jerusalem leaders' acceptance of Paul and Barnabas in vv.9b–10.

Thus, according to Paul's account of events, it is only at the Jerusalem Council that the leadership in Jerusalem came to recognise (ἵδοντες / γνώντες) that the Spirit was operative in the Gentile mission, making them part of the new community.

---

49 However, it is possible, to lay too much weight on the difference between two kinds of gospels (Burton, Galatians, 91f.; Betz, Galatians, 49). The genitive construction τῆς ἀκροβυστίας and τῆς περιτομῆς (Rom. 2.26f.; 3.30; cf.Eph. 2.11) are simply genitives of indirect object and thus here and Paul's insistence elsewhere that there is only one gospel, for the point here is not with regard to content but audience and type of outreach (Fung, Galatians, 99).

50 See page 182. As noted in our previous discussion the use of τήν χάριν τήν δοθείσαν μοι, refers not only to Paul's conviction that he is called as an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1.16; Rom. 1.5; 12.3; 15.15; 1Cor.3.10; Phil. 1.7; cf.Eph. 3.8) but also that he is empowered by the Spirit (Rom. 15.15).


52 A Pauline expression see, Rom. 3:2; 1 Cor. 9:17; 1 Thess. 2:4; 1 Tim 1:11; Titus 1:3; cf. Gal. 1.15. See Bultmann, 'Πνεύμα', TDNT 6: 174–228.

53 See also Heb. 2.4.

54 According to Betz (Galatians, 96) ἴδοντες denotes theological insight (Gal. 2.14; Matt. 27.3; Acts 12.3).

55 See Burton, (Galatians, 95) who considers both as synonymous.

56 The reciprocal recognition of the outworking of divine grace found in the expression of 'right hand of fellowship', that (Paul and Barnabas) should go to the Gentiles and (the Jerusalem leadership) to the circumcised (Gal. 2.9). See Cummins (Paul and the crucified Christ in Antioch, 132) who relates the use to Maccabean framework to interpret the passage and see this as betoken of an official compact involving the giving and receiving of pledges of friendship and/or terms of peace.
That Paul already believed before the Jerusalem Council that the same Spirit operated in his ministry as in Peter's is clear from his account of the manifest presence (ἐπερημένος) of the Spirit among Gentiles in his own work in Gal. 2.8. Even in Gal. 3.1ff., Paul uses the Galatians' original Spirit experience to win his argument against the judaising opponents there — he does not emphasise the content of the preaching, but its experiential result: the Galatians received the Spirit.

For Paul, the significance of the fact that God supplies the Spirit to non-proselyte Gentiles is to be seen in the light of his pre-Christian assumptions. (i) The Spirit would not be given to non-Jews and was only to be expected in the context of law observance; and (ii) the expectation that God would not pour out his Spirit in any general way until the dawn of a new age. In line with this latter expectation, and in common with other early Christians, Paul interpreted the experience of the Spirit as the fulfilment of the promise (Gal. 3.14) and the inauguration of the fullness of time (Gal. 4.4–6; cf. Rom. 8.23; Acts 2.15–21). For Paul the eschatological age had started and God had poured out His Spirit upon the Gentiles. This understanding developed even at an early stage of his missionary work, a conviction that was so compelling in terms of proof even the most skeptical accepted it. This conviction that the Spirit had come upon Gentiles apart from the law (Gal. 3.3) not only confirmed Paul's view about his mission, particularly his call as an apostle to the Gentiles, but also gave him the realisation that God was accepting the Gentiles as Gentiles.

On the one hand, an account written short time after the Jerusalem council (Paul's), and on the other a somewhat later reference (Luke's account), both confirm the credibility of the tradition concerning the significance of the Spirit experience and the entry of Gentiles into the newly constituted community. Significantly for our purpose, such a conclusion suggests Paul's awareness of the coming of the Spirit upon the Gentiles even at an early stage of his Gentile mission. The question before us then is, how did Paul come to such a belief? It is at this point that we need to recognise the

57 For surveys of the Judaising views and other perspectives, see Bruce, 'Galatian Problems', 51-55 (1969-73); J.J. Gunther, St.Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings (NovTSup 35; Leiden: Brill, 1973); Barclay, Obeying the Truth, 45-52.

