

## JESUS AND THE SPIRIT IN LUCAN PERSPECTIVE

By M. Max B. Turner

### I INTRODUCTION

In several quite diverse theological circles it has become fashionable to describe Jesus' relationship to the Spirit - at least during the period of the ministry - as archetypal of Christian relationship to the Spirit. Writers of such differing theological persuasions as L. S. Thornton,<sup>1</sup> J. D. G. Dunn,<sup>2</sup> T. S. Smail<sup>3</sup> and G. W. H. Lampe<sup>4</sup> have, in contrasting ways, attempted to build bridges between Jesus' experience of the Spirit and that of Christians today. Each has pointed to the writer of Luke-Acts as a NT author who may perhaps be said to set the disciples' experience of the Spirit in parallel to that of Jesus. The inference drawn is that Luke invites his readers to understand Jesus' relationship to the Spirit as paradigmatic. Thus far the writers agree, though they differ sharply on what

---

\* Delivered in January 1978, and subsequently revised.

1. *Confirmation: Its Place in the Baptismal Mystery* (Westminster: Dacre, 1950).
2. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970); 'Spirit and Kingdom', *ExpT* 82 (1970/71) 36-40; *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1975); and elsewhere.
3. *Reflected Glory: The Spirit in Christ and Christians* (London: Hodder, 1975).
4. See especially *God as Spirit* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), and also, *inter alia*, 'The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Saint Luke' in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford: Blackwell, 1957) 159-200, and 'The Holy Spirit and the Person of Christ' in *Christ, Faith and History* (ed. S. W. Sykes and J. P. Clayton, Cambridge: CUP, 1972) 111-130.

they consider Luke's alleged parallels to teach. For Thornton, Jesus' dual relationship to the Spirit - through conception and the Jordan event - prefigures Christian baptismal regeneration and subsequent confirmation. For Smail Jesus' conception by the Spirit and subsequent baptismal anointing anticipate rather Christian birth by the Spirit and empowering respectively (though he does not think the latter two need be separate events). Lampe interprets the parallel in terms of the Spirit of sonship and obedience given both to Jesus and to Christian disciples in their respective baptisms - though he is sometimes doubtful whether Luke thought this way. Dunn explores a not entirely dissimilar position to Lampe's, but opposes his sacramental emphasis.

The thesis that Jesus' baptismal reception of the Spirit, in Luke, is paradigmatic of subsequent Christian experience in Acts, was first explored in detail by Hans von Baer in his masterly monograph, written in 1926.<sup>5</sup> It is in Baer's work, and particularly in Dunn's development of it, that we can best see the significance of the questions involved when we speak of Jesus' relationship to the Spirit as archetypal.

*The Contributions of Hans von Baer and James D. G. Dunn*

Baer's dissertation was essentially an answer both to the influential little monograph by H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus* (1888),<sup>6</sup> and to the then very recent and

5. *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926). For a more nuanced discussion of Baer than space allows here see my unpublished Cambridge dissertation *Luke and the Spirit: Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts* (PhD 1980 - henceforth referred to as *Luke*) 10-15. For a historical survey of the understanding of the Spirit in Luke-Acts see F. Bovon, *Luc le Théologien* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1978) 210-254, or, specifically on the question of what receiving the Spirit means, Turner, *Luke*, 1-40.
6. *ET The Influence of the Holy Spirit* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979). For further detail see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 1-5.

erudite volume by H. Leisegang, *Pneuma Hagion: Der Ursprung des Geistesbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik* (1922).<sup>7</sup>

Leisegang contended that most of the Spirit material in Luke-Acts was heavily penetrated with a wide variety of Hellenistic motifs, was late, and was derived from Greek mysticism.<sup>8</sup> Gunkel had questioned whether the Spirit as portrayed in the Gospel and Acts had anything to do with the ordinary religious and moral life of the Christian; was it not rather a purely charismatic power?<sup>9</sup> Against Leisegang, Baer sought to show that the Spirit material in Luke-Acts was early and Jewish in character; not only were the individual Spirit-motifs scattered throughout Luke-Acts derived from a Jewish background, but, further, even the Lucan theological bridge connecting the Spirit on Jesus with the Spirit on the disciples was also erected of intrinsically Jewish materials, not Hellenistic ones.

To accomplish this task, Baer took over and developed an observation made by E. Meyer, namely, that Luke had a special concern for salvation history.<sup>10</sup> Baer set out to show that Luke depicts the Spirit, first and foremost, as the driving force of this redemptive history. Here was a uniting theme of indubitably Jewish extraction. Thus, according to Baer, Luke envisaged three quite distinct epochs each with its own appropriate activity

7. Cf. my Luke (as at n. 5) 5-7.

8. For detailed criticism of Leisegang's view see Baer (as at n. 5) Part II; G. Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (London: Marshall, 1930) esp. 363-379; G. Verbeke, *L'Évolution de la Doctrine du Pneuma du Stoïcisme à Saint Augustin* (Paris: Brouwer, 1945) 260-287; C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1966<sup>2</sup>) 10-14, 36ff, 124ff, etc.; Turner, *Luke*, as at n. 7.

9. For a modern restatement of Gunkel's position see G. Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit: Force de l'Église* (Paris: Cerf, 1975) *passim*.

10. Baer (as at n. 5) 43.

of the Spirit. In the first of these Luke (following sources) depicts a number of figures, including John the Baptist, as representatives of the epoch of Israel, endowed with the Spirit of prophecy, preparing for the advent and revelation of the Messiah. With the virginal conception, and baptism of Jesus by the Spirit, we have the dawn of a new epoch 'in der der Geist Gottes als Wesen des Gottessohnes in dieser Welt erscheint'.<sup>11</sup> The theme of the Gospel is to display this Spirit working in the Son (empowering the preaching of good news, throwing back the powers of darkness, and inaugurating the kingdom);<sup>12</sup> while in Acts the victorious march of the 'Pentecostal' Spirit to Rome is described - the Spirit is now given to the church to carry on the decisive mission initiated by Jesus until his parousia.

As Baer was deliberately drawing out the unity between Jesus' experience and that of the disciples - both receive the Spirit as the driving force of the Christian proclamation - it is not altogether surprising that he tended, with some qualifications,<sup>13</sup> to portray Jesus (in relationship to the Spirit) as the first Christian in an epoch before others could become Christians. Thus, according to Baer, Jesus' baptism is the first fulfilment of the Baptist's promised Spirit-baptism (Luke 3:16); the dove of the new covenant comes upon him at the waters of Jordan and thereby transforms John's baptism into Christian baptism.<sup>14</sup> When Acts 16:7 refers to 'the Spirit of Jesus', Luke means precisely the Spirit in the character with which he came upon Jesus of Nazareth at his baptism and was subsequently manifest through him.<sup>15</sup>

---

11. *Ibid.* 48.

12. *Ibid.* 69-73, and, on Lk. 11:20, 132-136.

13. *Ibid.* esp. 111; cf. 4, 45, 103.

14. *Ibid.* 65ff, 156-167. Whence e.g. the comments by G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1967<sup>2</sup>) 33.

15. Baer (as at n. 5) 42, 170ff. Lampe takes up and develops this strand in Baer's thought: e.g., *Studies in the Gospels* (as at n. 4) 193ff.

At the heart of all that Baer says, however, lies a fundamental ambiguity: what *is* the character of the gift of the Spirit which Jesus receives? On the one hand Baer can insist that as Luke portrays Jesus as the divine Son through conception by the Spirit, Luke therefore cannot think of Jesus growing in the Spirit like John (cf. Lk. 1:80), and he must have understood Jesus' Jordan experience purely as a messianic empowering to preach good news.<sup>16</sup> This provides the vital parallel between Jesus and his disciples who, with Pentecost, also receive the gift of the Spirit as an empowering to preach.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, all that Baer has to say (against Gunkel) about the Spirit 'als Wesen des Gottessohnes' is in tension with such a view,<sup>18</sup> as is his emphasis on the inextricable connection between Christian baptism and receiving the gift of the Spirit (should we expect the Spirit *qua* missionary empowering to be received by all baptizands?).

Baer seems to be working (probably unconsciously) with at least two quite distinct concepts of what Spirit reception is all about. Sometimes he means that the Spirit is experienced as the 'life' of eschatological sonship (i.e. the Spirit enables a man to become and to be a son of God), at other times he means that one who is (already) a son of God receives an empowering to preach. For all the light that Baer throws on Lucan pneumatology it remains unclear whether he thinks Jesus (at Jordan) and his disciples (at Pentecost) received the Spirit primarily as empowering for mission, or whether he associates reception of the Spirit with Christian existence at a more fundamental level.

In his work *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*,<sup>19</sup> J. D. G. Dunn attempts to press beyond Baer and to specify more precisely the significance of Jesus' endowment. Dunn's research led him to the conclusion that Luke understood

---

16. Baer (as at n. 5) 41, 61-65.

17. *Ibid.* 61ff, 164ff.

18. *Ibid.* esp. 16ff, 95-98, 184ff.

19. Dunn (*Baptism in the Holy Spirit*, as at n. 2) esp. 23-37.

the descent of the Spirit at Jordan as *both* Jesus' own entry into the new age and covenant and his anointing with the Spirit as Messiah, Servant and representative of his people;<sup>20</sup> and thus he felt obliged to oppose Pentecostalist exegesis which tends to understand Jesus' experience merely as an empowering to effect messianic redemption.

