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Summary

The present article assesses the relationship of the concept of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism to Pauline pneumatology. Since the functions and effects of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism are disputed, the scholarly debate is reviewed, followed by a comparison of the Jewish concept and the Pauline view of the Spirit, demonstrating points of commonality and difference.

I. Introduction

One of the gains of recent scholarship in the area of New Testament pneumatology is the agreement concerning the starting point. It is generally accepted that Judaism (or most forms of Judaism, hereafter ‘Judaism’) perceived the divine Spirit to be ‘the Spirit of prophecy’.1 In the current scholarly debate, this agreement is most obvious with reference to Lukan pneumatology.2 Unfortunately, this starting point

---


has not been sufficiently recognised with reference to Pauline pneumatology. The present article attempts to relate these two themes: the Spirit of prophecy and Pauline pneumatology.

II. The Spirit of Prophecy

A. The Spirit of Prophecy in Judaism

That the Spirit of God is known as ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ in Judaism is not hard to demonstrate. The most obvious place to look is in the Aramaic Targums. In Targum Onkelos, Joseph is said to have the Spirit of prophecy in him after he interpreted Pharaoh’s dream (Tg. Onk. Gn. 41:38). Similarly Joshua is said to have the Spirit of prophecy in him (Tg. Onk. Nu. 27:18). The Spirit of prophecy is said to rest upon the seventy elders of Israel, and they prophesied as a result (Tg. Onk. Nu. 11:25-29). The same thing happened to Balaam, the false prophet (Tg. Onk. Nu. 24:2).

In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Joseph and Balaam are depicted in a virtually identical manner to their depiction in Targum Onkelos (Tg. Ps.-J. Gn. 41:38 [Joseph]; Tg. Ps.-J. Nu. 24:2 [Balaam]). The cases of the seventy elders (Tg. Ps.-J. Nu. 11:25-29) and of Joshua (Tg. Ps.-J. Nu. 27:18) are not identical to Targum Onkelos but are sufficiently similar. Here the term used to describe the divine Spirit is not ‘the Spirit of prophecy’ but ‘the prophetic Spirit’ (note also Tg. Ps.-J. Nu. 11:17). In addition to these references, we also find the Spirit of prophecy in Tg. Ps.-J. Genesis 45:27: when Jacob saw the Egyptian

---


4 ‘Pauline pneumatology’ could obviously be defined differently. In this discussion, all thirteen Pauline epistles will be included in order to gain an overall view of the relationship between the Spirit of prophecy and the Pauline legacy. In addition, since our approach is thematic rather than chronological, all Pauline references will be cited in the canonical order.

5 It is not unusual to find the phrase ‘the spirit of prophecy from before the Lord’ in the Targums, as in Tg. Onk. Gen. 41:38. M.L. Klein, ‘The Preposition של (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums’, JTS 30 (1979) 502-507, has shown that the word ‘before’ is an expression of deference used in the case of a respectable person or institution. It is an Aramaic idiom and is, therefore, not an attempt to distant the Spirit of prophecy from God.
carriages sent by Joseph his son, the Spirit of prophecy rested upon him and he started thanking God for the fact that Joseph was alive and well.

Besides the two Targums to the Pentateuch already mentioned, we find the Spirit of prophecy associated with Israel's judges, kings, prophets, and priests including Othniel (Tg. Neb. Judg. 3:10), Saul (Tg. Neb. 1 Sa. 10:6, 10; 19:23), David (Tg. Neb. 2 Sa. 23:2; 1 Chr. 28:12), Solomon (Tg. Ket. Ct. 1:1; 7:2; Ec. 1:4; 3:11-14; 4:15; 9:7; 10:7), Azariah (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 15:1), Zedekiah (Tg. Neb. 1 Ki. 22:24; 2 Chr. 18:23), Micaiah (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 18:27), Jahaziel (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 20:14), Zechariah (Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 24:20), Isaiah (Tg. Neb. Is. 61:1), Ezekiel (Tg. Neb. Ezk. 1:3; 3:22; 8:1; 11:5; 37:1; 40:1), and Micah (Tg. Neb. Mi. 3:7-8).

Outside the Targums, the two terms (the Spirit of prophecy and the prophetic Spirit) are rare. The former appears in Jubilees 31:12, where a spirit of prophecy came down upon Isaac's mouth just as he was about to pronounce blessings on Levi and Judah; the latter appears in Philo with reference to Moses and the seventy elders (Fug. 186), with reference to the false prophet Balaam (Vit. Mos. 1.277), and with reference to Aaron (Quaest. in Ex. 2.105). Thus, D.E. Aune notes that 'the Spirit of God was identified as the Spirit of prophecy primarily within Rabbinic Judaism (second century A.D. and later), not within such other sects of early Judaism such as the Qumran community'.

But the situation is not so clear-cut. Scholars have increasingly come to appreciate the importance of the Aramaic Targums for New Testament study, not least because of the discovery of targumic fragments in the Qumran caves (4QtgLev [4Q156], 4QtgJob [4Q157], and 11QtgJob [11Q10]), suggesting that written targums existed from pre-Christian times. Equally important is the fact that, while the term

---

6 In the NT, the term appears in Rev. 19:10.
‘the Spirit of prophecy’ is not commonly used outside of the rabbinic tradition, the concept of the divine Spirit being the Spirit of prophecy is. This can be seen from at least two factors.

First, prophetic figures are identified as such because of the presence of the divine Spirit. Thus, according to the translators of the LXX, the prophets are precisely those who have the divine Spirit (Nu. 11:29; 4 Kgdm. 2:9, 15; Ne. 9:20; Ze. 1:6; 7:12). People wondered whether Saul was a prophet because the Spirit came upon him as upon the other prophets (1 Kgdm. 10:10-12; 19:23-24). In Josephus’ writings, a true prophet is said to have the power of the divine Spirit (Ant. 8.408). Similarly, for Philo, a prophet is indwelt by the divine Spirit, the true author of prophecies (Spec. Leg. 4.49); so Moses, the most perfect of the prophets, was filled with the divine Spirit (Decal. 175).9

Second, the divine Spirit is often associated with prophecy or prophesying. Thus, according to the translators of the LXX, prophecy is the direct result of the coming of the Spirit upon the seventy elders (Nu. 11:25-27), Saul (1 Kgdm. 10:6, 10; 19:23-24), Saul’s men (1 Kgdm. 19:20-21), Jahaziel (2 Chr. 20:14-15), Zechariah (2 Chr. 24:20), and future Israel (Joel 2:28). In Josephus’ account of Jewish antiquities, the same thing is said of Saul (Ant. 6.223), his men (6.222), and David (6.166). In Philo, it was Moses who, under the direct inspiration of the divine Spirit, prophesied concerning the utter destruction of the Egyptian army (Vit. Mos. 1.175; cf. 2.246-58), the divinely provided manna (2.265), and his own death (2.291).10

This equation of the Holy Spirit with prophecy is firmly established by the time of Rabbinic Judaism. According to the Rabbi Nathan, the Holy Spirit is called by ten names: parable, metaphor, riddle, speech, saying, glory, command, burden, prophecy, vision (‘Abot R. Nat. A.34). This text is significant in two ways. On the one hand, ‘prophecy’ is one of the ten names given to ‘the Holy Spirit’. On the other hand, other rabbinic lists of ten names sometimes replaced ‘the Holy Spirit’ with ‘prophecy’ (see, e.g., ‘Abot R. Nat. B. 37; Gn. Rab. 44.6; Ct. Rab. 3.4). Thus, for instance, Midrash Haggadol on Genesis 24 equates ‘prophecy’ with seeing, watching,

---

9 See also 1QS 8:15-16; CD 2:11-13; Philo Quaest. in Ex. 3.9; Sir. 48:12; t. Pesah. 4.14; t. Sota 12.5; 13.3; y. Sota 9.13; b. Sota 48b; b. Yoma 9b; Ex. Rab. 5.20; Lev. Rab. 15.2; Nu. Rab. 15.25.