58 Barclays, Obeying the Truth, 84.
role of the Hellenists, whose views on the Holy Spirit were significant in relation to Paul's conviction.

7.3. The Hellenists and the Church in Antioch

Most scholars agree that Law-free mission to the Gentiles is associated with the Hellenists (Acts 11.20).\(^{59}\) Then the key question is, did they expect the Spirit to be given to the Gentiles? This question needs to be placed within the theological justification for acceptance and integration of the Gentiles into the Christian community.\(^{50}\) When did they think this happened, and does that give a clue as to how they perceived the coming of the Spirit?

Scholars are of diverse opinions concerning the reasons for the beginnings of a mission among the Gentiles.

(a) There are those who argue that the rejection of the gospel by the Jews resulted in the turning towards Gentiles.\(^{61}\) A weakness of this argument is that, though Jesus experienced a similar refusal by his fellow Jews, he did not turn to the Gentiles.

(b) There are others who argue that it was the spiritualisation of Torah in the Diaspora that led the Hellenists into mission to the Gentiles. The Hellenist Christians were radical enough within the spectrum of Judaism to arouse Paul's anger;\(^{62}\) one needs to be aware that spiritualised allegorising tendencies were not actually that frequent in Hellenistic Judaism (\(4\) Macc; \(Let.\) Aris.; Philo;\(^{63}\) Josephus).\(^{64}\)

(c) Paula Fredriksen, however, argues that the law-free mission existed before Paul,\(^{65}\) and was started by the Hellenists in the Diaspora synagogues, where she locates the presence of Gentiles. Therefore she rejects the idea that circumcision was the reason for persecution. Her argument is built on the idea that the hostility was


\(^{60}\) A detailed discussion on the question what made Hellenists to go into Gentile mission is beyond our scope of enquire. It is only to note that the persecution resulted from their new found belief led them to move into the Gentiles territories.


\(^{62}\) Räisänen, 'Paul's Conversion and the Development of His View of the Law', 404–419. According to Räisänen the 'spiritualising' tendencies from the Diaspora (Philo. \(Mig.\) 87–93) are recognised as a possible stimulus for the activities of the Hellenists to involve in law free mission. The Hellenists displayed a liberal attitude toward parts of the law, which they reinterpreted in spiritual or ethical terms.

\(^{63}\) Philo only mildly rebukes the Alexandrian allegorizers (\(Mig.\) 89–93).

\(^{64}\) See Kraus, Das Volk Gottes, 89.

\(^{65}\) P. Fredriksen, 'Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2', \(JTS\) 42 (1991) 532-64.
aroused as a result of ‘the open dissemination of a Messianic message’ which put the entire Jewish community at risk.\textsuperscript{66} If that were the case, then the Hellenist sector expected the Spirit upon Gentile from the very beginning of their mission.

There are a few problems with Fredriksen’s suggestions. (i) She takes lightly the distinction between God–fearers and the proselytes in the early church.\textsuperscript{67} (ii) She neglects the fact that Paul speaks explicitly about the reasons why he became involved in the persecution (Gal. 1.23f and Phil. 3.4), that is, his zeal for the Law and for the traditions of the ancestors. (iii) She also ignores further reasons for Paul’s persecution activity, to wit the Temple criticism and the self–perception of the Hellenists that they are the new community of God in the Spirit. To this last point we now turn our attention.

In our previous discussion,\textsuperscript{68} we mentioned that the Hellenists’ possession of the Spirit provided them an understanding that they are the new eschatological community (Acts 6.14; 7.1–53).\textsuperscript{69} It is probable that their claim of faith in Jesus as the Messiah and their awareness that they were endowed with the eschatological gift of the Spirit (Acts 6.11; 13; 14; 7.51ff)\textsuperscript{70} might have created some tension among the Jews and consequently led to their selective persecution.\textsuperscript{71}

We are told that the Hellenists who were scattered following the persecution in Jerusalem travelled as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus, and Antioch, and that “they spoke the word to no one except Jews.”\textsuperscript{72} That their proclamation of the gospel was initially

\textsuperscript{66} According to Fredriksen, (‘Judaism’ 556) the enthusiastic proclamation of a Messiah executed very recently by Rome as a political troublemaker, a crucified Messiah, combined with a vision of approaching end preached also to Gentiles was dangerous.