Dunn's distinctive contribution lies both in his assertion that Jesus himself is not related to the new age until the Spirit descends upon him<sup>21</sup> - Jesus' supernatural birth belongs entirely to the epoch of Israel<sup>22</sup> - and in his claim that, at Jordan, Jesus *began* to experience what was virtually archetypal Christian existence.<sup>23</sup> Jesus' 'empowering for service' is not to be understood as the primary purpose of his anointing; it is only a corollary of it.<sup>24</sup> Rather the ministry is to be regarded as a necessary period in which Jesus is baptized with 'Spirit-and-fire'; the 'fire' of which he must quench with his own death before he may then baptize the community with the 'Spirit' (alone). Only with the third epoch can the disciples enter the new age;<sup>25</sup> until Pentecost only Jesus had tasted the life (and sonship) of the new aeon; only in *him* was the kingdom present.<sup>26</sup> At Jordan we see 'the beginning, albeit in a restricted sense, of the end-time';<sup>27</sup> as such this first baptism in the Spirit could well be taken as typical of all later Spirit-baptisms - the means by which God brings each to follow in Jesus' footsteps.<sup>28</sup>

Later sections of Dunn's thesis are devoted to an attempt to show that all the occasions of receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts are concerned with conversion-initiation into the new age.<sup>29</sup> The picture which

---

20. *Ibid.* 41 and 23-37

21. *Ibid.* 41.

22. *Ibid.* 31.

23. *Ibid.* 32ff; 41f.

24. *Ibid.* 32.

25. *Ibid.* 38-54.

26. *Ibid.* 26, and *Expt* 82 (1970/71) 39f.

27. *Ibid.* 24.

28. *Ibid.* 32.

29. *Ibid.* 38-54 (on the Pentecostal event); 55-72 (on the Samaria incident); 79-82 (on Cornelius' conversion); 83-89 (on the 'disciples' at Ephesus); 90-102 (drawing the threads together).

emerges is remarkably sharp: 'baptism in Spirit' and 'receiving the (gift of) the Spirit' are understood by Dunn almost to have been technical terms, in earliest Christianity, designating that work of the Spirit in and through which a man begins to experience the new age, the kingdom of God, the new covenant, sonship, resurrection 'life', and so on.<sup>30</sup> In other words, Dunn's research leads him to believe that the gift of the Spirit was almost universally understood as the gift of the matrix of Christian life. This is how Jesus' experience of the Spirit before Pentecost is to be understood, no less than that of his disciples after it. It is precisely, then, the Spirit on Jesus that is transferred to the disciples.<sup>31</sup> We can hardly be surprised, when we turn to a more recent publication by Dunn,<sup>32</sup> to find him answering Gunkel's question ('what has the Spirit to do with the ordinary religious life of the community?') - not to mention the older and more general question: 'what has the religion of Paul to do with the religion of Jesus?' - by affirming that it is Jesus' experience of the eschatological Spirit that is the bridge between Jesus' religion and Paul's.<sup>33</sup> To describe Jesus' experience of the Spirit as archetypal clearly has considerable implications for Lucan soteriology and christology.

---

30. *Ibid.* 95 and *passim*; also *ExpT* 81 (1969/70) 349-351.

31. Here Baer's theory of epochs becomes essential to Dunn's concept of the meaning of the gift of the Spirit.

32. *Jesus and the Spirit* (as at n. 2).

33. *Ibid.* part 1 and 357ff. It should be noted that Dunn seems increasingly hesitant about his appeal to Luke for such a picture: it is Paul, rather than the gospels, who presents Jesus' life of sonship in the eschatological Spirit as archetypal: Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980) 138ff. This last work was published too recently to receive full attention in this paper.

*The Purpose of this Paper*

In this paper I wish to question whether the writer of Luke-Acts regards Jesus' relationship to the Spirit as paradigmatic in anything approaching the manner outlined above. Does Luke regard Jesus' experience as archetypal of Christian life in the Spirit, or does he view the gift of the Spirit to Jesus at Jordan as fundamentally different from that poured out on the disciples at Pentecost? To be sure, we have to do with God's Holy Spirit on both occasions; but this does not settle the question, for receiving the Spirit can mean different things in differing circumstances or contexts. To say that a man receives the Spirit (or that the Spirit 'comes upon' him) at a particular point is to use metaphorical language that is more ambiguous than it sounds. After all, we do not, I presume, mean that at the moment Jesus was baptized (or at Pentecost) the Spirit came *where* he had not been before; but rather that the Spirit began, on the occasion in question, to *do* things he had not done before in and through the lives of the respective people.<sup>34</sup> To talk of an individual receiving the Spirit (or of the Spirit coming upon him, etc.) is simply to say that at that particular point in time the Spirit began some new activity (or coherent nexus of activities) in and through him.<sup>35</sup> The way is thus open to biblical writers to speak of a man receiving the Spirit on several occasions - either because the activity of the Spirit inaugurated once is then renewed at a subsequent date, or because some new nexus of activities of the Spirit in a person is added to the work God's Spirit is already doing (or has done) in and through him. An example of the latter type is ready to hand in Luke-Acts, for Jesus is described as receiving the Spirit at least twice: once at Jordan (Lk. 3:21f) and once at Pentecost (Acts

---

34. See Lampe, *God as Spirit* (as at n. 4) *passim* for the emphasis on spatial language as functional metaphor.

35. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 35-40; M. M. B. Turner, 'The Concept of Receiving the Spirit in John's Gospel', *VoxEv* 10 (1977) 24ff.



2:33).<sup>36</sup> As these 'receivings' of the Spirit themselves correspond to two quite different spheres of activity of God's πνεῦμα, we have no reason to assume that either of them necessarily matches in content what Luke means when he says that *disciples* receive the gift of the Spirit. Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα λαμβάνειν is not a technical term; so we can only meaningfully say the disciples received the *same* gift of the Spirit as Jesus did - and that Jesus' experience was archetypal - if we can be certain Luke understood the nexus of activities of the Spirit inaugurated by the Jordan-event to be essentially the same as that commenced in the disciples at Pentecost. Our task in what follows is to probe this question. We begin by asking what Luke considers to be the significance of Jesus' reception of the Spirit at the Jordan event.

## II LUKE'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS' RECEPTION OF THE SPIRIT IN THE JORDAN EVENT

### (a) Luke 3:21f

Least decisive for an understanding of Luke's view of the *significance* of the 'descent' of the Spirit on Jesus is the baptismal pericope itself.<sup>37</sup> In 3:21f, Luke follows his sources (Mark and Q?<sup>38</sup>) very closely, and what changes he introduces have little theological bearing on the question at hand.<sup>39</sup> We may be relatively

---

36. *Vide infra*; for other examples see *VoxEv* 10 (1977) 24-43.

37. For a tradition-history of the pericope see especially F. Lentzen-Deis, *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern* (Frankfurt am Main: Knecht, 1970); also my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 42-57.

38. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1927) 188, 205; Turner, *Luke* (as at n. 5) 40f, 42f.

39. The allegation that Luke has separated Jesus' baptism from his receiving of the Spirit (see the commentaries by A. Plummer (98) and J. M. Creed (57)) seems to rest on a misunderstanding of the nature of the aorist tense (see my *Luke*, as at n. 5, 211 n. 77). The view that he has altered the content of the heavenly voice, assimilating it more closely to Ps. 2:7, rests on the acceptance of an unlikely textual reading. The western reading has had notable defenders (see J. D. G. Dunn, as at n.

confident that Luke did not believe the Spirit actually to have been restricted to heaven before Jesus' baptism, and on that occasion to have descended thence physically. In the first instance Luke thinks the Spirit is already active on earth (e.g. in John the Baptist; cf. Lk. 1:15; 7:26); secondly the words ἀνεψχηθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν represent a standard formula introducing visionary encounters, as the author of Acts is well aware (cf. 7:56; 10:11).<sup>40</sup> A bodily descent of the Spirit to Jesus is no more in view at Luke 3:22 than is a literal descent of a sheet full of animals to Peter at Acts 10:11; the 'descent' of the Spirit as a dove, and the heavenly voice, are thus to be taken as mutually interpretative elements in a private visionary experience.<sup>41</sup>

More than this can only be read out of the pericope by first being read into it. It is possible that Luke identified in the heavenly voice allusions to both Psalm 2:7 and Isaiah 42:1; the former he could hardly have missed as he quotes it at Acts 13:33; the latter he may have spotted because he has assimilated Deuteronomy 18:15 to Isaiah 42:1 in his redaction of Mark 9:7 (Lk. 9:35), and because both Isaiah 42:1f and Luke 3:22 concern people upon whom God has set his Spirit. If we

---

32, II 73; to whose list add A. Harnack and Th. Zahn), and has received its fullest defence recently by M. Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969) 192-5. But, against, see H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1967) I 193f; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 155; Turner, *Luke* (as at n. 5) 212 n. 79.

40. Contra R. Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963) 248, and W. Michaelis, *TDNT* 5, 353; see F. Lentzen-Deis (as at n. 37) 105ff, and my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 212 n. 78.
41. Cf. F. Lentzen-Deis (as at n. 37) chs. 5 and 6.

could be sure Luke did make these identifications then we might surmise that he thought the vision was given to inform the messianic Son<sup>42</sup> that from that point on the Spirit would be with him as the power by which he would exercise the role of the messianic Herald/Servant of Isaiah 42:1ff<sup>43</sup> - and the dove symbolism could certainly be interpreted in a way that supports this.<sup>44</sup> But our problem is that Luke is not writing a commentary on his sources; he does not tell us how he understood them, and there are too few redactional clues within the pericope itself from which to deduce Luke's understanding of this episode. We must look elsewhere in Luke-Acts to discover Luke's interpretation of the incident. Even that this visionary encounter decisively inaugurated Jesus' messianic role can only be inferred from the context in which the pericope is placed.