10 See also 1 En. 91:1; 4 Ezra 14:22; Bib. Ant. 9:10; 18:3, 11; 28:6; 32:14; 62:2; Jub. 25:14; Sir. 48:24.
proverb, interpretation, the Holy Spirit, prophecy, vision, oracle, sermon, riddle.

While these texts in their present forms tend to be later than Early Judaism, what is interesting is the fact that the translators of the LXX link the divine Spirit with prophetic pronouncement of a ‘parable’ (Nu. 23:7; 24:2-4; cf. Nu. 24:15, 20-23; 2 Kgdms. 23:2-3): the coming of the Spirit of God upon Balaam resulted in his taking up of a ‘parable’ concerning the future of Israel. This coincides with ‘Abot R. Nat. A.34, where ‘parable’ is one of the ten names given to the Holy Spirit. The LXX of Numbers 24:2-4 is particularly important because of its references to ‘parable’ (24:3), ‘oracle’ (24:4), and ‘vision’ (24:4). So too LXX Joel 2:28 attributes prophecy, ‘dreams’, and ‘visions’ to the pouring out of the divine Spirit. These texts demonstrate what the functions and effects of the Spirit of prophecy were thought to be.

B. Current Scholarly Debate

Contention among biblical scholars arises in relation to precisely this point: the functions and effects of this Spirit of prophecy. E. Schweizer, for example, thinks that Luke ‘shares with Judaism the view that the Spirit is essentially the Spirit of prophecy’; according to Schweizer, this results in Luke’s acceptance of glossolalia and authoritative preaching as manifestations of the Spirit, and in his rejection of miracles and ethical effects as manifestations of the Spirit. Thus, in contrast to Mark and Matthew who viewed the Spirit as ‘the power of God which makes possible speech and action of which human resources are not capable’, Luke viewed the church as ‘the community of the prophets. Only on the margin do we find formulae in which the Spirit is generally understood as dwelling continually in the individual or the community.’

Similarly, R.P. Menzies thinks that Judaism tended to view the Spirit of prophecy ‘exclusively’ as the source of prophetic inspiration, which includes revelatory power, special insight, esoteric wisdom, prophetic words of guidance, and inspired speech. Miraculous power and resurrection of the dead are generally not

---

11 Menzies, Development, 98-99, however, argues that they represent earlier tradition.  
attributed to the work of the Spirit. Likewise, the gift of the Spirit "was not viewed as a soteriological necessity: one need not possess
the gift in order to live in right relationship to God and attain eternal
care. The only exceptions, according to
Menzies, are found in 1QH and the Wisdom of Solomon, where

the gift of the Spirit, previously [i.e., in other parts of Judaism] viewed as the
source of esoteric wisdom and inspired speech, is presented as the source of
sapiencial achievement at every level [and not a donum superadditum
granted to some individuals for special tasks]. Thus the developments within
the sapiencial tradition culminate in the attribution of soteriological
significance to the gift of the Spirit. 17

Menzies concludes that there are three different types of
pneumatologies in the New Testament: the prophetic pneumatology of
Luke-Acts (like Judaism), the charismatic pneumatology of Jesus and
the primitive church (Q, Mark, and Matthew) which joins the Spirit of
miraculous power to the Spirit of prophecy, and the soteriological
pneumatology of Paul who ‘was the first Christian to attribute
soteriological functions to the Spirit’.18

This view of the Spirit of prophecy, as advocated by Schweizer
and Menzies, differs markedly from those of C.S. Keener, J.S. Vos,
and M.M.B. Turner. According to Keener, Judaism perceived the
Spirit both as the Spirit of prophecy and as the Spirit of purification.
While the former is undoubtedly the more frequent, the latter is not
entirely absent. 19 By the Spirit of purification, Keener means the
ethical Spirit that purifies or cleanses people from sin, and empowers
them to do God’s will and to act righteously. As far as the New
Testament is concerned, Keener thinks that, while the Spirit of
prophecy alone appears in Luke-Acts (thus agreeing with Menzies
here), both the Spirit of prophecy and the Spirit of purification appear
in Matthew and John. 20

Similarly, Vos thinks that the Spirit of prophecy in the Old
Testament and Judaism not only performs a prophetic function, but
also a helping or enabling function, resulting in purification, renewal,
righteousness, life, and salvation for the people of God. Moreover, he
thinks that these two functions are closely related. The prophetic

16 Menzies, Development, 112, cf. 76.
17 Menzies, Development, 112.
18 Menzies, Development, 283, 317.
(Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997) 8-10.
20 Keener, Spirit, 91-215, see especially 201 n. 2.
Spirit grants divine knowledge and reveals the divine will, leading to right relationship with God and the salvific presence of God.\textsuperscript{21} Turner likewise thinks that the Spirit in Judaism is not simply the source of prophetic inspiration. He categorises five functions of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism:

1. the Spirit gives charismatic revelation and guidance to people through visionary experiences, dreams, hearing of words, or some combination of these;
2. the Spirit gives charismatic wisdom and understanding to people to interpret dreams or to rule wisely either conspicuously or inconspicuously;
3. the Spirit inspires people to give immediate prophetic or oracular speech, the extreme form of which being ecstatic or mantic prophecy where the Spirit completely displaces the speaker’s natural faculties;
4. the Spirit inspires people to give immediate charismatic praise and worship typically (but not necessarily) addressed to God; and
5. the Spirit grants people supernatural strength and power to overcome enemies or to perform miraculous deeds (such as dividing the waters as in the case of Elisha).\textsuperscript{22}

Already we begin to see the significant difference between Turner and others (such as Schweizer and Menzies) who do not include miraculous power as a function of the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism. But the gap between them does not stop here. Like Vos, Turner argues that the revelatory Spirit is simultaneously the ethical and soteriological Spirit:

\begin{quote}
It would appear various sectors of Judaism expected the ‘Spirit of prophecy’ to give such important and/or transforming revelation, and such ethical \textit{renewing} wisdom, that these activities would almost inevitably be regarded
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21} Vos, \textit{Pneumatologie}, 57. Vos’ conclusion, then, is radically different from that of Menzies. ‘Die einzelnen Vorstellungen von der Heilsbedeutung des Geistes — von der Reinigung bis zur Verwandlung — lassen sich weitgehend von der alttestamentlich-jüdischen Pneumatradition her begreifen’ (144).

