EQ

Evangelical Quarterly

An International Review of Bible and Theology

in Defence of the Historic Christian Faith

Vol. LXXXIII No. 1 January 2011

Editors: I Howard Marshall, John-Paul Lotz,
John G F Wilks

Paternoster:
thinking faith

EQ 83.1 (2011), 73–83

A rejoinder to Carsten Timothy Lotz

Youngmo Cho

Dr Youngmo Cho, who teaches at Asia Life University, Daejon, South Korea, responds to Carsten T. Lotz's evaluation of his book on the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts and Paul.

KEY WORDS: Luke-Acts, Paul, Pneumatology, Kingdom, Spirit

Introduction

I extend my appreciation to Carsten Timothy Lotz for taking the time to evaluate my work and also to the editors of the *Evangelical Quarterly* for allowing me to respond. I hope that my response will not only answer the objections and correct some misunderstandings made by my critic but also clarify some of the unclear parts of my book. Therefore, I welcome this opportunity to shed more light on the core of my arguments.[1]

Lotz's succinct summaries of each chapter are helpful in describing the contents of the book, but because they are brief and very selective, readers may not get a complete picture of what the book is about unless they themselves read it. Although the critique attempts to be the work of an impartial academician, it is biassed by its bent towards a particular author whose point of view has been debated and at times negated in the book. Lotz has attempted to critique this book with the aim of defending Max Turner's position; namely, the Spirit in the Intertestamental Period (ITP) is not limited to the Spirit of Prophecy and empowerment but is also related to soteriological aspects which Turner calls 'life giving'. By forcing the ITP literature into the life-giving function of the Spirit, Turner has tried to defend the uniformity between Luke and Paul's articulation of the work of the Spirit, which I have disputed, and in this critical evaluation, Lotz is taking the hits for Turner. But for the sake of academic clarity, Lotz should have rather limited himself to critiquing my work on *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul* instead of defending Turner.

As Lotz has rightly pointed out, the issue of the 'Spirit and Kingdom' which was raised by J. D. G. Dunn nearly four decades ago is still not dealt with by any other scholars in such detail as I have attempted in *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul*. However, instead of focusing on my central subject, the relationship of the Spirit and Kingdom in Luke and Paul, he moves away from it and focuses on some of the minor issues and makes them the major parts of his critique. The critical interaction should have been on whether I have been able to clarify the usage of the concept of the Spirit and Kingdom in these two

1 C.T. Lotz, 'A Critical Evaluation of Youngmo Cho: *Spirit and Kingdom in the Writings of Luke and Paul: An Attempt to Reconcile these Concepts*', *Evangelical Quarterly* 82 (April 2010), 124-41.

authors. The aim of the discussion in the book is primarily to explore the conceptual relationship between Luke and Paul rather than focusing on the unity or the disunity, though the latter aspect exists. But Lotz's critique attempts to bring in the issue of ITP and its vastness to question my well researched and duly presented material in which I have clarified how Luke and Paul have connected the concept of the Spirit and Kingdom in their own views.

However, there are legitimate questions which are raised and objections that are made, and therefore I feel it is important that I address them and point out the areas where Lotz appears to misconstrue my arguments.

1. The role of unity and diversity in the ITP and in Luke and Paul

In Chapter two of my book, I have thoroughly examined the ITP literature relating to the concept of the Spirit and given enough evidences to show how Turner's position of attributing the ethical or soteriological function to the Spirit during the ITP does not hold water. Lotz himself concedes that, although there is diverse use of the concept of the Spirit in this period, as is demonstrated by Turner's monograph, the soteriological aspect is not consistent; at best, it has only some limited soteriological implications.[2] The argument from the ITP literature was examined in my book and the conclusion was drawn that the Spirit which is given to the Messiah is for empowerment (*extraordinary wisdom*) and not for making the Messiah righteous (*life-giving wisdom*). I have consistently maintained in the book that the Spirit anoints the Messiah with the 'extraordinary wisdom' and not the 'life-giving wisdom'. This extraordinary wisdom is given to him by the Spirit to complete the messianic tasks; it is the Spirit of empowerment which is also seen in Jewish prophetic traditions prior to ITP literature. The ITP maintains the traditional Jewish concept of the Spirit as the Spirit of Prophecy or charismatic manifestation and Luke gives it its New Testament interpretation. The reason we see Luke drawing his understanding of the Spirit of Prophecy from ITP is the remarkable similarity between his and the ITP's understandings of the Spirit which I have tried to compare comprehensively in the book, whereas Paul sees the soteriological function of the Spirit (although the empowerment function is not absent from him). Certainly, Paul is not ignorant of the ITP literature but what he has written concerning the Spirit's soteriological function goes further than any ITP author had written. In drawing such conclusions, it was not my intention, as Lotz critiques, to make Paul and Luke antagonistic and the book does not make any such inferences; my aim had been to show that the two authors have different emphasises on the functions of the Spirit. Therefore, instead of creating the chasm of disunity in the New Testament, what I have done is simply to offer a comparison of these bodies of literature and allow readers to form their own conclusions: Luke sees the work of the Spirit in