- 
42. That the allusion to Ps. 2:7 has this import seems probable: see M. A. Chevallier, *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-Judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: PUF, 1958) and cf. R. N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity* (London: SCM, 1970) 95; E. Lohse, *TDNT* 8, 360-362; M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (London: SCM, 1976) 44. Against those who deny that a reference to Ps. 2:7 is intended see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 200 n. 13, 201 nn. 14 and 15, 202 n. 17.
43. At the time of Jesus, Is. 42:1ff was never read in a non-messianic way (so J. Jeremias, *TDNT* 5, 686ff). In view of the close associations between Is. 42:1ff and Is. 61:1f (on which see R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* (Freiburg: Herder, 1976) 91f) the term 'herald' was not inappropriate; cf. R. W. Fisher, 'The Herald of Good News in Second Isaiah' in *Rhetorical Criticism* (ed. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1974) 117-131.
44. For the view that the dove symbolizes a messenger of good tidings see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 46, 203f nn. 21 and 22, 206 nn. 32 and 33.

## (b) Luke 4:16-21

That the scene at Nazareth is of programmatic import for Luke-Acts is hardly to be doubted;<sup>45</sup> Luke has gone against his understanding of the chronology of Jesus' ministry (cf. 4:23) in order to make *this* scene the first in his account of Jesus' public life and teaching, and elsewhere he takes up and develops its major themes.

At the heart of the passage stands a quotation from Isaiah 61:1f which ostensibly defines the purpose of Jesus' Spirit-anointing. When we take full cognizance of this, and when we further note that Luke has used two carefully constructed redactional notices in 4:1 and 14 to bind the Nazareth-pericope with the account of Jesus' baptism,<sup>46</sup> then we can be virtually certain that Luke intends us to interpret Jesus' baptismal experience in the light of what Jesus is reported to have said in 4:18-21.<sup>47</sup>

- 
45. As all from Baer (as at n. 5, 63) to the most recent writers agree: cf. H. J. B. Combrink, *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973) 39; L. T. Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977) 91f; I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39) 177f; G. Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Gütersloh, 1977) 107; M. Dömer, *Das Heil Gottes* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1978) 49ff, 61f.
46. So my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 79-85. The connexion did not simply derive from a pre-Lucan 'Bericht vom Anfang' as H. Schürmann suggests; *per contra* see G. N. Stanton in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley, Cambridge: CUP, 1973) 33f; J. Delobel in *L'Évangile de Luc* (ed. F. Neirynck, Gembloux: Duculot, 1973) 203-223, and my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 215 n. 100.
47. With *inter multos alios* M. Dömer (as at n. 45) 61ff. Introductory questions are dealt with in my *Luke* (as at n. 5), 57-61, 67ff. B. Chilton, *God in Strength* (Freistadt, 1979), unfortunately was not available to me in time to be used.

To be more precise, the OT quotation is composite:<sup>48</sup> it is substantially the LXX of Isaiah 61:1f - omitting the words ἰσάσθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ from 61:1(d) and καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως κτλ from 61:2 - but the citation has also been enriched by the addition from Isaiah 58:6 of the clause ἀποστεῦλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει just before the closing words καλέσαι (Lk. κηρύξαι) ἐνλαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν.

There have been several notable attempts to explain the modifications introduced to the Isaiah 61 passage,<sup>49</sup> but only two directly affect our question of the significance of Jesus' reception of the Spirit. Building on the work of E. Schweizer,<sup>50</sup> M. Rese<sup>51</sup> and G. Haya-Prats<sup>52</sup> suggest that it is Luke who is responsible for the changes noted, and he effects them because he views the gift of the Spirit to Jesus (and to his disciples) as the Jewish Spirit of prophecy; that is (following Schweizer) the power to preach, not to heal. So we are told by Schweizer, 'Luke adopts the typically Jewish idea that the Spirit is the Spirit of prophecy'<sup>53</sup> and 'this prevents him from directly attributing to the πνεῦμα both the χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων on the one side and strongly ethical effects...on the other'.<sup>54</sup> Again, 'though the miracles are important for

---

48. A more detailed discussion of the text of Lk. 4.18f is provided in my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 58f, as well as in the works cited below. Is. 61:1(d) is included by Koine 0 pm Ir (and accepted by Schürmann, as at n. 39, 226, 229 n. 5) but, against, see the arguments of I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39, *ad loc.*) and L. C. Crockett, *The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke* (unpublished PhD, Brown University, 1966) 279.

49. Cf. L. C. Crockett (as at n. 48), whose monograph is devoted almost entirely to this passage; T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (Berlin: Akademie, 1968) 39-41; M. Rese (as at n. 39) 143-154; B. Chilton (as at n. 47) 159-170.

50. Schweizer, *TDNT* 6, 404-415; *idem*, *Int* 6 (1952) 259-278.

51. Rese (as at n. 39) 143ff.

52. Haya-Prats (as at n. 9) 40, 172f. 53. *TDNT* 6, 407.

54. *TWNT* 6, 407; *TDNT* 6, 409 actually attributes to Schweizer the opposite view by mistranslation.

Luke, they are never ascribed to the Spirit....Though Luke can use δύναμις or πνεῦμα almost as synonyms, the distinction between them is clear at this point': Luke's debt to the Jewish concept of the Spirit of prophecy 'may be seen in Lk. 4:23-27, where the miraculous signs mentioned in the quotation in v. 18 are specifically rejected as manifestations of the Spirit and only authoritative preaching is regarded as a fulfilment of the prophecy'.<sup>55</sup> This hypothesis is then supposed to explain why Luke omitted Isaiah 61:1d; in its place he introduced the clause from Isaiah 58:6 because it contains the words ἐν ἀφέσει by which Luke would understand ἀφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν.<sup>56</sup>

But the whole theory is a tissue of implausibilities, and certainly does not account for the omission from Isaiah 61 which it was invoked to explain: had Luke thought of the Spirit as the power of preaching there would have been no reason for him to delete Isaiah 61:1d - those whose complaint it is that they are συντετριμμένοι τῇ καρδίᾳ need precisely the balm of healing words that such a charisma might inspire. More fundamentally, we need to point out that in the OT, in intertestamental Judaism and in rabbinic Judaism, the Spirit of prophecy is the organ of revelation to an individual, hardly ever (if at all) the power of preaching.<sup>57</sup> The charisma concerned is active in revealing data to the 'prophet', not in the speech act which reports such revelation or applies it to the

---

55. Both quotations from TDNT 6, 407.

56. M. Rese (as at n. 39) 145. This suggestion proves unlikely on closer analysis as (a) the context of Is. 58:6 could hardly suggest such an interpretation and (b) Luke does not elsewhere depict sin as an oppressive burden (cf. τεθραυγμένους); he tends rather to portray illness in this way (Lk. 13:16; Acts 10:38f).

57. In the OT the Spirit of prophecy is best described as 'the supernatural power that evoked the revelatory state of mind' (so J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963) 177). On the meaning of the term in rabbinic Judaism see especially P. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom Heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (Munich: Kösel, 1972). Apocalyptic Judaism and Qumran do not use the terminology 'Spirit of prophecy' but where the

audience.<sup>58</sup> Finally, Schweizer's case that in Luke the Spirit has nothing to do with miracles is quite inadmissible for three reasons. (a) At 7:21f Luke specifically identifies the πτωχοί who hear good news with the possessed, the blind, the lame and the lepers who are healed by Jesus (7:21; redactional) - the good news that is preached to them, in context, is nothing less than the effective proclamation to them of the word of their release from Satan's oppression (cf. Lk. 11:20ff; 13:16; Acts 10:38). Yet it is precisely for this πτωχοῖς εὐαγγελίσασθαι that Jesus is anointed with the Spirit; pace Rese, it is not merely metaphorical 'eyes' that Jesus believes himself given by the Spirit to open (Lk. 4:18; cf. 7:21).<sup>59</sup> (b) The hendiadys ἔχρισεν...πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει at Acts 10:38 identifies the source of Jesus' healing power as his anointing with the Spirit. Recognizing this, Schweizer is forced to say Luke is using a traditional formula here,<sup>60</sup> but there are too many redactional features in this Petrine speech for us to believe that Luke is

---

concept of prophetic inspiration is involved there is no suggestion of charismatic speech, but rather of revelation to the individual (see G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1975) part 1, chs. 3 and 4; also T. M. Crone, *Early Christian Prophecy* (Baltimore: Saint Mary's, 1973) 75ff). For further detail, and on Philo's more complex position, see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 219-223.

58. Not even Mic. 3:8; Mart. Isa. 5:14 or CD 2:12 provides an exception to this (see my *Luke*, as at n. 5, 220-221 nn. 142, 145, 146 respectively). Philo thinks of πνεῦμα as inspiring the very act of speaking (*Quis Rerum*, 264ff; *De Specialibus Legibus* 1, 65) but only when he moves away from traditional Jewish ideas towards Greek prophetism as outlined by Plato (*Phaedrus* 244f; *Ion* 533f); thus Moses delivers such prophetic speeches in 'ecstasy', 'outside himself' - 'the natural mind is evicted at the arrival of the divine spirit...mortal and immortal may not share the same home', etc.

59. *Contra* Rese (as at n. 39) 151f.

60. *TDNT* 6, 407 n. 486; *Int* 6 (1952) 266 n. 6.

thoughtlessly following a source and thereby beguiled into setting down ideas antithetical to his own.<sup>61</sup> Indeed the use of πνεῦμα in a hendiadys is characteristically, if not distinctively, Lucan, and quite probably represents his own choice of wording.<sup>62</sup>

(c) The statement that Jesus returned from the wilderness ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος (Lk. 4:14) envisages the signs Jesus performed on the basis of which φήμη ἐξῆλθεν...περὶ αὐτοῦ (4:14b,23,37; cf. 5:15 etc.).