as virtually essential for fully authentic human existence before God, and so also for that future state of it which writers mean by ‘salvation’.23

It follows that the Spirit cannot simply be a donum superadditum but must be an essential and salvific gift to Israel, enabling her to live in a right relationship with God. So Turner concludes:

neither the Old Testament nor Judaism knows of any ethically transforming or recreating gift of the Spirit that is necessarily other than the gift of the Spirit of prophecy which reveals God’s presence, wisdom and will to the human heart in such a way as thereby to motivate (and so enable) the life of filial righteousness.24

The case of Keener, Vos, and Turner is certainly to be preferred to that of Schweizer and Menzies. First, both the LXX and the Targums follow the MT in associating the Spirit with supernatural power, as in the cases of Samson (LXX Judg. 14:6, 19; 15:14; Tg. Neb. Judg. 14:6, 19; 15:14) and Elisha (LXX 4 Kgdms. 2:9-15; Tg. Neb. 2 Ki. 2:9-15), and in associating the Spirit with lifting a person up or transporting him from one place to another, as in the cases of Elijah (LXX 3 Kgdms. 18:12; 4 Kgdms. 2:16; Tg. Neb. 1 Ki. 18:12; 2 Ki. 2:16) and Ezekiel (LXX Ezk. 2:14; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5; Tg. Neb. Ezk. 3:12, 14; 8:3; 11:1, 24; 43:5).

Indeed, the Targum of the Prophets goes beyond both the MT and the LXX in that it literally calls the Spirit of the Lord the Spirit of power, as in the cases of Gideon (Tg. Neb. Judg. 6:34), Jephthah (11:29), Samson (13:25, 14:6, 19; 15:14), Saul (1 Sa. 16:14), David (16:13), and Elijah (1 Ki. 18:46). While this description of the Spirit is rare outside the Targums (though note Bib. Ant. 27:10), the concept of the Spirit of might or strength is not as rare (I En. 49:3; 2 Apoc. Bar. 6:3; 1QSb 5:25; 4Q161; Bib. Ant. 36:2; Josephus, Ant. 6.223; 8.408; Lev. Rab. 8:2; Philo, Virt. 217; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; Sir. 48:12, 24; Tg. Neb. 1 Sa. 11:6; 1 Chr. 12:19; Is. 11:2).25

25 For a fuller treatment, see Turner, ‘Jesus’ Miracles’, 131-36; Power, 105-18; Spiritual Gifts, 13-18. Menzies, ‘Spirit and Power’, 12-15, makes the point that Judaism tends to emphasise the Spirit of prophecy on the one hand and de-emphasise the Spirit of power on the other. The point of contention, of course, is not whether Judaism tends to see the Spirit in term of prophetic inspiration rather than miraculous power, but whether there is a perceivable tendency in Judaism to
Second, both the LXX and the Targums follow the MT in associating the Spirit with ethical or religious living (whether in relation to sin, transgression, idolatry, justice, righteousness, or the fear of the Lord), as in the cases of Israel in the wilderness (LXX Ne. 9:20; Is. 63:10-14), David (LXX Ps. 50:11-12; Tg. Neb. Ps. 51:13), Asa (LXX 2 Chr. 15:1-15; Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 15:1-19), Isaiah (LXX Is. 42:1-4; 61:1-4; Tg. Neb. Is. 42:1-4; 61:1-4), Micah (LXX Mi. 3:8-12; Tg. Neb. Mi. 3:8-12), the Davidic messiah (LXX Is. 11:1-5; Tg. Neb. Is. 11:1-5), and Israel of the future (LXX Is. 32:15-17; 44:1-5; Ezek. 36:27; Tg. Neb. Is. 32:15-17; 44:1-5; Ezek. 36:27).

Moreover, there are other Jewish texts which clearly link the Spirit with ethical effects (such as 1 En. 67:10; 1QH 7:6-7; 9:32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 16:6-12; 1QS 4:20-23; b. Ber. 31b-32b; Dt. Rab. 6:14; Mek. Beshallah 3; Middr. Pss. 14:6; Philo, Gig. 55; Sir. 39:6; T. Sim. 4:4; T. Levi 2:3-4; T. Benj. 8:1-3; Wis. 7:7; 9:17). Worth special mention are those texts that link the Spirit with the Davidic messiah (1 En. 49:2-3; 62:1-2; 1QSb 5:25; 4Q161; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; T. Levi 18:7). These texts are based on Isaiah 11:1-5, where the Spirit is not only called ‘the Spirit of wisdom and understanding’ but also ‘the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord’.27

Schweizer and Menzies could no doubt point out that the Spirit in some of these texts remains the Spirit of prophecy or wisdom (e.g., 2 Chr. 15:1; Ne. 9:20; Ps. 51:13; Is. 11:2; 44:3; 61:1; 63:11; Mi. 3:8), and a clear distinction should be made between the indirect effect of the Spirit (producing righteousness through the prophetic word) and the direct effect of the Spirit (mediating immediate righteousness or inner renewal).28 H. Gunkel earlier makes a similar point: prophetic inspiration which comes through the Spirit may have ethical
dissociate the Spirit from miraculous power. It is here that Menzies seems to have gone beyond the evidence.

26 Turner, Power, 123 n. 12, rightly notes that the changes in Tg. Neb. Is. 63:10-11 from ‘Spirit’ to ‘Memra’ (the divine word or command) is not motivated by the desire to reduce the ethical aspect of the Spirit’s work, since the same kind of changes also occur in Tg. Neb. Is. 30:1, 48:16, and 63:14 where the Spirit in the MT stands more for the divine presence or the prophetic word than for his ethical work (cf. also Tg. Neb. Hag. 2:5; Zc. 7:12). More significant are two texts (also noted by Turner, Power, 123): Tg. Neof. Gn. 6:3 (I have put my Spirit in the sons of man because they are flesh and their deeds are evil) and Tg. Ps.-J. Gn. 6:3 (Did I not put my Holy Spirit in them that they might perform good deeds?). Both of these link the Spirit with good or evil deeds more than MT Gn. 6:3 (My Spirit will not contend with man forever, for he is flesh).