2 Ibid., 126.

the area of empowerment for the proclamation of the kingdom of God and Paul sees the work of the Spirit in the area of the totality of life in the kingdom of God. The objections Lotz has against this view are tenuous for the following reasons:

First; he maintains that the distance in time is a factor for me not to have come to such conclusions. This is a hypothetical objection without any evidential value. According to Lotz, the ITP spans over 400 years, whereas Paul and Luke share 30 to 50 years together and therefore, due to this time factor, there must be more unity between Paul and Luke than among the varying ITP writings concerning the Spirit. He even thinks that it is inconceivable to have any literary unity among authors who live in such a long span of time. Granted that the time span of the ITP is longer than that of Paul and Luke, the time difference cannot be the factor to cause doubt about the unity or the diversity of the various authors. Neither the longer nor the shorter time span can be the only basis to create unity or diversity on this topic. What we have to do is to see the evidence itself that I have adequately presented in the book. A longer time span does not guarantee diversity and vice versa. My point in the book was not to argue for the homogeneity of the whole of the ITP literature; what I demonstrated was the lack of evidence for the function of the Spirit as the life-giving agent for soteriological purposes which Turner tried to argue for. The Spirit in the ITP is presented in line with the older Jewish tradition as the Spirit of Prophecy with little or no connotation for ethical or soteriological functions. This view has been taken up by Luke whereas Paul demonstrated a developed view of Spirit, not just empowerment and prophecy but also as the ethical and soteriological agent; which is clearly a major difference from what studies in Luke have shown so far. The close proximity of their chronology and the contemporary nature of their writings do not necessarily demand them to agree with one another; it can rather provide the platform to present a different point of view when both the authors live and write in the same time frame. Therefore, it suffices to say that forcing Luke and Paul to agree on the concept of the Spirit because they were contemporaries is an inadequate argument which does not do justice to their writings, and the same can be said of the ITP's concept of the Spirit just because it had longer span of time.

Second, for Lotz, the vastness of the body of literature of the ITP guarantees disunity and diversity; there cannot be such unanimity on the subject like the Spirit. As stated above, it was not my intention to unite the ITP literature, but to see if it offered any evidence for the soteriological function of the Spirit. The studies I have conducted and documented in the book show that there is no evidence for such aconcept of the Spirit in the ITP. Lotz's argument assumes that if the body of literature is vast enough, it will have many different views on any given topic and therefore, since the ITP is vast, it would surely have something to say about the soteriological function of the Spirit from which Paul draws in forming his concept of the Spirit. Lotz's attempt to show such evidence is a misinterpretation of some of those texts as we shall see in the next point of discussion below.

Third, Lotz believes that, because Luke and Paul knew each other, they must

agree in what they write and therefore, my conclusions of discovering two different aspects of the function of the Spirit in Luke and Paul are flawed. This cannot get any simpler; my argument is not an inquiry on how much they knew each other or whether they agreed on everything. What I have argued is based upon their writings. But even if we have to take Lotz's argument seriously, it gives us reason to believe that there are legitimate conceptual differences in their writings on the topic of the Spirit because they knew each other well. They differ from each other, not because they are against each other but because they need to complement each other. Luke writes hagiographically on Paul, but the text does not provide us with any evidence of either one of them mentoring the other or living in agreement on various arguments of the day. Paul is known to have differed from his fellow apostles, companions and friends on many occasions and it is not a surprise to see Luke presenting a different function of the Spirit which might have not been addressed by Paul or vice versa. Such conclusions are not based on imagination only as Lotz would like us to believe, but I have, along with other scholars demonstrated in the book that Luke's depiction of the work of the Holy Spirit is different from that of Paul and similar to that of the ITP literature.