If the Schweizerstrasse proves to be a *cul de sac*, we may perhaps turn more profitably to the line of interpretation suggested in the works of A. Strobel,<sup>63</sup> U. Busse,<sup>64</sup> J. A. Sanders,<sup>65</sup> and R. B. Sloan.<sup>66</sup> The common factor in their differently nuanced positions lies in their view that the Nazareth-pericope reflects the language and ideas of messianic jubilee theology. Undoubtedly decisive impetus was given to this direction of study by the recent publication of the Qumran

---

61. *Vide infra* pp. 22ff.

62. There are only two NT instances of hendiadys involving πνεῦμα that are not in Luke (Jn. 4:23; 1 Cor. 2:4): Luke has seven such expressions (1:17; 3:16 (=Q); Acts 6:3,5; 10:38; 11:24; 13:52), four of which involve πληρῶν/πλήρης and are therefore redactional - see my *Luke* (as at n. 5), 233 n. 217.

63. A. Strobel, 'Die Ausrufung des Jubeljahres in der Nazarethpredigt Jesu: zur apokalyptischen Tradition Lk 4. 16-30' in *Jesus in Nazareth* (ed. W. Eltester, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972) 38-50.

64. U. Busse, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus* (Stuttgart: VKB, 1977).

65. J. A. Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4' in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults* (ed. J. Neusner, Leiden: Brill, 1975) Vol. 1, 75-106.

66. R. B. Sloan, *The Favourable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin: Schola, 1977). Cf. also O. Betz, *Int* 22 (1968) 136.



fragment 11Q Melchizedek,<sup>67</sup> which offers a peshet of Leviticus 25:10ff; Deuteronomy 15:2f; Psalm 82:1f and 7:8f, all telescoped within the organizing framework of Isaiah 61:1-2.<sup>68</sup>

According to the writer, 'Melchizedek'<sup>69</sup> will appear in the tenth jubilee (lines 7-9) to 'proclaim liberty' to those who are captives (lines 4-6),<sup>70</sup> to atone for their iniquities (lines 6(?) and 8) and to execute God's judgement on the hosts of Belial (lines 9,11-15,20). All this is described as 'the year of good favour for Melchizedek' (line 9), or as Zion's announced salvation (lines 15f,23f); the reign of her Elohim (cf. Is. 52:7).

The use of Isaiah 52:7 introduces the figure of a herald of good tidings (מַבְשֵׁר: lines 16ff) who, according to the reconstructed text of line 18, is anointed with the Spirit to bring good news.<sup>71</sup> Because this figure is described with the opening words of Isaiah 61:1 we might expect him to be none other than Melchizedek who, on this interpretation, would be anointed with the Spirit in order that he might effectively proclaim liberty to the afflicted captives of Belial.<sup>72</sup> In other words, the

67. See A. van der Woude, *OTS* 14 (1965) 354-373; M. de Jonge and A. van der Woude, *NTS* 12 (1965/6) 301-326, which slightly revises the *editio princeps*.

68. Cf. M. Miller, *JBL* 88 (1969) 467-469.

69. Or one who enjoys 'the heritage of Melchizedek': so J. A. Fitzmyer, *JBL* 86 (1967) 30ff.

70. I assume that the subject of the verbs in line 6 is Melchizedek (with Fitzmyer (as at n. 69) 34, against de Jonge and van der Woude (as at n. 67) 306).

71. See de Jonge and van der Woude (as at n. 67) 301, 306ff.

72. Fitzmyer (as at n. 69) 40, and Sanders (as at n. 65) 91, both take the text this way, recognizing that Is. 61:1-2 lies at the heart of the Melchizedek peshet. F. L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition* (Cambridge: CUP, 1976) 78, overlooks this powerful argument when he decides (we believe rightly) to the contrary.

Spirit would be conceived as an empowering to inaugurate the kingdom, to bring about the state in which 'מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהֵיךְ'. But there are good reasons to suppose that the מֶלֶךְ is not Melchizedek, but only his immediate forerunner, anointed with the Spirit of prophecy, and hence able to announce the details of a liberty for the captives that 'Melchizedek' would soon proclaim.<sup>73</sup>

11Q Melchizedek, then, witnesses to a use of Isaiah 61 in an eschatological context and in a way that focusses attention specifically on the notion of ἡμεῖς/ἄφεςις of the captives of Belial and the inauguration of a state of messianic well-being under the reign of God's vice-regent. The relevance of this for Luke 4:18-21, and for Luke-Acts in general, should be immediately apparent. It is of course wildly improbable that there was any direct dependence of the tradition in Luke 4:16-30 on that of 11Q Melchizedek, but this programmatic passage of Luke's gospel does appear to have certain points of contact with jubilee hopes: (1) The very choice of Isaiah 61, which itself echoes jubilee language, is significant. (2) The modifications to the Isaianic citation are readily explained as a heightening of the jubilee emphasis already present in the quotation; the elimination of Isaiah 61:1d makes room for the addition,<sup>74</sup> in parallel to the words κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτους ἄφεςιν, of the extract from Isaiah 58:6 which already had a history of sabbatical and jubilee interpretation.<sup>75</sup> The added words - ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει - draw attention to the theme of the release of the afflicted which is central in jubilee theology.<sup>76</sup>

(3) Beyond the Isaiah citation Strobel is able to find a

---

73. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 68f.

74. For a structural argument for the removal of Is. 61:1(d) see H. J. B. Combrink, *Neotestamentica* 7 (1973) 24ff, but compare also Sloan (as at n. 66) 91f.

75. For details see Sloan (as at n. 66) 39f and the literature cited by him.

76. So Sloan (as at n. 66) 39f and *passim*.

series of further minor contacts between Luke 4:16-30 and jubilee material.<sup>77</sup>

It would be hazardous, on the basis of this evidence, even to begin to speak of a *Lucan* jubilee theology - far more so to make this a *central* motif in Luke's soteriology, as R. B. Sloan does, for Luke nowhere uses the distinctively jubilee vocabulary (ἐνιαυτὸς ἀφέσεως σημασίας; Lev. 25:10ff), and nowhere else develops unambiguously jubilee concepts.<sup>78</sup> Nevertheless Strobel is probably right to suggest that for his programmatic speech of Jesus Luke chose to use a source derived from a community amongst whom jubilee hopes were important,<sup>79</sup> and, we should add, he did so because the structure of their thought chimed so closely with his own understanding of Jesus' ministry as one of effective proclamation of liberty to those afflicted by Satan (cf. 4:18f; 7:21f; 11:20ff; 13:16; Acts 10:38). It is the particular merit of Ulrich Busse's detailed study that he brings this last aspect to clear and full expression.<sup>80</sup>

77. Strobel (as at n. 66) 38-50.

78. *Contra* Sloan (as at n. 66) ch. 3 and *passim*, who fails to distinguish distinctively jubilee language from more general redemption language, and thus tends to press all uses of εὐαγγελίζομαι and ἄφεσις (and even contexts where forgiveness is merely implied: cf. 120) into the service of his thesis that Jesus' ministry is characterized as a jubilee year. Most of Luke's closest echoes to jubilarious thoughts outside Lk. 4:16ff derive from Q. Luke does not even have a positive sabbath theology (*contra* S. Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday* (Rome: Gregorian, 1977) 21f, who argues that Luke presents Jesus as hallowing the sabbath as a fitting memorial of his messianic jubilee activity, see M. M. B. Turner, 'The Sabbath, the Law and Sunday in Luke-Acts' forthcoming in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day* (ed. D. A. Carson, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981)).

79. Strobel, as at n. 77, and compare H. Schürmann (as at n. 39), but without accepting his thesis of a 'Bericht vom Anfang'.

80. Busse, as at n. 64, *passim*.

What then is the significance of Jesus' reception of the Spirit according to Luke 4:18f? It amounts to this: that Jesus has received the Spirit as the power to effect messianic ἄφεσις of the πτωχοῦ (4:18: 7:21f), the τεθραύσμενοι (4:18), those whom Satan had bound (13:16), in short, of all οἱ καταδυναστευόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (Acts 10:38). The Spirit is with him and empowers him to inaugurate the cosmic eschatological liberation which will finally be consummated in the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων (Acts 3:21; cf. 1:6). Before we examine the fuller implications of this we must first turn to a third passage, to which reference has already been made: Acts 10:35-38.