\textsuperscript{68} See discussions in pages 133–134;

\textsuperscript{69} See the notion of church as temple - Gal. 2.9; 1 Cor. 3.16–17; 2 Cor. 6.16 cf. Gal. 2.9; Eph. 2.20–22.

\textsuperscript{70} Hengel (Between Jesus and Paul, 22ff.) argue that stimulus for the Stephen party’s Temple/torah critique was the charismatic, eschatological gift of the Spirit.

\textsuperscript{71} E. Larsson (‘Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde’, NTS 33 (1987) 205-25.221-22) disputes claim (Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 28) that the stimulus for the Stephen party’s Temple/Torah critique was the charismatic eschatological gift of the Spirit, because both Hellenists and Hebraist received the same Spirit. However, Larsson underestimates that the two groups, though sharing the same experience of the Spirit could not have arrived at contrasting conclusion (Gal. 3.1–5; cf. Acts 11.1f; 15.1f).

\textsuperscript{72} The lack of any casual relation between the conversion of Cornelius in Acts 10.1–11.18 and the beginnings of the Gentile mission at Antioch in 11.19–21 suggests that the former bears an intentional placement on the pages of Acts. The mission to the Gentiles at Antioch traces its link to the scattering of the church as a result of the death of Stephen (cf.8.1, 4; 11.19), not to the events leading up to the house of Cornelius. Esler (Community and Gospel in Luke–Acts, 96) observes how 11.19, with its theme of scattering (σύν δισαπαρέντες), takes up immediately from 8.4 (σύν δισαπαρέντες), thus lacking any sign that ‘the mission to the Gentiles in Antioch is a consequence of the conversion of a Roman centurion by Peter.
directed at the Jews is also entirely plausible, inasmuch as fellow Jews would have been a natural point of departure for their missionary activity. But among them were some men of Cyprus and Cyrene who on coming to Antioch, spoke to Greeks. It is probable that the mission to the Gentiles as such had not yet begun.

It was only gradually, and at least at first, to a minority (11.20) that the relevance of the gospel to a Gentile audience became apparent. These first Gentile converts were among the God-fearers of one or more of the synagogues in Antioch. That there was a significant number of God-fearers in Antioch, attached to the synagogues, is clear from Josephus' statement (J.W. 7.32; 45). Antioch became the focal point of the preaching of the gospel to Gentiles (Acts 11.20–26), and the gathered community (including Gentiles) in Antioch might have displayed 'gifts of the Spirit' in the context of their worship, thus demonstrating their acceptance by God. It is here then that we need to place the realisation that God has poured out the Spirit upon the Gentiles.

The manifest presence of the Spirit in the proclamation of the Gospel (1 Thess. 1.4-5; Gal. 3.14; Rom. 15.16); accompanied by powerful phenomena (1 Thess. 1.5; Gal. 3.5; Rom. 15.18-19) could have inspired faith among non-proselytes Gentiles. It is probable that the first coming of the Spirit on Gentiles in Antioch could be similar to that of Cornelius incident, where they received the Spirit (ἡ δωρεά τοῦ άγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται [recalling ἐκχείν of Acts 2.17ff, 33; cf. 10.47]), they spoke in tongues and μεγαλυτέρων τον θεόν (Acts 10.44–48). The immediate consequence of receiving the Spirit is an ability closely related to the Spirit (Acts 2.3f.) and previously not theirs, and an outburst of praise. The Gentiles' praise of God is ascribed to the agency of the Holy Spirit.