2. My engagement with Turner, Dunn and historical exegetes

When Lotz defends Turner's position and attempts to critique my summary of him, his criticism is suspect. While his aim is to show the correctness of Turner's position on the ITP's concept of the Spirit as having the life-giving function or as a soteriological agent, in his second point, Lotz refutes himself by saying that Turner does not think that the life-giving function of the Spirit exists in the ITP as one of the main points; it only provides the seed for some future Christians to bring the concept to fruition.[3] While he referred in the title of his second critique to wider scholarly engagement with various names, he found no evidence that I had misrepresented any of them. He should have better titled his point as 'Cho's engagement with Turner' because his only concern is to defend Turner. He charges me of misrepresenting Turner, and creating a false antithesis by creating a straw man to shoot. This is a gross misrepresentation of my whole argument and engagement with Turner. The presence of the life-giving function of the Spirit of Prophecy in ITP, for which Turner vociferously argues, is a self-imposed interpretation of some of the texts which I have exegetically explained to show how they do not mean what Turner wishes them to mean. He interprets those texts backward with Pauline lenses and implies that, because the Spirit of Prophecy is present in certain individuals,for Turner that necessarily guarantees the moral or soteriological function of the Spirit. No, it does not. Those texts do not explicitly or implicitly express such conclusions. Jubilee's portrayal of Joseph is one such example on which Lotz bases his argument against me. Lotz believes that because Joseph has the Spirit of the Lord, he is a moral person. But

3 Ibid., 133.

the text does not say so. It says Joseph had extraordinary wisdom that was visible to Pharaoh and the reason such wisdom is present is because the Spirit of the Lord gave him that wisdom. But Lotz wants to see this through Christian lenses and wants to believe that, since the Spirit of the Lord is in Joseph, the Spirit must function as an ethical or soteriological agent for Joseph to live a morally right life. From the Genesis account of Joseph's life as well we cannot draw such a conclusion. What the Genesis accounts say is that God was with Joseph and he lived a moral and righteous life all the way from his boyhood to the ruler of Egypt and the Spirit of the Lord gave him the wisdom not only to interpret Pharaoh's dreams but also to govern well. This is what Jubilees is also trying to say, but Lotz wants to play with the effects in Joseph's life and want to believe that Jubilees talks about the function of the Spirit as life-giving and soteriological because Joseph was a righteous man; he believes that the very presence of the Spirit of Prophecy guarantees a life-giving or moral function, but the text does not say so and this is what my argument says. What happens when the Spirit comes? That is not the point, the point is; does ITP say that it is the Spirit who gives them life in the same way as we see Paul talking about it? Or do we see them saying that they have power to proclaim God's word because the Lord gave them his Spirit for that function?

The weakness in Lotz becomes obvious in one example where he charges me of creating a false antithesis. For this charge against me, he relies on his own interpretation of Jubilees 1:20-25. He quotes 1:20 where it says "I shall create for them a holy spirit". This 'holy spirit' is created, which can also be translated as "righteous/upright spirit" and comparing it with Psalm 51:10ff., it can also be a "clean spirit" that loves the law of the Lord and wants to remain faithful to him. Therefore, Jubilees 1:20-25 possibly talks about the condition of the human spirit which is created by God and nowhere does the text imply that it is the Spirit of the Lord or the function of the Spirit of Prophecy.[4] It is God creating in them a clean spirit, but Lotz wants to see in the text what is not there; namely the function of the Spirit of Prophecy as life-giving and moral agent. By equating this spirit in 1:20-25 with the Spirit of the Lord in 40:5ff; Lotz has misinterpreted the text or has misunderstood it in the process of defending Turner's position. So, his attempt to label me as creating a straw man to shoot is rather a clumsy exegesis. My exegesis of the text and the representation of Turner's view will stand the academic test if one looks at them objectively.

4 Jubilees 1:20-25 mention God creating 'a holy (righteous) spirit' in man in response to Moses' prayer of protection for the Israelites from falling away from God. Levison takes this 'holy spirit' to be the human life itself. He even sees the 'holy spirit' in Psalms 51 to be the condition of human existence because of the spirit's parallelism with the human heart. John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 56-72. Also cf. David Lambert., 'Did Israel Believe That Redemption Awaited Its Repentance? The Case of *Jubilees* 1', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006), 631-50.