27 For a fuller treatment, see Turner, ‘Ethical/Religious Life’, 173-86; Power, 121-37.

28 Menzies, Development, 301 (criticising Vos).
consequences, but this should not be confused with the Spirit who produces direct ethical effects. The difference might be evident in a contrast between Paul and the Wisdom of Solomon:

For Paul the Spirit is the power of God which transforms him in his innermost being; for The Wisdom of Solomon wisdom is the teacher who instructs regarding God’s paths (7:22; 8:9; 9:10-11; 10:10). A man learns wisdom, but the Spirit seizes him. Thus, all the statements of The Wisdom of Solomon and of Paul, as similar as they may appear, have an entirely different meaning.29

Such a sharp distinction, however, is probably overdrawn. On the one hand, it is not obvious why prophetic revelation or instruction could not seize or grip a person deeply in the way Gunkel understands it. A number of biblical cases point in this direction: Nathan and David (2 Sa. 12:1-15), Elijah and Ahab (1 Ki. 21:20-29), Azariah and Asa (2 Chr. 15:1-15), and Jonah and the people of Nineveh (Jon. 3:5-9; cf. Je. 20:7-9; Am. 3:8; Mi. 3:8). On the other hand, wisdom and the Spirit are often closely connected in Judaism so that the two should probably not be contrasted sharply. After all, the Spirit is known as ‘the Spirit of wisdom’ in a number of Jewish texts (Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9; Is. 11:2; LXX Ex. 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Is. 11:2; Tg. Onk. Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9; Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9; Tg. Neof. Ex. 28:3; Dt. 34:9; Tg. Neb. Is. 11:2; I En. 49:3; 61:11; Wis. 7:7).30

Given the fact that wisdom in the Old Testament and Judaism is not merely technical and esoteric (Menzies’ emphasis), but also highly moral and religious,31 and that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom (Jb. 28:28; Ps. 111:10; Pr. 1:7; 3:7; 9:10; Sir. 1:11-20; 19:20; cf. Pr. 2:1-22; Philo Gig. 47; 53-57; Wis. 7:7-14, 22-28; 8:4; 9:10-18), the Isaianic tradition concerning the Davidic messiah is entirely consistent with the rest of Judaism when it speaks both of ‘the Spirit of wisdom and understanding’ and ‘the Spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord’ (Is. 11:2). The Spirit of ethical

30 Note also Gn. 41:38-39; Dn. 4:18; 5:11, 14; LXX Dt. 34:9; Dn. 4:15; 5:11-14; 1QH 9:30-32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 1QS 4:18-22; 1QSB 5:25; Joseph and Asenath 4:7; Josephus Ant. 10.239; Jub. 40:5; Philo Gig. 24, 47; Jos. 116-17; Pss. Sol. 17,37, 18; Sir. 39:6; T. Levi 2:3; Tg. Ps.-J. Ex. 31:3; 35:31; Tg. Neof. Ex. 31:3; 35:31; Wis. 9:17.
living, therefore, belongs together with the Spirit of prophecy and the Spirit of wisdom.\textsuperscript{32}

Third, both the LXX and the Targums follow the MT in associating the Spirit with deliverance from national enemies, as in the cases of Israel’s judges and kings (LXX Judg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 15:14; 1 Kgdms. 11:6; 16:13; Ps. 50:11; Is. 11:2; Tg. Neb. Judg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 15:14; 1 Sa. 11:6; 16:13; Ps. 51:13; Is. 11:2), and in associating the Spirit with divine guidance and life as in the cases of Israel’s prophets and priests (LXX 3 Kgdms. 22:24; 2 Chr. 15:1; 20:14; 24:20; Ne. 9:20, 30; Is. 32:15; 44:3; Ezek. 37:6, 14; Mi. 3:8; Ze. 7:12; Tg. Neb. 1 Ki. 22:24; 2 Chr. 15:1; 20:14; 24:20; Is. 32:15; 44:3; Ezek. 37:14; Mi. 3:8). Moreover, there are other Jewish texts which link the Spirit with salvation in one way or another (e.g., 1QH 7:6-7; 9:30-32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 16:6-12; 1QS 8:14-16; 1QSa 5:25; 4Q504; CD 2:11-13; Bib. Ant. 27:9-10; 36:2; Jub. 5:8; 40:5; Philo Gig. 55; Decal. 175; Virt. 217; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; Sir. 48:12-14; Wis. 9:17-18).\textsuperscript{33}

Schweizer and Menzies could no doubt point out that in most of the cases above, the Spirit is not given to all Israel but only to a few individuals within Israel for divinely appointed tasks.\textsuperscript{34} This is true, but it does not follow that the gift of the Spirit is, therefore, ‘not viewed as a soteriological necessity’.\textsuperscript{35} What is significant is that these appointed tasks have soteriological relevance for the people of Israel. The judges and kings are raised up by God to save Israel from her enemies, and the prophets, priests, and sages (notably Solomon and the wisdom literatures that bear his name)\textsuperscript{36} are raised up by God to guide and instruct Israel to live in piety and righteousness so that they might enjoy the full blessings of a holy God.

One of Menzies’ main difficulties is his virtual identification of salvation with God’s initial gift of forgiveness of sins to a person.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{32} Note the wisdom terminology in Is. 11:2 (wisdom, understanding, counsel, knowledge). Given these more or less synonymous terms, it would not be inappropriate to speak of the ethical ‘Spirit of wisdom’ here. It is no wonder that 1 En. 62:1-2, following this Isaianic tradition, sums it up by calling the Spirit ‘the Spirit of righteousness’. So Turner, ‘Ethical/Religious Life’, 185; Power, 132.

\textsuperscript{33} For fuller treatments, see Hui, ‘Concept’, 227-43; Turner, ‘Pentecostal Paradigms’, 81-86.

\textsuperscript{34} Menzies, Development, 76, 112; Schweizer, ‘Pneu’ma’, 6.412.

\textsuperscript{35} Menzies, Development, 112.

\textsuperscript{36} G.G. O’Collins, ‘Salvation’, ABD, 5.909, rightly notes that ‘Salvation comes through the gift of wisdom (Prov 1:20-2:22; 8:1-36; Wis 8:2-9:18)’, and we have already seen the close relationship between the Spirit and wisdom.

\textsuperscript{37} Menzies, Development, 184, 206-207, 248, 267, 275, 279.
But this is too negative and too individualistic. Too negative, because salvation is a far more comprehensive term. It goes beyond the forgiveness of sins (negative aspect) and ‘means nothing less than wholeness of body and mind’ (positive aspect). Too individualistic, because ‘Judaism was not primarily a religion of individual salvation’. In Judaism, salvation is nothing less than the full restoration of Israel which would include the gathering of the twelve tribes in the land of Israel, the conversion or subjugation of the Gentiles, a purified and glorified Jerusalem with its temple, and purity and righteousness in Israel’s worship and lifestyle.

Thus, we may conclude that in Judaism, the divine Spirit is simultaneously the Spirit of prophecy (or the Spirit of revelation), the Spirit of wisdom, the Spirit of power, the Spirit of ethical living (or the Spirit of righteousness), and the Spirit of salvation and life. Given that some of the functions and effects of the Spirit tend to overlap (revelation-wisdom and righteousness-salvation; power and deliverance-salvation), no sharp distinction should be made between the various descriptions of the Spirit.

III. Pauline Pneumatology

If we are on the right track with respect to the Spirit in Judaism, we need to ask two questions with respect to Pauline pneumatology. First, in what ways is Paul similar to Judaism? Second, in what ways is Paul different from Judaism? With these in mind, we shall look in turn at the Spirit and prophecy, defining ‘prophecy’ broadly here to include revelation, wisdom, charismatic praise, and inspired utterances (section A), the Spirit and power (section B), the Spirit and ethical living or righteousness (section C), and the Spirit and salvation or life (section D).