We build the above assumption on the fact that the Christian message, whatever its content, was in the understanding of these first believers a message for Jews (Acts

---

73 Against the reading Ἐλληνισταί, see Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul, 8.
75 See Dunn, Jesus, Paul and the Law, 144–148.
77 This praise recalls the δεσμευμένος τοῦ θεοῦ δίκαι παρασκεύας of the God fearer Cornelius in Acts 10.2. When μεγαλυτέρων occurs again with Gentiles in Acts 13.48, it is safe to assume relation to the reception of the Spirit though this is not explicitly mentioned. It is interesting to note that Gentiles lacking the Spirit did not acknowledge and praise God, rather as Luke indicates, they praised people or idol (12.22; 19.34). Barrett (Acts of the Apostles, 1: 291) observes that where the Spirit 'is manifestly at work it is plain that there is divine action.
Insofar as the Gentiles were considered at all, it was probably along the lines of conventional expectation (Isa. 2.1-4; 42.1-9; 49; 55.4-5; 60.1-7; 66.18.23) that they would share at some future date in the blessing of a restored Israel. The idea of the eventual ingathering of the Gentiles, that the end is near, and that the Gentiles would finally see the light and turn to worship the true God could be the reason for the accommodation of Gentiles into the Christian community (Isa. 2.2/Mic. 4.1; Isa. 19.16–25; 25.6; 66.18–24; Zech. 8.23; Ps. 7.31–41). It is possible that the Hellenists regarded the conversion of the Gentiles as an important part of God’s plan for the last days.

Thus it is probable that it was the Hellenist section of early Christianity which was first to believe (in Antioch) that God had poured out the Spirit upon Gentiles apart from the Law. Such a conclusion is built on the assumption that (i) the Hellenists understood the community of Christian believers as the new eschatological Temple, a supposition that is supported by their pneumatic characteristics. (ii) It is possible the Hellenists’ understanding of Jesus’ saying about the temple in Mk. 11.17, with its combination of Isa. 56.7 and Jer. 7.11 describing the temple as a universal place of prayer, could explain their open-hearted acceptance of Gentiles.

7.4. Paul, the Spirit and the Gentiles

As noted in our previous discussion, Paul’s Pharisaic past did not lead him to expect the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles (a lack of expectation fully shared by the Pharisaic believers [Acts 10.45; 11.2; 15.2, 5] in the early church).

---

78 As we have argued in chapter 2, that the writer of Isa. 44.1–5 believed that the activity of מִנְיָה will cause the Gentiles to turn to YHWH. Likewise, prophet Joel the coming of the new age is attributed to the ‘outpouring’ of the spirit. The overwhelming presence of the מִנְיָה will signal the turn of Israel’s fortune and as a consequence ‘all flesh in Israel’ will prophecy and see visions and dreams and that will in turn attract the nations towards Israel. The tradition on Joel’s prophecy could be a significant influence for the Hellenists.

79 Horn, ABD 3: 271 makes distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christian communities in their convictions about the Spirit. According to him, Christological differences between them led to the differences in the understanding of the Spirit. But in the light of our discussion it is ecclesiological reasons made the distinction.

80 A threat against the temple played an important part in the trial of Jesus (Mk. 14.28; Matt. 26.51 cf. Jn. 2.19). The version in Acts is closest to Mark (Richard, Author’s Method 289–90). We find in both texts καταλύσεω (Mk. 14.58) and καταλύσει (Acts 6.14). The most significant difference between the two is that in Acts, Luke has deleted the final two-thirds of Mark’s verse, the part which mentions the rebuilding of a temple ἄχρι τοῦ ἐστίν. The term ἄχρι τοῦ ἐστίν is frequently used in LXX and refer to an idol or idol house, the product of human hands (Lev. 26.30; Wis. 14.8). The Hellenistic adjective ἄχρι τοῦ ἐστίν from Mk. 14.58 seems to have influenced Acts 7.48. See discussions in A. Weiser, Apostelgeschichte Kap.1-12, (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981) 173; Conzelmann, Acts, 51; Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity, 187.

81 Hengel, Pre–Christian Paul, 82–83.
However, Paul's Damascus experience possibly contributed to an openness in his expectation of the Spirit upon the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{82}

According to Gal. 1.17–18, immediately after conversion Paul went to Arabia,\textsuperscript{83} and it is widely argued that Paul began his missionary work there.\textsuperscript{84} Such a view is built on an argument which perceives that Paul was the apostle to the Gentiles from the moment of his conversion.\textsuperscript{85} The evidence either for or against such a mission is minimal; there is, for example, no record of any church in Arabia founded by Paul.\textsuperscript{86} In Gal.1.17 Paul contrast Arabia with Jerusalem. Paul's reference to him not consulting leaders in Jerusalem, instead sought further divine guidance and inspiration in Arabia supports our case.