3. Defining the terms 'life-giving wisdom' and 'extraordinary wisdom', and 'kingdom of God'

Life-giving wisdom

The term is clear throughout the book as what it means and it is surprising to see how Lotz has some issues with it. It is a term which includes soteriological as well as ethical functions of the Spirit. From Paul's writings, this function of the Spirit is the ground and the necessity for salvation to take place; and it is not limited to the act of salvation alone, since this function of the Spirit continues in the life of the saved person. I have tried to show in the book that we do not find this function of the Spirit in the ITP, but Lotz believes this function to be there and tries to defend Turner by playing games with the word itself. In my book I have made it clear as to what I mean by this term and it is surprising to read Lotz's criticism. While he argues for Turner's position of this function of the Spirit in the ITP, one can hardly find any evidence of this term being used in the ITP. Lotz himself is confused while trying to defend Turner's position. Within the space of one statement he contradicts the same thing in defending Turner's position; he says 'the Spirit in the ITP was "soteriologically necessary", but not necessary for salvation'.[5] This is the crux of the matter which Lotz tries to get round by playing with the etymology of *soteria*; he wants his readers to believe his attempt to dichotomize the same term and charges me with grossly distorting Turner's view. If the Spirit is not necessary for salvation, then, what is he talking about when he says 'soteriological necessity'? If this dichotomy is true, Lotz, along with Turner, is equating salvation with morality. Turner argues as Lotz defends him, in terms of expectations; 'the Spirit was expected to work in tandem with the Messiah and the people of God… to realize and perfect the salvation already established by God through messiah'. This is not the ITP's view; it is Turner's or Lotz's, but there is no clarity as to what that means. For him salvation is already established by God without the necessity of the Spirit, and yet he defends Turner by saying 'the Spirit was expected' to work for salvation. Where this expectation is recorded in the ITP, he does not tell us. On the other hand, by conceding that the Spirit in the ITP was not necessary for salvation, he has gone ahead of my argument. I have said that the ITP does not record the necessity, but Lotz declares that for Turner it was not necessary. Yet, Turner defends this 'soteriological necessity', and the reason he sees this function of the Spirit in ITP is because of what 'could have happened' (or what is expected) in a person's life when the Spirit of Prophecy descends. It is a pre-suppositional statement that presupposes ethical improvement in the life of the person because she or he has the Spirit of Prophecy; but this hypothesis cannot be true since we do not see it being recorded in the ITP literature. Therefore, this function is attributed to the Spirit only in the New Testament and there mostly by Paul. Paul understands that one of the functions of the Spirit is to create the ground for salvation and lead the individual in moral

5 Lotz, Ibid., 135.

and ethical purity aided by the work of the Spirit. This life-giving wisdom of the Spirit functions in the process of sanctification; beyond the work of salvation and this is what Turner tries to allude when he says 'soteriologically necessary but not necessary for salvation'. I have argued in the book that we do not see such a concept of the Spirit in the ITP; we see this function made clear only in the writings of Paul, and Turner reads backward into the ITP what Paul writes about it. Luke on the other hand is not concerned about this function of the Spirit, but in line with the ITP's concept he is interested in the function of the Spirit which enables the Christians to live empowered lives and proclaim the kingdom in the power of the Spirit. It has been adequately argued in my book that Luke has taken the Jewish concept of the Spirit and given it a new dimension in which he focuses on the 'extraordinary wisdom' of the Spirit instead of the 'life-giving' function which we see in Paul.

Extraordinary wisdom

Lotz says that I have *never* defined this term. This is not correct, for I defined it (page 28, note 54). I used the term 'extraordinary wisdom' to incorporate the prophetic or charismatic functions of the Spirit that empower one to proclaim God's message. The term is used in order to square with the concept of 'life-giving wisdom', which, as we saw, indicates the soteriological and ethical functions of the Spirit. While I agree that the Spirit does have both functions, my intention in using 'extraordinary wisdom' is to demonstrate that the ITP literature understands the prophetic or the charismatic function of the Spirit and 'life-giving wisdom' is a New Testament innovation which Lotz understands perfectly. While we can assume the effects of the Spirit in ITP, what we do see is not the explicit mention of the life-giving work of the Holy Spirit but the Prophetic and Charismatic function for which I prefer the term 'extraordinary wisdom'. In this extraordinary wisdom, the Spirit inspires one to proclaim what God has done and said; it is a function of the Spirit in which he grants prophetic and charismatic insight with which Turner and Lotz agree by accepting that this has been the dominant function of the Spirit in the ITP. After acknowledging its dominance, they fail to take into account the empowered actions or the ability of the ones who receive the Spirit of prophecy, and on the other hand, they see ethical implication of the Spirit of prophecy even though the texts are silent on this. By using the term 'extraordinary wisdom' I have attempted to explain not only the prophetic and charismatic insight but also the ability to proclaim that insight. How the soteriological and ethical experience is achieved in the ITP is a question that needs to be discussed. And I have attempted to answer this question by arguing that the ITP takes the knowledge of Torah (the law) and the work of Messiah as the foundation of salvation and righteousness with which Lotz and Turner agree. Keeping the law had been the way of salvation in Judaism of the ITP and the function of the Spirit was understood in terms of proclaiming the knowledge of God through prophetic and charismatic manifestation of the Spirit. In order to empower the messengers, the Spirit comes upon them with divine empowerment of prophetic and charismatic wisdom and language that