A. The Spirit and Prophecy

There is little question that, like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy. The more obvious Pauline passages are 1 Corinthians 12:1-14:40 and 1 Thessalonians 5:19-20 (cf. Rom. 12:3-6; Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11). Here, prophecy is one of the gifts or manifestations of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:10; 13:2, 8; 14:1-40; cf. Rom. 12:6), and to despise prophecies is to quench the Spirit (1 Thes. 5:19-20). Three other Pauline passages are also worth mentioning. In 1 Corinthians 14:37, a prophet is more or less equated with a Spirit-inspired person (cf. Ho. 9:7). In 2 Thessalonians 2:2, ‘by Spirit’ is generally taken to mean prophetic utterance, and NIV even translates it as ‘by some prophecy’. In 1 Timothy 4:1-3, while there is some doubt as to whether a specific oracle is in view, there is no doubt about the revelatory function of the Spirit who speaks. Not surprisingly, the Spirit-inspired prophet is a key figure in the Pauline churches (1 Cor. 12:28, 29; 14:37, Eph. 2:20; 3:5; 4:11).

What is less sure is whether by ‘prophecy’ Paul is thinking primarily of immediate Spirit-inspired prophetic utterance or of non-charismatic communication-report of revelation previously given by the Spirit. 1 Corinthians 14:6, with its distinction between ‘revelation’, ‘knowledge’, ‘prophecy’, and ‘teaching’, points in the direction of spontaneous prophetic utterance (note also 1 Cor. 14:24-25; 2 Thes. 2:2). Indeed, the Pauline contrast between ‘prophecy’ and ‘tongues’ in 1 Corinthians 14:1-40 suggests that what we have here is a contrast between two forms of spontaneous speech: prophecy as spontaneous intelligible speech, and tongues as spontaneous unintelligible speech. If this is so, then there is a stronger tendency for spontaneous prophetic utterance in the Pauline churches than in Judaism.

---

41 Whether Rom. 12:3-6 should be put alongside 1 Cor. 12:1-14:40 and 1 Thes. 5:19-20 is a moot question, since χάρισμα by itself means ‘gift’ rather than ‘spiritual gift’ or ‘gift of the Spirit’. See Fee, Presence, 32-35, 606-7; Turner, Spiritual Gifts, 264-67, 271-73.
42 Fee, Presence, 74 n. 135.
43 Aune, Prophecy, 289-90, thinks so. Fee, Presence, 769, is less certain.
44 For a distinction between the two, see Turner, ‘Preaching’, 74-75, 85-86.
45 D.A. Carson, Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) 103; W.A. Grudem, The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians (Lanham: UPA, 1982) 138-39. Fee, Presence, 225, however, thinks that the difference between the four terms ‘is not at all clear’.
46 Turner, Power, 98-99, notes that while milder spontaneous prophetic utterance tends to appear in Palestinian Jewish writings, the more strongly invasive form is more characteristic of Hellenistic Jewish writings (especially in Josephus and
Similarly, there is little question that like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the Spirit of wisdom and revelation. The more obvious Pauline passages are 1 Corinthians 2:10-16, 12:1-14:40, Ephesians 1:17, 3:3-5, and Colossians 1:9. Here, the Spirit reveals divine wisdom (1 Cor. 2:6-16; Eph. 1:17; 3:3-5; Col. 1:9), hidden mysteries (1 Cor. 2:7; 13:2; Eph. 3:3-5), specific revelations (1 Cor. 14:6, 24-26, 29-33; Eph. 1:17), and special knowledge (1 Cor. 12:8; 13:2, 8; 14:6). Thus, not surprisingly, the Spirit is called the ‘Spirit of wisdom and revelation’ (Eph. 1:17).

In view of this, it seems not unreasonable to assume that at least some of the ‘visions’ and ‘revelations’ (1 Cor. 9:1; 15:8; 2 Cor. 4:6; 12:1, 7; Gal. 1:12, 16; 2:2), as well as the ‘mysteries’ (Rom. 11:25; 1 Cor. 4:1; 15:51; Eph. 3:9; 5:32; 6:19; Col. 1:26-27; 4:3), mentioned by Paul form part and parcel of the Spirit’s revelatory work. This is especially so since there are indications that Paul is aware of the fulfilment of Joel’s promise that the Spirit of prophecy would be poured out upon the eschatological people of God, granting them ‘visions’ and ‘dreams’ (Rom. 5:5; Tit. 3:6; cf. LXX Joel 3:1-2; Acts 2:17-18, 33; 10:45).47

Likewise, there is little question that, like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the Spirit of charismatic praise. The more obvious Pauline passages are 1 Corinthians 12:1-14:40, Ephesians 5:18-19, and Colossians 3:16. Here, the Spirit enables charismatic singing to God (1 Cor. 14:15; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; cf. 1 Cor. 12:10, 28; 13:1; 14:2, 14), as well as to each other (1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16).48 Both 1 Corinthians 12-14 and Ephesians 5:18-19 are important since they suggest that Spirit-inspired singing is seen to be one of the characteristic signs of being filled with the Spirit. At this point, Pauline pneumatology appears to come out stronger than Judaism since the latter does not emphasise this aspect of the Spirit to the same

---

47 Note the common reference to the outpouring (ejkcevw) of the Spirit in these passages.

48 A.T. Lincoln, Ephesians (Dallas: Word, 1990) 346, is probably right in taking ‘spiritual’ to qualify all three terms of ‘psalms and hymns and songs’ (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16) which would cover all forms of Christian hymnody, spontaneous or otherwise. For possible examples of these hymns which edify the church, see Eph. 5:14; Phil. 2:6-11; Col. 1:15-20; and 1 Tim. 3:16.
degree.\textsuperscript{49} This is all the more so if we take into account the fact that in Paul charismatic praise probably includes singing in tongues (1 Cor. 14:15; cf. Acts 2:4; 10:46; 19:6).\textsuperscript{50} The references to wisdom and understanding in Ephesians 5:15-19 is also worth noting, since it suggests that the Spirit of charismatic praise is none other than the Spirit of wisdom.