(c) Acts 10:35-38

The wording of this short section of Peter's speech appears to be modelled on Luke 4:16-30 and to interpret it.<sup>81</sup> The evidence supporting this conclusion is as follows: (1) The word δεκτός makes the only appearance that it ever makes in the Lucan writings outside Luke 4:16-30 where it occurs twice; here (v. 35), as in Luke 4, the reference is to conditions under which a man is δεκτός to God. (2) The words λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλεν, while based on Psalm 106:20 (LXX), also echo Jesus' ἀπέσταλκέν με (Lk. 4:18). (3) εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην derives from Isaiah 52:7, but is closely associated with, and interprets, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῦς (Lk. 4:18); the same connection is made in 11Q Melchizedek at lines 16-18. The εἰρήνη envisaged at Acts 10:36 corresponds to the

81. Busse (as at n. 64) 369 rightly speaks of a consensus on this. Whether or not Luke was using a source at this point is, however, not agreed. Since M. Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: SCM, 1956) 110f, the majority of scholars have taken the speech to be a Lucan composition. G. N. Stanton has argued otherwise, pointing to the echoes of Is. 61:1f and Ps. 106:20 (LXX) as evidence for a pre-Lucan tradition (*Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (Cambridge: CUP, 1974) 70-80); but it hardly supports his case that the former is Luke's programmatic passage and that the latter appears again in Paul's speech at Acts 13:26b! While I know of no good reason to doubt that the speech in essence may derive from Peter, it is quite another matter to demonstrate

Hebrew concept of 'well-being' associated particularly with the messianic age (cf. Lk. 2:14; 10:5; 19:24) and with the freedom from hostile powers, whether spiritual or temporal, that this state involves (cf. Lk. 1:78, 71).<sup>82</sup> The fruits of this proclamation of εὐρήνη are spelt out by Luke in Acts 10:38 in terminology reminiscent of the acts of Hellenistic saviours; Jesus went about (διήλθεν - Lucan)<sup>83</sup> performing works of beneficence (εὐεργετῶν)<sup>84</sup> - which is further specified in the words καὶ ὠμένοιο τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου (cf. εὐεργασία at Acts 4:9). (4) While the comment οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος corresponds mainly to Luke's post-resurrection christological stance, it should nevertheless be pointed out that he uses κύριος of Jesus in the gospel at carefully chosen points,<sup>85</sup> one of which is 7:19,<sup>86</sup> in a context where that 'lordship' is attested by Jesus' fulfilment of Isaiah 61:1f (Lk. 7:19-22). (5) Ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας κτλ. (10:37) conforms to the perspective of Luke 4:14ff. (6) Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρεθ is strikingly coincidental as 'Nazareth' is not used elsewhere in Luke-Acts other than in the infancy narratives and at Luke 4:16. (7) Both passages describe Jesus' rejection. (8) the parallels reach their perigee in 10:38 where the words ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει echo Luke 4:14 (ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν: redactional), and are very close, in wording and in substance, to Luke 4:18 (Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς).

---

that the wording we have goes back to a pre-Lucan written source.

82. Cf. G. von Rad, *TDNT* 2, 405f; W. G. Foerster, *TDNT* 2, 412f.
83. Busse (as at n. 64) 353 n. 2.
84. Cf. *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. F. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake) Vol. 4, 121; G. Bertram, *TDNT* 2, 655; U. Busse (as at n. 64) 354f.
85. See I. de la Potterie in *Mélanges Bibliques* (ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux, Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) 117-146.
86. With Bf13 etc.; see B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: UBS 1971) 143.

From this evidence, particularly from v. 38, we may deduce the following three conclusions:

(A) Luke understood the words πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ (Lk 4:18a) in parallel to οὗ εὐνεμεν ἔχρισέν με. That is to say that he understood the Spirit to be the chrism with which Jesus was 'anointed',<sup>87</sup> rather than given in consequence of some prior anointing,<sup>88</sup> and it would follow that the text of 4:18a should be punctuated after πτωχοῖς rather than after με.<sup>89</sup>

(B) Luke 4:16-30; 7:11-23 and Acts 10:35-8 (each a milestone in Luke's redactional endeavour)<sup>90</sup> present a common picture of Jesus which, while not using distinctively messianic jubilee terminology, nevertheless remains close to its central concept - the release of men from the power of evil, and their restoration in the blessings of the messianic age. This vivid picture Luke presents of grace offered to the oppressed 'poor' is, of course, only one aspect of his more general presentation of Jesus as a preacher of the kingdom, and as the author of 'salvation',<sup>91</sup> but, nevertheless, it is an important theme for him; one that runs like an *idée fixe* through his gospel.<sup>92</sup>

87. So Barrett (as at n. 8) 42, and compare 1 John 2:20, 27 (*bis*); TDNT 9, 572. De Jonge and van der Woude (as at n. 67) 311, and I. de la Potterie, NRT 80 (1958) 225-252, have strengthened the case from different perspectives.

88. Contra Sloan (as at n. 66) 49.

89. Contra I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39) 183.

90. On the redactional importance of 7:11-23 see F. Craghan, CBQ 29 (1967) 353-367. The redactional significance of the other passages is not in dispute.

91. A favourite Lucan terminology: see E. M. B. Green, *The Meaning of Salvation* (London: Hodder, 1965) 125-131; I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970) ch. 4 and *passim*; R. Glöckner, *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas* (Mainz: Grünewald, 1975) *passim*.

92. See G. Voss, *Die Christologie der Lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen* (Paris: Brouwer, 1965) ch. 1; U. Busse (as at n. 64) *passim*.

(C) As could have already been deduced from (i) the context of Luke 4:14, (ii) the incorporation of Isaiah 58:6 into the programmatic citation, and (iii) Luke's portrayal of the fulfilment of these verses in 7:22, Luke understood the Spirit as *the power operative through Jesus' proclamation and effective in acts expressive of his kerygma*; Luke 4 taken with Acts 10 makes this all but certain.

(d) *A Christological Contribution to the Understanding of the Chrism of the Spirit on Jesus*

W. C. van Unnik<sup>93</sup> has been followed by R. C. Tannehill,<sup>94</sup> F. Schnider<sup>95</sup> and M. Dömer<sup>96</sup> in drawing a line from Jesus' 'anointing' with the Spirit to his status as ὁ χριστός. It is then asserted that Luke would understand 4:18 to designate Jesus as the *Davidic Messiah*<sup>97</sup> - with (we must assume) the corollary that the Spirit be understood as the power facilitating his kingly rule. Now there can be no doubt that Luke regarded Jesus as the Davidic Messiah - even from birth (1:32; 2:11) - but that he connected this with Jesus' chrism remains improbable; for Luke Jesus' kingly reign is more properly said to begin with his resurrection, ascension and pouring out of the Spirit (Acts 2:33-36).

It must be remembered that the term χριστός at the time could also be applied to priestly figures and to prophets,<sup>98</sup> and so each occasion of χρίω/χριστός must be examined on its own merits. Thus, on the one hand, the apostolic prayer in Acts 4:27, which refers to Jesus as ὃν ἔχρισας, while certainly moving in the orbit of Davidic hopes,<sup>99</sup> probably has nothing to do with Jesus'

93. W. C. van Unnik, *NTS* 8 (1961/2) 113.

94. R. C. Tannehill in *Jesus in Nazareth* (as at n. 64) 69.

95. F. Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet* (Freiburg: UVg, 1973) 165, 189.

96. M. Dömer (as at n. 45) 63ff.

97. In addition to the works cited in nn. 93-96, see G. Voss (as at n. 92) 72-81, and compare Sloan (as at n. 66) 48-54.

98. See especially M. de Jonge, *NovT* 8 (1966) 132-148.

99. Against I. de la Potterie (as at n. 87), ὃν ἔχρισας must have a Davidic-messianic sense here: see de Jonge and van der Woude (as at n. 67) 311; J.

anointing with the Spirit; in this pre-Lucan tradition the verb is used in a referred sense and is best explained as an archaism (appropriate to the context of worship) underscoring God's appointment of the one men rejected.<sup>100</sup> By contrast, Luke 4:18 and Acts 10:38 derive their use of  $\chi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega$  from Isaiah 61:1 which was not associated with the Davidic Messiah in Judaism, perhaps for the obvious reason that the role envisaged by this passage is primarily a prophetic one. Luke 4:18 amounts, on further examination, to a peshet of a prophet's oracle spoken from a prophet's perspective<sup>101</sup> - for the evangelist assumes that the passage concerns a prophetic figure (4:24-27), indeed, one who will suffer the fate of the prophets in being rejected by the people (4:24, 28ff; cf. 11:47ff; 13:33f; 16:31; Acts 7:52). There are no royal motifs in the Nazareth pericope, nor at Acts 10:38; for Luke, then, Jesus is anointed with the Spirit for a prophetic task.

Having said this we must at once be more specific: Luke does not think of Jesus merely as a prophet; John the Baptist was the last and greatest of that line (7:26, 28), but now an era has dawned in which the kingdom is proclaimed and entered (16:16: cf. 7:28; 10:23f). Luke's eschatology leaves room only for the coming of the messianic Prophet,<sup>102</sup> which for him means not

---

Dupont, *Les Béatitudes* (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) II, 134.

100. Cf. my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 230ff (nn. 201-3).

101. As was first observed by A. Finkel in *Abraham Unser Vater* (ed. O. Betz, Leiden: Brill, 1963) 109ff. Compare I. de la Potterie (as at n. 87).

102. On the background of this figure see *inter alios* R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa* (1940; repr. Darmstadt: WB, 1970) 18ff; H. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1957) chs. 2 and 3; F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (London: Lutterworth, 1959) 352-406; J. Coppens, *Le Messianisme et sa Relève Prophétique* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1974) 172-180, and F. Schnider (as at n. 96) 27ff, 31ff, 89-100.