Gal 1.17 further informs us that he was in Damascus for some time, possibly three years (Gal. 1.18), but Paul gives no information on how he passed his time there.\textsuperscript{87} There are scholars who argue that Paul was involved in a mission to Gentiles during his time in Damascus.\textsuperscript{88} It is possible that Paul preached only to Jews.\textsuperscript{89} In 2 Cor. 11.32 (cf. Acts 9.23-25) Paul refers to the ethnarch of king Aretas was trying arrest him, possibly due to troubles emerging from his Jewish audience. That the Jews launch attacks on Paul seems to be something like a fixed theme in Luke, though it was historically well grounded in Paul's life (2 Cor. 11.24; 26; cf. Gal.4.29; 1 Thess.

\textsuperscript{82} It is possible to expect Paul to have been influenced by the various philosophical stream of Judaism' ideals of the reception of the Spirit. As noted in our discussion (Pages 92-108) on Philo, we have pointed out that Philo regarded the reception and the indwelling of the Spirit as a phenomenon in the life of the Jewish community as the people of God. In Virt. 212–219, Philo present Abraham as the prototype of the proselyte who receives the Spirit. In his conversion from astrology and polytheism to One God Abraham received the Spirit. It is possible to argue that it was in the light of Abraham's experience as the prototype proselyte that Paul arrived at the belief that Gentiles could become part of God's new commonwealth, and so receive the indwelling Spirit. However, it is quite strikingly obvious that Paul is not familiar with the Spirit usages of Philonic literature. For example, the term used by Philo for the receiving of the Spirit is καταστασις, and in the New Testament only Luke uses the term καταστασις (Acts 7.5; 45), and in neither instances is it related to the coming of the Spirit.

\textsuperscript{83} Hengel, \textit{Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity}, 84.
\textsuperscript{84} Stuhlmacher, \textit{Das paulinische Evangelium}, 84; Bornkamm, \textit{Paul}, 27; Betz, \textit{Galatians}, 74; Bruce, \textit{Galatians}, 96; Lyons, \textit{Pauline Autobiography}, 159. Scholars are of diverse opinion concerning Paul's presence in Arabia (i) Paul withdrew into the wilderness for the purpose of contemplative preparation for his subsequent work (Burton, \textit{Galatians}, 55–57; Gerhardsson, \textit{Memory and Manuscript}, 289. (ii) Paul intended eremitic life in Arabia as a means to maintain ritual purity in anticipation of the eschaton for or some other purpose. Taylor, \textit{Paul, Antioch and Jerusalem}, 69.
\textsuperscript{86} Gerhardsson, \textit{Memory and Manuscript}, 289; Dunn, \textit{Baptism in the Holy Spirit}, 76.
\textsuperscript{87} See J.A. Fitzmyer, 'A Life of Paul', \textit{NJBC}, 215-22.
\textsuperscript{89} Watson, \textit{Paul, Judaism and Gentiles}, 29-30.
Further, in Gal. 1.21 Paul refers to his ministry in the regions of Syria and Cilicia; again, we do not know exactly what happened.

According to Acts 11.25–26 it was on Barnabas's initiative that Paul left Tarsus to begin to associate himself with the church at Antioch (Acts 13–14), where the mission to the Gentiles had already begun. It is highly probable that Acts 13.4 represents the commencement of Paul's apostolic ministry, as the delegate of the Christian community in Antioch, accompanying Barnabas on the outreach of that community. Paul undoubtedly perceived his role to the Gentiles in Antioch as one which demonstrated that their salvation signalled the actualisation of those Old Testament prophecies looking forward to the outpouring of the Spirit on Israel, leading to its restoration, and thence to the conversion of the nations.

Horn has rightly pointed out that Pauline theology of the Spirit is rooted primarily in the Hellenistic communities of Antioch (Gal. 1.21; Acts 11.19–20; 13.1). What is therefore probable is that it is the Hellenists' understanding of the Spirit, particularly in relation to the Gentiles, exerted a marked influence on Paul's thought. As a result of his experience at Antioch and by the time Paul began his mission to the Gentiles it is possible that he anticipated that the Spirit would be poured out upon Gentiles.