Somewhat similar to the case of charismatic praise is that of charismatic praying. The more obvious Pauline passages are Romans 8:15-16, 26-27, 1 Corinthians 14:14-15, Galatians 4:6, and Ephesians 6:18. Here, the Spirit enables the charismatic cry of sonship (Rom. 8:15-16; Gal. 4:6), as well as other forms of charismatic address or praying to God (Rom. 8:26-27; 1 Cor. 14:14-15; Eph. 6:18). Both the cry of sonship and the exhortation to pray in the Spirit in Ephesians 6:18 suggest that Spirit-inspired praying is also one of the characteristic signs of the presence of the Spirit. At this point, the difference between Paul and Judaism is even greater than before, since the latter seems to lack any obvious interest in this aspect of the Spirit.\textsuperscript{51}

The case of charismatic preaching and teaching is not as simple. The more obvious Pauline passages are Romans 12:7-8, 15:18-19, 1 Corinthians 2:4-5, 12:28-29, 14:6, 26, 2 Corinthians 3:1-4:6, 6:6-7, Ephesians 4:11, Colossians 3:16, and 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6. Here, the Spirit is the source of inspiration, either more generally for people’s ministry of proclamation and instruction (Rom. 15:18-19; 1 Cor. 12:28-29; 2 Cor. 3:1-4:6; 6:6-7; Eph. 4:11; cf. Eph. 3:7), or more specifically for their charismatic preaching (1 Cor. 2:4-5; 1 Thes. 1:5-6) and teaching (Rom. 12:7-8; 1 Cor. 14:6, 26; Col. 3:16; cf. Col. 1:28-29). 1 Corinthians 2:4-5 and 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6 are important since they make the contrast between human words and divine Spirit/power. What is being emphasised is the fact that the readers had the common experience ‘of being addressed by God’s Spirit, of being


\textsuperscript{50} There is considerable doubt concerning whether /\textit{T. Job} 48-50 is a true Jewish parallel to these Pauline passages. See Turner, \textit{Power}, 100; /\textit{Spiritual Gifts}, 12 n. 22, 236.

\textsuperscript{51} Some possible references are 1QH 16:11-12, b. /\textit{Ber}. 31b-32a, and Sir. 39:6. But ‘the spirit’ by which the speaker implores God in 1QH 16:11 could be a human, even if renewed, spirit and not the Holy Spirit. See Hui, ‘Concept’, 233-37.
grasped by divine power,…of being compelled with a whole-hearted conviction to accept and affirm Paul’s message’.52

The difference between Paul and Judaism at this point is more difficult to judge. On the one hand, Schweizer and Menzies claim that Judaism sees the Spirit as the source of prophetic inspiration, including authoritative preaching and inspired speech. On the other hand, Turner argues that, unlike early Christianity, Judaism does not make any clear connection between the Spirit and charismatic preaching (defined as expository discourse or address). On the whole, Turner is right, in that most of Menzies’ references do not link the Spirit directly with prophetic proclamation or speech (manner) but rather with prophetic revelation (content), and the remaining texts are rather ambiguous.53

The problem, however, is not solved completely in this way. On the one hand, in our earlier discussion of the Spirit of ethical living in Judaism we have seen that, contrary to Gunkel, prophetic revelation and instruction could seize or grip people deeply, as in the biblical cases of Nathan and David, Elijah and Ahab, Azariah and Asa, and Jonah and the people of Nineveh. On the other hand, one of the major effects of the Spirit of wisdom is the charismatic teaching of the sage, who ‘will pour forth words of wisdom of his own…[and] many will praise his understanding’ (Sir. 39:6-9 [NRSV]). Similarly, Wisdom of Solomon 9:17-18 speaks of people being ‘taught’ by Spirit-wisdom (cf. 1 Cor. 2:13), presumably through a sage such as Solomon. An obvious example of this kind of charismatic teaching would be the Teacher of Righteousness, who believed himself to be endowed with the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in order that he might instruct and so lead the Qumran community (cf. 1QH 9:30-32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 16:6-7, 11-12; 1QS 4:18-22). Thus, while there appears to be a discernible difference between early Christianity and Judaism in terms of charismatic preaching (a more specific form of charismatic teaching), this is less true in terms of charismatic teaching in general.

B. The Spirit and Power

When it comes to the relationship between the Spirit and power, again there is little question that like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the

53 Some possible references to prophetic speech (manner) rather than prophetic revelation (content) are ‘Abot R. Nat. A. 34, Midrash Haggadol on Gn. 24:2, and Philo Virt. 217. But even these are being questioned by Turner, Power, 101-103; ‘Preaching’, 80-87.
Spirit of power. The more obvious Pauline passages are Romans 15:19, 1 Corinthians 2:4-5, 12:9-10, 28-29, 2 Corinthians 3:1-18, 6:6-7, Galatians 3:5, Ephesians 3:16, 1 Thessalonians 1:5, and 2 Timothy 1:6-8. Here, the Spirit is the source of power either more generally behind Paul’s ministry (Rom. 15:19; 2 Cor. 3:1-18; 6:6-7; cf. Eph. 3:7; Col. 1:29), or more specifically for works of healings and miracles (1 Cor. 12:9-10, 28-30; 13:2; Gal. 3:5; cf. 2 Cor. 12:9, 12) and other Spirit-inspired deeds or qualities such as charismatic preaching and boldness (1 Cor. 2:4-5; Eph. 3:16; 2 Tim. 1:6-8; cf. Rom. 15:13; Eph. 6:18-19; Col. 4:3-4).54 Given this close association between the Spirit and power, it is not surprising to find the Spirit being described as the Spirit of power (2 Tim. 1:7).55

Judaism is not wholly different though the emphasis appears to be on military might rather than on miraculous power as in Paul. Thus, the Spirit is the source of power either behind the military might of the judges and the messiah (LXX Judg. 6:34; 11:29; Is. 11:2; 1 En. 49:3; 1QSB 5:25; 4Q161; Bib. Ant. 27:9-10; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7; Tg. Neb. Judg. 14:6; 15:14; Is. 11:2), or for miraculous acts (LXX 4 Kgdms. 2:9-15; Josephus Ant. 8.408; Sir. 48:12-14; Tg. Neb. 2 Ki. 2:9-15), or for other events or qualities such as being lifted, being transformed, prophecy, courage, and moral strength (1QH 7:6-7; 16:6-7; 2 Apoc. Bar. 6:3; Bib. Ant. 36:2; Josephus Ant. 6.223; Philo Virt. 217; Sir. 48:24; Tg. Neb. 1 Sa. 11:6; 1 Chr. 12:19; Ezk. 8:3; 11:1).

C. The Spirit and Ethical Living

Similarly, there is little question that like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the Spirit of ethical or religious living. The more obvious

54 Scholars are divided over 1 Thes. 1:5. Some (Marshall, Wanamaker) take it to mean power for works of miracles, others (Best, Bruce, Dunn, Fee, Fung) take it to mean power for charismatic preaching.