is higher than the ordinary wisdom and language. Therefore, by 'extraordinary wisdom', I include the prophetic and charismatic insight along with the ability to proclaim this prophetic and charismatic insight; which in other term, the empowerment of the Spirit to proclaim the kingdom of God. Studies in Luke, such as those of Menzies, Stronstad and others have argued that this is what Luke has in his mind when he presented the Acts of the Apostles the way he did. He saw the function of the Holy Spirit as empowering by imparting to the believers the 'extraordinary wisdom' to proclaim the reality of God's kingdom. As to whether I have misrepresented Turner or disagreed with him, the readers will make up their own minds, but as far as Lotz's critique goes, it is done with a misunderstanding of the texts of the ITP where he has simply erased the difference between the human spirit and the Spirit of the Lord. The human spirit, which God creates in man for a righteous living, receives the Spirit of the Lord to proclaim God's message, but by equating the human spirit with the Spirit of the Lord, Lotz attempts to demonstrate the presence of 'life-giving wisdom' in the ITP which is simply not present otherwise.

Kingdom of God

In chapter three, I discussed this topic, but Lotz ignores my exegesis and charges me with distortion of Paul's concept of the kingdom of God. The exegesis clearly gives evidence of the 'already and not yet' concept of the kingdom of God in Paul. There are similarities and dissimilarities between Paul's and the Synoptics' usage of the term and the dissimilarities appear when Paul connects the Spirit with the kingdom. The present life in the Spirit and the future reality are both included in Paul's use of the kingdom language. My description of the kingdom of God in Paul does not say that for Paul life in the Spirit subdues the kingdom of God, neither did I say that this concept is not important for Paul. Paul has a clear concept of the kingdom of God where he sees the present and future reality of it, but the difference between him and the Synoptics is that he chose to express the life in the kingdom from a pneumatological epistemology. Expressing the kingdom of God through the use of the life in the Spirit language is very much a Pauline concept which we do not see in the ITP. The kingdom of God includes the present and the future reign of God, but for Paul, when I said 'the Spirit is portrayed as the life of the kingdom in its totality',[6] this does not mean the totality of the kingdom; it means the totality of life in the kingdom. For Paul, the Spirit is the agent or the ground for the totality of life in the kingdom; soteriologically, ethically and eschatologically. But Lotz misunderstands my thesis and thinks that I have allowed life in the Spirit to replace the kingdom itself. I have also provided the similarities of life in the kingdom in the Synoptics and life in the Spirit in Paul,[7] but Lotz makes no mention of such evidence in his criticism. He stands on his misapplication of my conclusions by saying that I

6 *Spirit and Kingdom*, 62.
7 *Spirit and Kingdom*, 68-75.

have grossly misunderstood Paul's concept of the kingdom and thus misrepresented him. A careful reading of chapter three of my book will show that I have maintained Paul's continuation of the teaching of Jesus on the kingdom of God and its dual timeline, but Lotz has misunderstood what I have written when he charges me of inverting the kingdom with the Spirit in Paul. As the Synoptics make use of the kingdom of God terminology, Paul makes the use of the life in the Spirit terminology to describe both, the present and the future reality of life in the kingdom of God.