---

91 Although in Rom. 15.19 Paul refers to him being 'preaching the gospel of Christ from Jerusalem as far around as Illyricum', it do not disprove our suggestion that in the initial years of Paul's mission was limited to the Jews.
92 Hengel and Schwemer (Paul 91-105) argue that Paul's and that of the Hellenist Christians' theology, including his law-free gospel as early as the mission in Damascus. However such a position cannot be maintained in the light of lack evidences.
94 Scott (Paul and the Nations) argues that in doing so, Paul saw his mission to the Gentiles as encompassing the territory assigned to Japeth in the Table of the Nations.
95 Horn, *Das Angeld*, 154.
96 For example, it is clearly evident in the Pauline letters, especially when Paul informs the Corinthian Christians that they are indeed God's temple: "Do you not know that you (plural) are God's temple, and God's Spirit lives in you?" (1 Cor. 3:16; cf. 6:19). This saying establishes that worship is not facilitated by a holy site, building or objects, but by the presence of God's Spirit. "For it is we who are the circumcision, we who worship by the Spirit of God, who glory in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:3). The place of worship is the human heart, cleansed, renewed and accompanied by the Spirit, or the Christian community as the Spirit's temple (1 Cor. 3:16). Further, this imagery of the Temple cult spills over even into his description of his call to the Gentiles. As noted in our earlier discussion, Paul's refers to his call to serve God as a priest, striving to bring an offering (προσφορά) of the Gentiles that might be acceptable, sanctified (ευνοοδεικτος) by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15.16; Phil. 2.17; 4.18; cf. Rom. 12.1; 16.5; 1 Cor. 16.15). More importantly this will now sit well with the proclamation in Isa. 66.19–20 of God's glory among the "nations... that have not heard of my fame" as the condition for the Diaspora Jews being "brought as an offering ... to the holy mountain Jerusalem" (Isa. 66.20). Such and understanding might have come from Hellenist Christian circles.
It is here that we need to place Paul’s initial thoughts on the Spirit and its relation to the Gentiles - the conceptual framework in which Paul began to believe that Gentiles are part of the eschatological gathering now evidently filled with the Spirit.

7.5 Conclusion

We began our discussion with the Jerusalem council as the point by which the early church had come to the conclusion that God had given the Spirit to the Gentiles, and that they are therefore part of the eschatological community, as Gentiles.

It was the manifest outpouring of the Spirit of God upon Gentiles as Gentiles that played the decisive role in convincing the first leaders of the early church that the Gospel is now available for all, including the Gentiles, apart from the law.

Paul was not the first to see the Spirit coming upon the Gentiles. However, such a conclusion had to be traced to the Hellenistic communities whose theological convictions indicated that the church was the eschatological Temple, with the Spirit of God as the manifest presence of God. Their persecution, which resulted from that belief, led to the Diaspora where in Antioch they became involved in Gentile mission. It was probably in Antioch that the Hellenists first found the manifest outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles. It is only later when Paul joined the church in Antioch that he recognised the coming of the Spirit on the Gentiles.

To the question, “Did Paul anticipate the Spirit when he went out to the Gentiles?” our answer is, “Yes.” When he began his mission to the Gentiles he had already come to believe that God had poured out his Spirit upon them in the light of the prophetic promises. However, this recognition did not happen at Damascus, but came later on, in his involvement with the Hellenistic communities of the Diaspora. Thus for Paul, the origin of his initial thoughts on the Spirit lies in a dawning recognition that is rooted primarily in his Damascus experience and commission, and secondarily in his involvement with the church in Antioch.
Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

We set out to inquire into Paul's initial thoughts on the Holy Spirit. Our hypothesis was that Paul's conviction that God had endowed the Spirit upon the Gentiles apart from Torah observance is rooted primarily in his Damascus experience and secondarily to his time prior to the Jerusalem council.