55 It is somewhat surprising to find Fee consistently dissociating the Spirit from resurrection power (see, e.g., Presence, 553, 735, 790, 808-11) especially in view of the OT motif of the Spirit of creation and life (Ps. 104:30, Is. 32:15, 44:3, Ezk. 37:1-14) and the frequent juxtaposition of Spirit and power terminologies in Paul (both recognised by Fee, Presence, 35-36, 906-907). Eph. 1:19-20 is worth noting since the power at work in the believers is taken to be the same power which raised Jesus from the dead. If, as Fee repeatedly argues, the Spirit is the very power at work in the believers, then the power that raised Jesus must also somehow be related to the divine Spirit. Similarly, if the Spirit determines both the present eschatological existence of the believer (Rom. 8:23; 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Gal. 3:3; 5:25; Eph. 1:14) and his future eschatological existence (Rom. 8:10; 1 Cor. 15:44-46; Gal. 6:8) it would be reasonable to think that he is somehow related to the power of resurrection that bridges the two eschatological existences.
Pauline passages are Romans 2:29, 7:4-6, 8:1-13, 14:17, 15:30, 1 Corinthians 6:18-20, 2 Corinthians 3:1-18, Galatians 3:3, 4:29, 5:13-6:10, Ephesians 4:17-32, 5:15-21, Philippians 3:3, Colossians 1:8-12, 1 Thessalonians 4:3-8, and 2 Timothy 1:7. Here, the Spirit stands in opposition to sin (Rom. 7:5; 1 Cor. 6:9-11, 18-20; Gal. 5:19-21; Eph. 4:17-32; 5:15-21) and flesh-Torah (Rom. 2:29; 7:4-6; 8:1-13; 2 Cor. 3:1-18; Gal. 3:3; 4:29; 5:13-6:10; Phil. 3:3), and brings forth ethical qualities such as righteousness, love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control, holiness, and endurance (Rom. 14:17; 15:30; Gal. 5:22; Eph. 4:24; Col. 1:8, 11; 1 Thes. 4:3; 2 Tim. 1:7).56

There are some obvious similarities between Paul and Judaism at this point. In Judaism, the Spirit also stands in contrast to sin (LXX Mi. 3:8-10; I En. 67:10; 1QH 7:6-7; 14:12-14, 25-26; T. Levi 2:3-4; T. Benj. 8:1-3; Tg. Neof. Gn. 6:3; Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 15:1-19; Mi. 3:8-12) and flesh (Philo Gig. 28-31; Quod Deus 2; Quis Her. 57; cf. LXX Gn. 6:4; Jub. 5:8; Tg. Neof. Gn. 6:3), and brings forth ethical qualities such as righteousness, love, joy, peace, goodness, faithfulness, compassion, mercy, and godliness (LXX Is. 11:1-5; 32:15-17; 61:1-3; I En. 62:2; Philo Gig. 55; Pss. Sol. 17:37; 18:7-8; T. Sim. 4:4; T. Benj. 8:1-3; Tg. Ps.-J. Gn. 6:3; Tg. Neb. 2 Chr. 15:1-19; Is. 11:1-5; 32:15-17; 44:1-5; 61:1-3; Wis. 9:18).

More important is the common understanding between Paul and Qumran in that it is the Spirit of wisdom and understanding that promotes ethical and religious living. In 1QH, the psalmist thanks God for the gift of the Spirit by which he is upheld and does not stumble (7:6-7), is brought to submission (12:11-13), is purified (16:11-12), and is drawn near to God (14:12-13; 16:11-12). Here, the psalmist is primarily thinking of the Spirit of wisdom and understanding (9:30-32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 16:6-7). What the Spirit reveals, however, is not some esoteric wisdom and understanding having nothing to do with ethical living, ‘but the sort of understanding of God and of his word that elicits righteous living.’57

The case of Paul is similar. Romans 8:14 and Galatians 5:18 speak of believers being led by the Spirit within an ethical context (cf. Philo Gig. 55). If we ask how they are being led, an obvious answer lies in 1 Corinthians 2:6-16, 12:1-14:40, Ephesians 4:1-16, 5:15-21, and

---

56 We should probably not include 1 Thes. 1:6 here since it appears to be a charismatic joy or a special gift of the Spirit for persecuted believers rather than as a fruit of the Spirit for growing believers.

57 Turner, Power, 128 (his emphasis).
Colossians 1:9-12. It is through the charismatic teaching of the apostles, prophets, and teachers (such as Paul in 1 Cor. 7:40 and elsewhere) and the Spirit-given wisdom and understanding within each believer that they come to know God and so learn to live righteously before him.

Victor Furnish, however, does not think that the Spirit is ‘the means by which the individual Christian is enabled to discern God’s will in the midst of the various complex decision-situations in which he is daily involved’. But this appears to overlook the motif of the Spirit of prophecy who grants divine wisdom and revelation. It would be better to say that, for Paul, ‘the Spirit of God engages the believer at every level of his being and receptivity: internally, in his heart and mind with charismatic wisdom and revelation; and externally, through charismatic teaching and exhortation given by the Spirit-inspired people of the Christian community.’

Despite these similarities, there are at least two fundamental differences between Paul and Judaism at this point. First, the Spirit in Judaism stands alongside rather than in contrast to the Torah (see, e.g., 1QH 12:11-13; 16:6-7; 1QS 8:16; CD 2:12; Dt. Rab. 6:14; Midr. Ps. 14:6; Philo Decal. 175; Sir. 39:6-8; cf. Sir. 19:20; 24:3-23; Wis. 18:4). Indeed, Paul’s antithesis between Spirit and Torah is somewhat unique and forms ‘part of his distinctive contribution to New Testament pneumatology’.

Second, in contrast to Philo and the rest of Judaism, the Pauline antithesis between the Spirit and flesh is an apocalyptic or eschatological dualism. This apocalyptic or eschatological dualism brings us to a key theme in Pauline pneumatology. In contrast to the ‘flesh’ which belongs to the present evil age (Gal. 1:4), the Spirit in Paul is the Spirit of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:3-18; 1 Thes. 4:8; cf. Je. 31:31-34; Ezek. 36:23-28; Jub. 1:22-25; 1 Cor. 11:25) and new creation (Rom. 8:23; 1 Cor. 15:44-46; 2 Cor. 1:22; 5:5; Eph. 1:14),

59 Hui, ‘Concept’, 283. For a more detailed interaction with Furnish and Deidun, see Hui, ‘Concept’, 273-84.
60 Turner, Spiritual Gifts, 118. We should perhaps add that the Pauline antithesis of the Spirit and Torah is not always absolute (Rom. 7:12-14; cf. Rom. 3:31; Gal. 5:13-23).
that brings new eschatological existence-life to the believer (Rom. 6:4; 7:6; 1 Cor. 5:7; 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15; Eph. 2:15; 4:24; Col. 3:10; cf. Ezk. 37:14).  

In fulfilling these Old Testament promises, the Spirit is none other than the eschatological return of God to his new temple (1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19; Eph. 2:22; cf. 2 Cor. 6:16) and the permanent dwelling or presence of God in the midst of his eschatological people (Rom. 5:5; 8:9-11, 23; 1 Cor. 2:12; 3:16; 14:24-25; 2 Cor. 1:21; 5:5; 6:16; Gal. 3:2-5; Eph. 1:13; 4:30; 1 Thes. 4:8; 2 Tim. 1:14; Tit. 3:6; cf. Is. 45:14; 63:10; Ezk. 37:27).  

Given this conceptual background of the divine presence in the midst of the people of God and the connection between Ephesians 4:30 and Isaiah 63:10, we should probably see LXX Isaiah 63:8-14, which speaks of God being present with his people through his Holy Spirit and of God leading (ἀγω) his people through the wilderness, as the Old Testament passage standing behind Romans 8:14 and Galatians 5:18. In other words, Paul sees the presence and leading of the Spirit in the believers as the presence and leading of God who is even now effecting a new exodus out of the present evil age for his eschatological people (cf. Rom. 10:5-8; 1 Cor. 5:7; 10:1-13; 2 Cor. 3:1-4:6; 6:16-18; Tit. 2:14). No wonder, for Paul, the Spirit who is the presence and power of God that effects new covenant obedience promised in the Old Testament (Je. 31:31-34; Ezk. 36:23-28), is the necessary and sufficient factor in the believers’ ethical living. In place of the Torah, the Spirit has become the dominant identity marker of the eschatological people of God (2 Cor. 1:22; Eph. 1:13; 4:30; cf. Rom. 8:9, 14-15; Gal. 3:14; 4:6).