4. From 'kingdom of God' to 'Jesus as the Lord of the kingdom'

When it comes to the issue of the kingdom in the Synoptics and Paul, Lotz once again misquotes my arguments. He writes that according to my book, Paul has 'altered the core content of Jesus' message of the kingdom'.[8] Nowhere in my book have I suggested that Paul has altered the content of Jesus' message concerning the kingdom; rather I have consistently maintained that Paul incorporates the same view of the kingdom of God as is seen in the Synoptics. Lotz has presented my position as if I am arguing for Paul to have changed the core content of the Jesus' message concerning the kingdom. Another wrong impression is given when he asserts that I have not taken into account the post Pentecost realization of the kingdom.[9] In chapters three and four, I have clearly argued that the concept of the kingdom of God equally features in Paul as it has been presented in the message of Jesus, but the differences appear in how Paul has expressed the life in the kingdom. With clear exegesis I have presented my arguments that while Paul takes the present and the future reality of the kingdom of God, he does so with the language of the Spirit. The totality of life in the kingdom is expressed by the usage of the life in the Spirit. But in the Synoptics the kingdom terminology features prominently when they talk about life. The Synoptics do not necessarily mention the kingdom as 'expectation', it is already a present reality there with future expectations also playing part, for which Lotz would do well to study my exegesis. As far as the book of Acts is concerned, I have maintained my position that the present and the future expectations of the kingdom of God are proclaimed with the power of the Spirit. When it comes to Paul's concept of the kingdom, he has not changed neither has he deviated from the core of what we have found in Jesus and the disciples; but what Paul has done is to use a different language to express the same realities about the life in the kingdom of God. The Spirit initiates one's entrance and the existence in the kingdom of God; the totality of the life in the kingdom of God is the life in the Spirit for Paul. In this life in the Spirit, there is a place of realization that because the Spirit is present, one lives in the kingdom of God and yet, because the kingdom of God is yet to be fully realized; there is also a future expectation of the coming reign of God. Lotz believes that in Acts there is no expectation, just the realization; it

8 Ibid., 136.
9 Ibid., 137.

is an incomplete picture of the kingdom of God in Luke-Acts. Luke presents the proclamation of the kingdom in the power of the Spirit and Paul presents the realities of the kingdom of God by demonstrating the evidences that are found in the life in the Spirit. The change from kingdom language to Spirit language in Luke and Paul needs to be taken in the context of how these two authors have presented the Spirit. When Luke uses the Spirit, he does so to demonstrate how the Spirit enables to proclaim the kingdom of God or the Lord of the kingdom. But when we see Paul's writings, we have argued that he does so to demonstrate how life is lived in the kingdom of God through the Spirit. Lotz admits that the Spirit becomes the central focus in Luke and Paul, but he (like Dunn and Turner) refuses to see the differences between Paul and Luke in spite of the evidence I (like others) have presented in my book.

Conclusion

As I conclude my response, I have to admit that I am puzzled by Lotz's fifth point of criticism in which he states that my conclusion does not follow on from the research. Throughout the book I have sustained my argument concerning the function of the Spirit in the ITP, not as a soteriological agent or 'life-giving' according to Turner, but as the source of empowerment for the proclamation of the prophetic message. To support my argument I have presented exegetical evidences and then concluded that Pauline concept of the Spirit is absent in ITP. Lotz does not have to accept my exegesis, but he cannot attribute his views to my research and claim that my research affirms the presence of the 'soteriological' function of the Spirit in the ITP from where Paul got his concept, whereas in my conclusion I negate that. At this point the question arises as to whether Lotz has understood my research at all.

Further, by being selective in summary he has presented an incomplete picture of my entire book and asked questions the answers to which are already there. The fundamental base of my book is that Paul does use a different language to express the kingdom of God and this language is clearly seen to be the Spirit language that he uses in a very different way from what we see in Acts. Luke takes up the kingdom language of Jesus and sees the Spirit to be the agent or the power to proclaim the kingdom whereas Paul sees the Spirit to be the source of life in the kingdom. In order to show this difference between these two authors, I studied the ITP literature to demonstrate that what we see in Paul is not found in the ITP whereas Luke seems rather impressed with the concept of the Spirit during the ITP. Luke has taken the function of the Spirit in line with the Jewish understanding of the function of the Spirit of prophecy, but when we compare Paul's concept of the function of the Spirit, especially the life-giving function; we do not see the life-giving function of the Spirit in the ITP literature except in a few writings as demonstrated by my exegesis. Because we see little connection between Pauline use of the function of the Spirit and the ITP, it is my proposition that Paul might be the first person to have attributed this function to the Spirit in order to express the reality of life in the kingdom of God.

Abstract

The author takes up the criticisms of his book made by Carsten T. Lotz and claims that they rest upon misunderstandings of what he wrote or can be refuted from the evidence of the sources. He continues to maintain that Luke takes up the kingdom language of Jesus and sees the Spirit to be the agent or the power to proclaim the kingdom whereas Paul sees the Spirit to be the source of life in the kingdom. A study of the literature of the Intertestamental Period demonstrates that what we see in Paul is not found in the ITP whereas Luke seems rather impressed with the concept of the Spirit during the ITP.