Elijah<sup>103</sup> but the prophet-like Moses.<sup>104</sup> Not only does Luke explicitly identify Jesus with the promised prophet-like-Moses at Acts 3:22ff (cf. 7:37), thereby laying the foundation-stone of his ecclesiology,<sup>105</sup> but his picture of Moses in Acts 7 is at points virtually a typology of Jesus,<sup>106</sup> closely modelled on the kerygma of Acts 3,<sup>107</sup> and on the picture of Jesus elsewhere in Luke-Acts. At Luke 24:19, Jesus is described in the same words as Moses is at Acts 7:22 (the Emmaus disciples referring to him as προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ),<sup>108</sup> while elsewhere, Luke's interest in Jesus as the Mosaic Prophet has moulded the transfiguration account<sup>109</sup> and,

103. Luke does develop an exegetical analogy between Jesus and Elijah at various points, but the decisive role of the eschatological Elijah in Judaism was to prepare the way of the Lord (cf. Mal. 3:24) - and this is the role Luke attributes to the Baptist (1:17,76; 3:3-6; 7:27). Cf. my *Luke*, as at n. 5, 228f n. 194.
104. W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: EV, 1961<sup>2</sup>) 121, and G. W. H. Lampe (as at n. 15) 177, long ago suggested this might be the identity of the figure behind Is. 61:1f in Lk. 4:18. The case has been made with increasing conviction in recent years: cf. F. Hahn (as at n. 102) 380ff; G. Voss (as at n. 91) § 14; I. H. Marshall (as at n. 91) 125-128; U. Busse (as at n. 64) 372ff, 381-411.
105. See especially G. Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels* (Munich: Kösel, 1975) 55 (and chs. 2-3 leading up to this); J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972) 41-74. See further my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 230f n. 196.
106. So M. D. Goulder, *Type & History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964) 164; R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (London: SCM, 1959) 94ff.
107. See the parallels adduced by R. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse* (New York: Abingdon, 1971) 78-94, 131-135.
108. The final seven words, as Lohfink points out, evoke Septuagintal descriptions of Moses.
109. See I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39) 380-389.

in the redaction of Luke 7:11-35, the one who fulfils Isaiah 61:1f (v. 22) is identified with the one earlier designated as μέγας προφήτης (v. 16) the description of whom closely resembles what Luke has to say about Moses.<sup>110</sup>

Luke has thus chosen in his programmatic passage to portray Jesus as the anointed Prophet; the Spirit on him is the δύναντις both of his words and of his deeds (Lk. 24:19), which belong intrinsically together, and which, together, are experienced as the beginnings of Israel's λύτρωσις (24:21) under the leadership of the new Moses. Luke does not think Jesus was by nature (as it were) the eschatological Prophet, and that he was then (at baptism) given a power by which to work; rather Jesus became the Prophet, or messianic Herald/Servant, precisely in the 'receiving' of the Spirit which inaugurated his ministry. *It is the character of the chrism he received which constitutes him the Prophet-like-Moses, and defines the messianic ἀρεσὺς he inaugurates.*

(e) *Implications*

From the passages we have examined a coherent picture emerges of Luke's view of the Jordan-event: it marks the inception of the Spirit's work through Jesus, empowering him as the eschatological Prophet to inaugurate salvation for the Israel of fulfilment, to bring liberty to the afflicted 'poor'. In the light of this we are justified in drawing the following inferences:

(i) While we can draw certain parallels between some of the activities of the Spirit in Jesus during his ministry, and what we later witness in the disciples after Pentecost, we cannot without further ado speak of Jesus' reception of the Spirit as *archetypal*. No disciple is called to follow in the footsteps of Jesus qua eschatological Prophet; no disciple receives a chrism that makes him this. Indeed the point of the parallels between Jesus' ministry in the Spirit and what takes place in Acts is not that the church has inherited Jesus' anointing, but that the risen Lord himself

---

110. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 230ff nn. 201-203.

continues his redemptive activity, as Lord of the Spirit (Acts 2:33, 16:7),<sup>111</sup> through the charismata he bestows in his church; hence Peter's declaration (Acts 9:34), 'Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you'.

(ii) Dunn has spoken of Jesus receiving a gift which was not primarily an empowering, but which empowered him only as a corollary of his receiving the Spirit as the life of the new age, of the new covenant and of the kingdom.<sup>112</sup> Further, Dunn insists that in the second epoch Jesus alone received these latter things in *his own life* before God; the disciples only entered on this new age existence after Pentecost. This appears to involve a triple misunderstanding:

(a) At least according to the passages we have so far examined, the *primary* emphasis in Luke-Acts is definitely on Jesus' receiving the Spirit as a charismatic power in his words and acts, making them effective against Satan and towards men.

(b) Of the reception by Jesus of a gift of the Spirit to control or mould his own inner existential life before God we have as yet detected no trace. We shall question in a subsequent section whether this element is to be found in Luke at all.

(c) If Jesus was anointed with the Spirit as a power to utter liberating words, to release men from the powers of this age, and to inaugurate a state of messianic well-being analogous to that expected in messianic jubilee theology, *then the very nature of the chrism given to Jesus implies that men were able to enter that new existence and kingdom 'life' during the period of the ministry.* All this is in accord

---

111. Against the 'absentee christologies' of H. Conzelmann (*The Theology of Saint Luke*, London: Faber, 1960) and G. Lohfink (*Die Himmelfahrt Jesu*, Munich: Kösel, 1971) see G. Stählin, 'Τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Apg. 16.7)' in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (as at n. 46) 229-252. In my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 128-147, I deal specifically with the relationship of the Jesus/disciple parallels to the question of the presence of Jesus in the Spirit.

112. *Vide supra*.

with Luke's view that the kingdom has been inaugurated with Jesus,<sup>113</sup> that it has come upon men (ἐφθασεν, 11:20),<sup>114</sup> and that it can be presented as a realm that men may enter even during Jesus' ministry (16:16).<sup>115</sup> At the very heart of Jesus' ministry, as set out by Luke, is the extension of God's redemptive grace and forgiveness. One mark of it is the scandalous table-fellowship with 'sinners', which was not merely an acted parable of a future possibility, but an index of realized eschatology.<sup>116</sup> Similarly God's end-time salvation has come to the house of Zacchaeus (19:9: cf. v. 11!), and the story of 'a sinful woman forgiven' stands as a redactional climax to the theme of the proclamation of liberty to the poor, and serves to illustrate the depth of response Luke considers possible, within Jesus' ministry, to Jesus' preaching of the kingdom.<sup>117</sup> In her case Luke could hardly be clearer:

113. Pace H. Conzelmann (as at n. 111) 107, 122, who maintains that Luke has so de-eschatologized that only the image of the kingdom is present in Jesus' ministry, not the kingdom itself. Almost all subsequent scholarship has disagreed with him: see *inter multos alios*, H.-W. Bartsch, *Wachet aber zu jeder Zeit* (Hamburg: Reich, 1963); I. H. Marshall (as at n. 91) 128-136; E. E. Ellis, *Eschatology in Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972); J. Zmijewski, *Die Eschatologiereden des Lukasevangeliums* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1972).
114. When Luke says the kingdom 'ἐφθασεν' he cannot have meant something like 'the eschatological order is imminent', for the kingdom in this sense had not dawned at the time he wrote. He must therefore have meant something more like 'God's redemptive order has been inaugurated'. Cf. my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 97ff.
115. Βούζεσθαι should probably be taken *in bonam partem*, and, with εἰς, should be taken as indicative of the presence of the kingdom: cf. I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39) 629.
116. The meals are an anticipatory enjoyment of the table-fellowship of the kingdom, firmly based on the offer and acceptance of divine forgiveness: see, *inter alios*, N. Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1976) 102-108; J. Jeremias, *ExpT* 83 (1971/2) 196-203.
117. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 103f.

she is told ἀφεώνται σου αἱ ἀμαρτίαι (7:48) and this is further clarified in 7:50: ἡ πύστις σου σέσωκέν σε, πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην. The reality of the woman's experience of forgiveness is to be measured by the act of devotion it stimulated.<sup>118</sup>

More significant than individual cases is the fact that the discipleship in which the Twelve follow Jesus is itself a reflection of new-age existence. The ethics in which they are instructed are those of the kingdom,<sup>119</sup> and, as Jeremias has repeatedly argued, are based on the assumption of a new divine grace.<sup>120</sup> The missions of the Twelve and of the seventy are highly charged with eschatological overtones,<sup>121</sup> and the conditions under which the disciples travel reflect the new and total trust in God's provision that is expected of his children (cf. 12.30ff) who are taught to express their whole new relationship to God in their simple, but eloquent prayer-address: 'abba' (11:2).<sup>122</sup> The group of disciples are already a community of faith: it is this that separates them from the living dead who do not respond to Jesus' word (9:60: cf. 7:48f; 8:12; 10:21; 22:32).<sup>123</sup> The suggestion that for the disciples the ministry is a period during which existential

- 
118. In v. 47 the οὕτω is to be taken with the preceding λέγω σοι (with, *inter alios*, C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* (Cambridge: CUP, 1963<sup>2</sup>) 147). The story assumes the prior conversion of the woman: so U. Wilckens, 'Vergebung für die Sünderin (Lk. 7:36-50)' in *Orientierung an Jesus* (ed. P. Hoffman et al., Freiburg: Herder, 1973) 418ff, and G. Braumann, *NTS* 10 (1963/4) 490.
119. See *inter multos alios* G. E. Ladd, *The Presence of the Future* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) ch. 13.
120. Jeremias, *inter alia*, *The Sermon on the Mount* (London: Athlone, 1961) *passim*; *New Testament Theology*, Vol. 1 (London: SCM, 1971) 181ff, and §§12, 15, 17 & 19.
121. Cf. J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (as at n. 120), §20; M. Hengel, *Nachfolge und Charisma* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968); Turner, *Luke* (as at n. 5) 105.
122. J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1967) 11-107.
123. Turner, *Luke* (as at n. 5) 105f.

experience of the kingdom remains a purely imminent possibility, one which is only realized later in the Spirit at Pentecost, simply cannot be justified exegetically.<sup>124</sup>

(iii) The disciples do not receive what Luke calls 'the gift of the Spirit' until Pentecost; but before then they have come to experience the 'life' of the kingdom. A number of scholars (notably Gunkel, Lampe,<sup>125</sup> Schweizer, Flender<sup>126</sup> and Haya-Prats) have concluded from this that Luke does not associate the Spirit with the salvation of the individual. But this is

---

124. Dunn appeals to, e.g., Mk. 9:1/Lk. 9:27, where 'seeing the kingdom' is an imminent, but future possibility; Lk. 12:31f, where the promise that God will give the disciples the kingdom they seek is interpreted by Dunn in terms of the promise of the Spirit offered to seekers at 11:13; and Acts 1:3-8, where Dunn (similarly, S. S. Smalley, *NovT* 15 (1973) 63) sees an intentional complementation between the terms Spirit and kingdom. But Luke relates the 'seeing' of the kingdom in Lk. 9:27 to the transfiguration; Lk. 12:31 echoes Dan. 7:18,27 and is almost certainly a reference to the consummation events (not Pentecost) - and there is no connection with the logion in 11:13; at Acts 1:3-8, the point of Luke's assertion that Jesus was teaching the things concerning the kingdom is not that the disciples will at Pentecost experience the kingdom (existentially) for the first time, but that from that point they will *preach* the kingdom (a Lucan theme) in the power of the Spirit: Jesus teaches them on the subject so that their preaching and witness is authoritative. For more detailed analysis see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 106ff.
125. In *God as Spirit* (as at n. 4) 70, however, Lampe finds some ground for the belief that Luke did perhaps, after all, associate the Spirit with salvation at a more fundamental level. For the shifts in his views see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 19-22, 32-34.
126. H. Flender, *Saint Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History* (London: SPCK, 1967) 135ff.

over-simplification. Though the presence of salvation in the ministry is strictly bound up with Jesus' activity, this can hardly be taken to mean that the Spirit is not associated with individual salvation; quite the contrary - Luke thinks the Spirit works *through* Jesus to accomplish individual redemption, both before and after Pentecost.