D. The Spirit and Salvation
Likewise, there is little question that, like Judaism, Paul views the Spirit as the Spirit of salvation and life. The more obvious Pauline passages are Romans 7:6, 8:2-13, 15:16, 1 Corinthians 6:11, 15:44-
46, 2 Corinthians 3:6-9, Galatians 4:29, 5:25, 6:8, 2 Thessalonians 2:13, and Titus 3:5. Here, the Spirit is the agent of washing or sanctification or justification (Rom. 15:16; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Cor. 3:8-9; 2 Thes. 2:13; Tit. 3:5), and the giver of eschatological life, whether present (Rom. 7:6; 8:2-10; 2 Cor. 3:6; Gal. 4:29; 5:25; Tit. 3:5) or future (Rom. 8:13; 1 Cor. 15:44-46; Gal. 6:8).

The more obvious parallel comes again from Qumran, where the Spirit of wisdom and revelation is not only the inspirer of ethical or religious living but also the agent of purification (1QH 16:11-12; 1QS 3:7; 4:21). But how does the Spirit cleanse and purify the community? The answer seems to lie in the 'knowledge’ and ‘truth’ of God as revealed by the Spirit to the community (1QH 9:30-32; 12:11-13; 14:12-13, 25; 16:6-7; 1QS 3:6-9; 4:18-23). It is through these that the community felt that they were being cleansed and purified by the Holy Spirit, and so became a house of truth (1QS 2:24; 4:5-6; 5:5-6; 8:9; 9:3) and a holy congregation (5:13, 20; 8:5, 21; 9:2, 6). Thus, ‘the revelatory Spirit is simultaneously the soteriological Spirit; the very basis of the transformed “life” and sustained righteousness of the restored community’.  

A similar concept appears in the Pauline epistles. As we have noted above, the Spirit is the agent of washing, sanctification, and justification. But how does he do it? The answer appears to lie in the charismatic preaching of people such as Paul (1 Cor. 2:1-5; 2 Cor. 3:1-18; 1 Thes. 1:5-6). It is the Spirit-inspired and faith-arousing preaching of Paul that led the believers to ‘faith’ in the ‘gospel’ or ‘word’ of ‘truth’ and so effected salvation or sanctification (Rom. 15:16-19; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Cor. 2:14-4:6; Eph. 5:26; 2 Thes. 2:13-14; Tit. 3:4-7; cf. Jn. 13:10; 15:3; Acts 10:15; 15:9; 22:16). 1 Corinthians 6:11 is significant because here we have two agents of salvation or sanctification: Jesus Christ as the objective agent effecting salvation through his sacrifice on the cross and the Spirit of God as the subjective agent effecting sanctification in the life of the individual believer.

---


Despite these similarities between Paul and Judaism (especially Qumran), there are also some fundamental differences. First, the means of sanctification is not the same. For Qumran, it is the sectarian interpretation of the Law that is the truth. For Paul, the gospel of Jesus Christ is the truth (2 Cor. 4:1-6; 6:7; Gal. 2:5, 14; Eph. 1:13; Col. 1:5). This also leads to the next major difference. Second, the Spirit in Paul is not only the Spirit of God but also the Spirit of Christ (Rom. 8:9; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19), who mediates the presence and power of Christ (Rom. 8:9-10; 1 Cor. 2:6-16; 12:5; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 3:16-17; 4:7-11), and recreates Christ, the last Adam or the new man, in the believers (Rom. 8:29; 13:14; 1 Cor. 15:45-49; Gal. 3:27; 4:19; Eph. 4:22-24; Col. 3:9-11). Third, salvation is no longer a matter of defeating national enemies such as the Romans and their Jewish collaborators, but spiritual forces such as Satan (1 Cor. 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:11; 4:4; Eph. 2:2; 6:11-12; 1 Thes. 2:18), sin (Rom. 5:12-8:11; 1 Cor. 15:56), flesh (Rom. 8:1-17; Gal. 5:13-6:10), and death (Rom. 5:12-21; 1 Cor. 15:25-26, 54-57). It is against these that both Jesus and the Spirit, the two agents of eschatological salvation, are involved (Rom. 8:2; 1 Cor. 6:11; 2 Cor. 2:14-4:6; Eph. 2:11-22; Phil. 3:3). Fourth, neither is salvation a matter of the gathering of the twelve tribes in the land of Israel and the subjugation of the Gentiles under Jewish rule, but a matter of the gathering of the Jewish and Gentile believers in the body of Christ through the Spirit of unity (1 Cor. 3:16-17; 12:4-13; Eph. 2:18-22; 4:3-4; cf. Acts 10:47; 11:15; 15:8).

IV. Conclusion

It seems that there are considerably similarities between the Spirit of prophecy in Judaism and Pauline pneumatology. The charismatic gifts of the Spirit in Paul could be seen as standing in essential continuity with the Spirit of prophecy and power within Judaism (section III.A & B). The ethical fruit of the Spirit mentioned in various Pauline epistles (especially Galatians) could be seen as standing in essential continuity with the Spirit of righteousness or ethical living within Judaism (section III.C). The sanctifying or life-giving work of the Spirit in

---

71 Hui, ‘Concept’, 45-90; Turner, Spiritual Gifts, 121-34.
72 The contrast between Paul and Judaism at this point is not an absolute one. Qumran, for example, speaks of the present reign of Belial (1QS 1:18; 24; 1QM 1:15; 13:4; cf. 2 Cor. 6:15). But there is clearly a difference of emphasis between the two.
Paul could be seen as standing in essential continuity with the Spirit of salvation and life within Judaism (section III.D).

The differences between the two, however, are not insignificant. There are at least three major developments from Judaism. First, there is the theme of eschatological fulfilment (section III.C & D). The Spirit is the Spirit of the new covenant fulfilling the divine promises of (1) his return and presence in the midst of his eschatological people, (2) his indwelling in their eschatological temple, (3) his writing of the Law in their hearts, and (4) his gift of eschatological salvation and life to them. Second, there is the theme of eschatological redefinition (section III.D). The Spirit is the Spirit of unity that unites the community of Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ, which is the redefined eschatological Israel, the people of God. Third, there is the theme of Christological emphasis (section III.D). The Spirit is not only the Spirit of God, but also the Spirit of Christ, the Jewish messiah and the last Adam and the eschatological new man. The eschatological people of God is even now being stamped with the image and life of this Christ by the Spirit. Yet, despite all these significant developments, Turner is right to say that the Pauline Spirit ‘is still recognisable as a theologically developed version of the “Spirit of prophecy”’.74

---