The Hebrew thought

Our task was to place Paul's thoughts in the context of the range of expectations of the Spirit upon people that were present in both Hebrew scripture and in the wider Jewish literature. The majority of texts indicated that such a concept is rare, and that it is usually only the covenant community to which the promise is seen to be given. However, it is argued that at least two texts anticipated Gentiles would become part of YHWH's covenant community when YHWH pours out the Spirit as part of the restoration of Israel.

The Second Temple Judaism

The various interpretative traditions of Second Temple Judaism anticipated the bestowal of the Spirit in the age to come. This study has demonstrated that one strand was prominent in a number of documents, where the writers expected the Spirit upon their community in the future so that the Spirit would purify them and bring them in obedience to God's statutes. However, some Qumran literature indicates that God has already poured the Spirit of purification upon the community. It is also pointed out that the apologetic stream of post-biblical Judaism tends to maintain a broader interpretation on the availability of the Spirit.

Pre-Christian Paul

In coming to pre-Christian Paul particularly evolving from his own self-perception as a Pharisee and persecutor of the church we found a good deal of continuity between his thought patterns about the Spirit and those of Second Temple Judaism. Paul might have been familiar with the common understanding of the Spirit as enabling prophecy and wisdom and of the Spirit's relationship with creation. What was particularly close to his thought was the Spirit's relationship with Law, and its role in the maintenance of the covenant community, especially as to its availability to those who study and practice Torah, to those who maintain purity and
obedience, and also to those who by showing fidelity to Torah will be rewarded with resurrection. These strands fit well with Paul’s own self-description as the one who was ζητάω for the Law and the ancestral traditions. It is probable that the pneumatic ideals of Stephen’s group challenged Paul’s pre-Christian anticipation of the Spirit, particularly in his role as a Torah interpreter, which possibly led him to be involved in the persecution of the church.

Paul’s Conviction

Paul’s Damascus experience was an experience of the Spirit. For Paul the significant aspect of his conversion experience was the revelation of the ‘glory of God’, which he experienced through the Spirit.

The Damascus experience prompted Paul to move beyond his narrowly defined perception of the Spirit. His pre-Christian belief that divine enlightenment, by the Spirit of God was necessary for the study of Torah, and that someone who was filled with the Spirit could adequately interpret the words of Holy Scripture becomes insignificant in the light of his new understanding of the Spirit. His perception changed from one in which the Spirit functioned as bringing revelation from within the Torah, to an understanding that the Spirit brings revelation from outside the Torah.

His experience of the ‘glory of God’ on the Damascus road provided him with the conviction that there was now a new relationship with God which now requires only the entrance into life within the sphere of the Spirit. Paul might have understood this in relation to the nature of the newly constituted covenant community.

His call to the Gentiles is rooted in his Damascus experience. Paul’s language of mission and particularly prophetic/Isaianic servant of YHWH elements, strengthen the point that he understood his calling as endowment with the Spirit for the mission to the Gentiles. Further the emphasis on ἀφορίζω and χάρις in his autobiographical passages (Gal 1.15-16a) indicates not only his acquaintance with biblical language, but provides him with a conviction that he is anointed with the Spirit to preach the gospel to the Gentiles.

However we also placed Paul’s Damascus experience in the context of the early church. It is clear that he was influenced by the Hellenists, whose theological beliefs included the notion of the church as the eschatological Temple with the Spirit of God as the manifest presence of God. The persecution which led to their dispersion
in the Diaspora resulted in their mission to the Gentiles, where they saw the activity of the Spirit, both in their proclamation of the Gospel as well as in the outpouring of the Spirit on Gentiles. That they could accommodate the non-proselyte Gentile into the Christian community was resulted in the conventional expectation of the pilgrimage of the nations rooted in the Old Testament. Paul, who was part of the mission enterprise of the Antiochene church believed along with other Antiochene Christians that God has accepted the Gentiles apart from law.

Thus we can conclude by saying that when Paul began his Gentile mission he anticipated the Spirit coming upon Gentiles apart from Law. However, this recognition did not happen at Damascus but later in his involvement with the Hellenistic communities in the Diaspora. The origin of Paul’s initial thoughts on the Spirit is a dawning recognition that is rooted in his Damascus experience and commission and secondarily in his involvement with the church in Antioch.
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