When men confess Jesus as προφήτης, or say that he is δυνατὸς ἐν λόγῳ (24:19; cf. 4:32 etc.) this means to some extent that *they* were conscious of the Spirit's power released through his teaching, and that it had a powerful effect on *them*. A number were indeed so deeply conscious of the authority and claim of Jesus' message - which is to say they were so positively responsive to Jesus' Spirit-empowered proclamation - that they left livelihood and family to follow him (cf. 18:28f). In other words, Luke relates the whole range of the disciples' experience of the kingdom to the Spirit on Jesus. Exorcisms and healings are only part of this; the Spirit also gives to Jesus' *teaching* a compelling power which liberates men from the ways of thinking that correspond to this age, and brings them to understand themselves as God's sons, enjoying the first fruits of the messianic age, through their relationship to Jesus.

There is a corollary to what we have just said: it is that in a very real sense we may speak, with Jeremias, of 'the *bestowing* of the Spirit on the disciples in the life-time of Jesus'.<sup>127</sup> By this we do not simply mean the empowering of the disciples for their missions (9:1 - 10:22; and cf. 11:9-13, which Luke refers to the time of the ministry),<sup>128</sup> but that from the Jordan-event onwards, a coherent nexus of activities of the Spirit has begun in those who respond to Jesus, and that this could quite legitimately be referred to as a reception of the Spirit on their part. For Luke, with John and Paul, clearly shares the view that to come under the influence of a man's teaching and charisma is to open oneself up to the spiritual power that expresses itself therein (cf. Jn. 6:63; 1 John 4:1f; 2 Cor. 11:4 - where

---

127. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (as at n. 120) 80; cf. also 79.

128. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 112-115.

Paul actually identifies this with receiving the Spirit; Col. 2:8ff).<sup>129</sup> To listen to Jesus, to come under the authority of the Spirit with which he preached, is to experience that Spirit existentially as a power moulding one's life and beliefs. This is, in a sense, to receive the Spirit as the life of the kingdom and of the new age. How this bears on the Pentecostal gift of the Spirit should become clearer in part IV of this paper.

### III THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE INFANCY NARRATIVES TO OUR UNDERSTANDING OF JESUS AND THE SPIRIT IN LUCAN PERSPECTIVE

Was Jesus' Jordan experience his own entry into new age existence, and the life of the kingdom, as Dunn suggests? Did Jesus then receive the Spirit as a power moulding his own inner existential life of obedience and sonship before God? Luke 1-2 seems to offer at least some clues as to how the writer might answer these modern questions.

Because of the Spirit's part at his conception, Jesus is to be called υἱὸς ὑψίστου, ἄγιος and υἱὸς θεοῦ (1:32,35). Both υἱὸς titles are to be understood, in context, in terms of the eternal and eschatological throne of David (1:32f).<sup>130</sup> Corresponding to the title υἱὸς ὑψίστου, Mary is told that δύναμις ὑψίστου will overshadow her. Similarly, corresponding with the affirmation τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται (with the title υἱὸς θεοῦ being appended in loose apposition<sup>131</sup>), Mary is told that πνεῦμα ἅγιον will come upon her. The hunt for a pagan, OT or Jewish background for these ideas has been relatively abortive, and, as R. E. Brown observes, 'the real parallel for the conglomeration of ideas in 1:35 is not an OT passage but the early Christian formulations of

129. See *VoxEv* 10 (1977) 24-25 and *passim*.

130. Cf. J. Fitzmyer, *NTS* 20 (1973/4) 391; F. Hahn (as at n. 102) 296f; and A. George, *RB* 72 (1965) 184-209. Compare R. E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London: Chapman, 1978) 310-316.

131. *Contra*, e.g., G. Voss (as at n. 91) §4.4, who takes ἅγιον as adjectival, see H. Schürmann (as at n. 39) 54.



christology',<sup>132</sup> particularly Romans 1:3f, Acts 13:32f, and Mark 9:7 and parallels. This does not mean that Luke has simply rewritten Rom. 1:3f, nor even that he stands at the end of a tradition-historical sequence which gradually fed back language that applied supremely to Jesus' parousia (Spirit, Sonship, power, reign, etc.), first of all to Jesus' resurrection (Rom. 1:3f; Acts 13:32f and 2:36f), then to his transfiguration, baptism and finally here to his conception. But all these occasions are associated with a similar concept, viz. that the one who will be glorified with power is already enjoying some ἀπαράβω of that future cosmic disclosure. In the context of Luke 1:32ff, Jesus is being described in terms that are parallel to but transcend what is said of the Baptist's relationship to the eschatological Spirit: 'Jesus is nicht nur vom Geist erfüllt wie Johannes (1:15), sondern er verdank seine *Existenz* diesem Gottesgeist'.<sup>133</sup> Already at his conception Jesus is related to the dawning eschaton at the deepest possible level; it is highly doubtful whether any subsequent point before his resurrection can be called a decisive entry into new age existence.

The outcome of this conception by the Spirit is portrayed in Luke 2:41-51, which is to be understood against the background of messianic hopes for a ruler endowed with wisdom (cf. Is. 11:2; Ps. Sol. 17:37; 1 Enoch 49:3) and with God's grace (cf. 2:40).<sup>134</sup> Already Jesus shows a religious wisdom that startles the leaders of Israel; already he knows *ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῦ ἐλθαί με* (2:49),<sup>135</sup> and that this transcends his duty to his

132. Brown (as at n. 130) 312; here Brown leans heavily on the article by L. Legrand, *RB* 72 (1965) 161-191.

133. G. Schneider (as at n. 45) 53; cf. his article 'Jesu geistgewirkte Empfängnis (Lk. 1:34f)' *Theologisch-praktisch Quartalschrift* 119 (1971) 105-116, which was only available to me in summary form.

134. See especially H. J. de Jonge, *NTS* 24 (1977/8) 317-354.

135. With H. J. de Jonge (as at n. 134) 331-337, we take this to mean 'about my Father's business'.

parents; already he knows that he is the Son, in an absolute sense (cf. the christological force of the other occasions of ὁ πατήρ μου: 10:22; 22:29 and 24:49).<sup>136</sup> Luke underscores the deep significance of Jesus' pronouncement with the notice καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς (2:50).<sup>137</sup>

Whether Luke considers Jesus' intimate relationship with the Father, and penetrating self-knowledge, to be the result of revelation by the Spirit (after the analogy of Luke 4:1) we cannot tell: the point remains that (for Luke) he has these before ever he steps into the waters of the Jordan. If to this the Jordan experience added any degree of intimacy, then it is hard to see how such an increment could be archetypal.<sup>138</sup> In other words Luke 1-2 offers evidence that would suggest the writer understood Jesus' baptismal anointing with the Spirit purely as a chrism to effect the messianic liberation of the downtrodden by words and deeds of power.

#### IV JESUS AND THE SPIRIT IN THE LIGHT OF PENTECOST IN LUKE-ACTS

From one perspective, the Pentecost narrative affords the most dramatic underlining of the uniqueness of Jesus' relationship to the Spirit as Luke conceives it. In words echoing Psalm 67:19 (LXX) Luke's Peter tells us Jesus ascended on high, like Moses in Jewish

---

136. I. H. Marshall (as at n. 39) *ad loc.*; also, by the same author, *Int.* 21 (1967) 87ff, and H. de Jonge (as at n. 134) 351-353.

137. Cf. H. Schürmann (as at n. 39) 137.

138. Cf. Dunn (as at n. 33) 142, who speaks of Jesus as perhaps even being "begotten" to a new level of sonship, 3:22D; 4:18; Acts 10:38'; but such a new level, following what has been said in Luke 1-2, would not obviously be archetypal - and at 4:18 and Acts 10:38 'sonship' is not in view.

tradition, to receive a gift which he gives to men.<sup>139</sup> In Moses' case it was the Law, but Jesus receives the gift of the Spirit which he then pours out (τῇ δεξιᾷ... ὑψωθείς, τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος... λαβὼν... ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε: Acts 2:33). We have already noted that πνεῦμα ἅγιον λαμβάνειν is metaphorical language denoting the inception of a new nexus of activities in or through a person, and here the meaning of the language is clear, if startling: Jesus received the gift of the Spirit in the sense that he is given the authority to administer or direct the gift.

But what, more precisely, *is* the nexus of activities of the Spirit over which Jesus is given lordship? The gift (2:38) which Jesus' ascension secures (2:33) is identified quite clearly as that promised by Joel: it is God's ἐπαγγελία (2:33; cf. 2:39; 1:4; Lk. 24:49), and Jesus 'pours' it out (ἐξέχεεν, 2:33; cf. ἐκχεῶ, 2:17 = J1. 3:1).

The scope of Joel's promise in its original context was specific: it concerned the Spirit of prophecy, *i.e.* the organ of God's revelation to man, not to be identified with the gift of prophecy as such, but the means by which God gave a revelatory dream, vision or word to an individual who might (or might not) then prophesy.<sup>140</sup> Any Jewish hearers were bound to interpret what Peter said in terms of the long-awaited outpouring of this Spirit of prophecy on the restored and cleansed Israel - not least because Judaism at the time tended to interpret every reference to the Spirit (except that on the Messiah) as the Spirit of prophecy.<sup>141</sup> Peter's speech

---

139. See J. Dupont, 'Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2:33' in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (as at n. 46) 219-228, and my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 117-129, for details and the relevant literature.

140. *Vide supra*, n. 57.

141. *Vide supra*, especially the work by Schäfer (as at n. 57) 107f, 114; see also W. Foerster, *NTS* 8 (1961/2) 117-134; J. Schreiner, *BZ* 8 (1964) 161-180.

would positively encourage such an understanding with its addition of the sentence καὶ προφητεύσουσιν to Joel's citation (2:18). When Peter later (at v. 38f) states that those who are baptized may receive the 'gift of the Holy Spirit', and when he goes on to say that this ἐπαγγελία (cf. Lk. 24:49; Acts 2:33) is offered ὑμῖν... καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν (cf. 2:17c) καὶ πᾶσιν (cf. 2:17b) τοῖς εἰς μακράν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσται κύριος κτλ. (cf. Jl. 3:5b), he is clearly drawing on the wording of Joel's prophecy both for the basis of the universality spoken of, and consequently, for the nature of the promised gift. Peter is not speaking of some more generally conceived promise of the Spirit, which may result in some persons experiencing the gift as the Spirit of prophecy:<sup>142</sup> *he commits himself to Joel's promise that the Spirit of prophecy will be given universally.*

Luke seems to have attributed a slightly wider range of activities to the Spirit of prophecy than Joel originally specified; for example, Peter appears to identify the tongues miracle as part of the fulfilment of what Joel promised, and elsewhere Luke includes other forms of charismatic speech (such as preaching with power, and paraclesis) within its scope, but these extensions all cohere with the activity of the Spirit of prophecy; they do not represent a different nexus of

- 
142. As W. Rudolph, *Joel-Amos-Obadja-Jona* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971) 72, observes, Joel's prophecy 'geht nicht um die Kraft zu einem neuen sittlichen Leben, sondern um die Gabe der Prophetie' - though, of course, the prophetic gift gives a decisive impulse to the ethical life of the community!

The world of scholarship has not been wanting in attempts to show that the pentecostal gift was not merely the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, but, in addition, a christocentric fulfilment of Ezekiel's promise of the Spirit as the presence and power of God at work in the new creation of man's inner life (Ezek. 36:26f); but this cannot be shown - for details of the attempts to do so, with a critique, see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 148-154, 157-159, and 'The Spirit at Pentecost in Lucan Perspective' forthcoming.

activities. Given this, we may go on to claim that all Luke has to say elsewhere in Acts about the Spirit given to the disciples is compatible with the view that he understood Peter in the way outlined above;<sup>143</sup> since Pentecost, the Spirit of prophecy is given to those who belong to the Israel of fulfilment, and who have already been cleansed by their faith in the Spirit-empowered kerygma of Jesus (during the ministry) or of the disciples (subsequently).<sup>144</sup>

Jesus, then, has received the Spirit in the heavenly places in the sense that he now has lordship over the gift of the Spirit given to the church. The Spirit of prophecy, promised through Joel, has now become the Spirit of Jesus (Acts 16:7)<sup>145</sup> and he distributes its individual and varied charismata (2:33!). Through this means he directs and empowers the church's mission to outsiders (e.g. Acts 2:4,33; 4:8,31; 8:29; 10:11-21; 11:12; 13:2,4,9; 16:6,7 etc.), and he gives charismatic wisdom and revelation where it is needed either for the defence and propagation of the gospel (Acts 6:3,5,10 and cf. Lk. 21:25!) or for the direction, sanctification and upbuilding of the church (5:1-11; 9:10ff,31; 11:28; 13:52; 15:28 etc.). This gift is no *donum superadditum*:<sup>146</sup> it is the link between Jesus in heaven and his disciples on earth; it is the means by which Jesus continues to announce his messianic ἄφεςις; it is the very life of the church. Here is the fulfilment of what the Fourth Gospel promises of the Paraclete.<sup>147</sup>

---

143. See chs. 4 and 5 of my *Luke* (as at n. 5).

144. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) ch. 5; this interpretation appears to provide the easiest explanation of the disciples' position in Acts 2, of the Samaria episode (*ibid.* 161-171), of the wording of the Cornelius incident at 15:8f (*ibid.* 171-173), and of that at Ephesus (Acts 19:2).

145. See especially G. Stählin (as at n. 111); cf. my *Luke* (as at n. 5) §4.4.

146. *Contra* Gunkel (as at n. 6); see my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 177-179.

147. Cf. *VoxEv* 10 (1977), esp. 26-28.

If Peter's Pentecost speech really represents early Jewish-Christian preaching at this point (as I have argued elsewhere)<sup>148</sup> then we need not look much further for the roots of divine christology; for in their claim that the charismatic-prophetic Spirit was now the Spirit of Jesus, under his lordship, Christians virtually identified Jesus with God<sup>149</sup> - for the Spirit in the OT and in Judaism was God's very own self-expression, the extension of *his* personality and activity.<sup>150</sup> Nothing in pre-Christian Judaism even approaches this claim made on behalf of Jesus;<sup>151</sup> never was it intimated that a man might become lord of the *יהוה יחיד*, and that his presence and activity might be mediated on earth through God's Spirit. Yet this seems to be Luke's meaning - he believes that Christian disciples knew the presence and activity of Jesus with them, and directing them, through the Spirit - and so Jesus' reception of the Spirit in the heavenly places makes a total break between Jesus' experience of the Spirit and that of his disciples.

## V CONCLUSIONS

Luke does not appear to be interested in presenting Jesus' relationship to the Spirit as archetypal; indeed he rather stresses the unique aspects of the Spirit's work in Jesus. Luke 1-2 provides a picture of one whose very existence bears the stamp of the eschatological Spirit. After his baptism the Spirit begins a new nexus of activities through him, empowering his proclamation of messianic liberty - making him, as it were, the

---

148. Turner (as at n. 78) n. 181; cf. my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 118.

149. See my *Luke* (as at n. 5) 126-129, and 'The Spirit of Christ and Christology' forthcoming.

150. See, *inter alios*, A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: UWP, 1964) 26-39; *idem*, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff: UWP, 1961) 15ff; G. W. H. Lampe, *God as Spirit* (as at n. 4) chs. 2 and 8.

151. *Contra* Dunn, *NovT* 14 (1972) 90f, see Turner, as at n. 149.

eschatological Prophet to Israel - and enabling him thus to bring others to experience the life of the kingdom and of the new age. During this period the Spirit was deeply at work in the lives of Jesus' disciples through his preaching.

With Jesus' ascension out of the world a new sphere of activities of the Spirit is called for if the work that has commenced is to continue. This dawns in Jesus' receiving a second 'gift' of the Spirit, this time the authority to direct and to dispose the Spirit of prophecy promised by Joel. By this means the risen Christ effects his lordship in the church, and continues to confront Israel (3:18-26) and the world with his word of release.

Even the apparent parallel between Jesus anointed as the eschatological Prophet, and the disciples receiving the Spirit of prophecy, cannot be pressed in favour of the view that Jesus' chrism, as such, is archetypal. For on the one hand (as Luke 2:41-51 establishes) Luke does not think of the chrism on Jesus as the organ of revelation to him, but as the power by which his words and actions bring salvation to others - which is to say that the authority of the eschatological Prophet Jesus is direct and christocentric; not Spirit-centred.<sup>152</sup>

- 
152. Dunn (as at n. 32) 49, paraphrases Jesus' position as not 'Where I am, there is the kingdom', but 'Where the Spirit is, there is the kingdom'. But this could not be further from the truth for Luke who, more than the other evangelists, identifies Jesus with the presence of the kingdom (cf. O. Merk in *Jesus und Paulus* (ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1973) 201-220; M. Völkel, *ZNW* 65 (1974) 57-70). Dunn's antithesis is barely more credible of a reconstructed 'historical Jesus' (allegedly different) than of Luke's picture of him; if the historical Jesus put so much emphasis on the Spirit as to give primacy to the Spirit over himself, and if he viewed the Spirit's presence with him as archetypal of future Christian experience, then the notorious dearth of *logia* about the Spirit becomes quite impossible to

And on the other hand the role of this figure, for which Jesus is anointed, is unique.

---

understand. In Luke, however, the picture remains relatively clear: it is not that he eliminates the possibility of the Spirit revealing material to Jesus (cf. 4:1b and 10:21?), but such an understanding is undernourished in his gospel. Jesus is not merely a great witness to God's revelation, but the revealer (cf. 10:22); it is not 'Thus saith the Lord' (or 'the Spirit'; cf. Acts 21:11) but 'I say to you' that captures the tone of his teaching. Any concept of a gift of the Spirit to reveal data to Jesus is overshadowed by the presentation of Jesus' reception of the Spirit (3:21; 4:18; Acts 10:38) as a power to release others into new life.