

**ASIA PACIFIC THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

**THE SPIRIT IN MATTHEW:  
AN EXEGETICAL WORD STUDY OF THE MATTHEAN ΠΝΕΥΜΑ**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE ASIA PACIFIC THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT TO THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE MASTER OF THEOLOGY IN PENTECOSTAL STUDIES**

**BY  
YEE THAM WAN**

**BAGUIO, PHILIPPINES  
OCTOBER, 2003**



To Moon Tee,  
and our three sons, Lemuel, Elroi and Ian.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

My finishing this research project needed many wonderful people that the Lord has placed around me over the last three years. Dr. Robert Menzies has been a very encouraging and patient mentor to me. The Academic Dean at the Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (APTS), Dr. Wonsuk Ma and Dr. Kay Fountain (Associate Dean), together with the rest of the faculty and administrative staff, have been most helpful. I must also make special mention of all my fellow-students of the first Th.M.(Pentecostal Studies) cohort at APTS: Kang Chang Soo, Gani Wiyono, Saw Tint San Oo, Conrado Lumahan, Marife Carable and Doreen Alcoran. We had the privilege of sitting under some of the best professors in the world. I will always treasure the memories of our time together.

To God be the glory!

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....                                       | iv |
| CONTENTS.....   | v  |
| Chapter   |    |
| I. INTRODUCTION .....                                       | 1  |
| Background.....   | 1  |
| Significance.....   | 2  |
| Purpose Statement & Choice of Critical Methods.....         | 3  |
| Thesis Statement .....                                      | 5  |
| Presuppositions .....                                       | 5  |
| II. REVIEW OF SOME KEY PRECEDENT LITERATURE.....            | 7  |
| Greek Texts, Grammars and Word Studies .....                | 7  |
| Commentaries on Matthew .....                               | 9  |
| General Matthean Studies.....                               | 13 |
| The Internet & Electronic Media .....                       | 14 |
| Specific Precedent Literature on Matthean Pneumatology..... | 16 |
| III. PRELIMINARY ISSUES IN MATTHEAN STUDIES.....            | 18 |
| Leading Questions in Matthean Scholarship .....             | 18 |
| General Areas of Matthean Studies .....                     | 20 |
| Summary .....   | 31 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| IV. OVERVIEW OF THE PNEUMA PASSAGES IN MATTHEW .....                            | 35  |
| Distribution of Πνευμα in Matthew and the Other Gospels .....                   | 37  |
| TABLE 1: Distribution of πνεῦμα Incidences in the Gospels .....                 | 38  |
| TABLE 2: Distribution of Incidences Where πνεῦμα Refers to the Divine Spirit .. | 39  |
| V. EXEGESIS OF MATTHEAN PNEUMA PASSAGES .....                                   | 40  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Birth Narrative (Mt. 1:18-25).....                                | 41  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Baptist’s Prophecy (Mt. 3:1-12).....                              | 48  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:13-16) .....                              | 55  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Testing of Jesus’ Sonship (Mt. 4:1-11) .....                      | 61  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Commissioning of the Twelve (Mt. 10:17-20).....                   | 65  |
| Πνεῦμα upon Messianic Servant of God (Mt. 12:15-21).....                        | 72  |
| Πνεῦμα in Exorcism by Jesus (Matt 12:22-28) .....                               | 77  |
| Πνεῦμα in Teaching of Unpardonable Sin (Matt 12:30-32).....                     | 82  |
| Πνεῦμα upon David (Mt. 22:41-46) .....  | 89  |
| Πνεῦμα At the Death of Jesus (Mt. 27:45-56).....                                | 92  |
| Πνεῦμα in the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula (Matt. 28:18-20) .....              | 98  |
| VI. THE PLACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN MATTHEW'S THEOLOGY .....                    | 107 |
| The Holy Spirit and Matthean Messianic Christology .....                        | 107 |
| The Holy Spirit and Matthean Trinitarian Theology .....                         | 110 |
| The Holy Spirit and Matthean Ecclesiology .....                                 | 111 |
| VII. CONCLUSION: “THE MATTHEAN PENTECOSTAL SPIRIT” .....                        | 114 |
| EPILOGUE .....  | 117 |

## Appendices

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| APPENDIX I .....  | 118 |
| Distribution of πνεῦμα in the Gospels .....   | 118 |
| APPENDIX II .....   | 125 |
| Overview of Syntax & Translation of Matthean Usage of Πνεῦμα for the Divine Spirit..... | 125 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY .....  | 126 |
| Internet/Electronic Sources .....   | 134 |

## I. INTRODUCTION

### Background

The moral failures of some highly visible Pentecostal/Charismatic personalities have logically prompted the question, “How could someone be so spiritually gifted and immoral at the same time?” Sometimes, the Pentecostals’ explanation for the failures of their famous colleagues is that the Pentecostal experience has little or no direct relationship with personal holiness. This reasoning is used especially in non-Wesleyan Pentecostal traditions. It does not mean that Pentecostal groups from non-Wesleyan traditions are not interested in a holy lifestyle. In fact, just like all other Pentecostal groups, they maintain a high standard of ethics and holiness. They were very strong in publicly condemning the sins committed by their colleagues. Even so, the explanation, that the Pentecostal experience has little or no direct relationship with personal holiness, will probably not be satisfactory to many. For a lot of people, the explanation simply does not reflect God’s high standards of holiness.

Part of the reason for this separation between divine power and divine holiness could perhaps be the way Pentecostals/Charismatics have founded their theology. Pentecostals and Charismatics have relied primarily on Luke-Acts and the Pauline epistles for the theology of their spiritual experiences, with Pentecostals focusing on Luke-Acts and Charismatics focusing on the Pauline epistles, particularly 1Corinthians. This is because Pauline and Lucan writings apparently have the most to say about the Holy Spirit. Even so, the emphases on Luke's prophetic/missionary motif and Paul's charismatic/power motif may have been overdone at the expense of a broader-based biblical theology. For example, the Matthean kingdom

culture/lifestyle motif described in the Sermon on the Mount is not specifically considered as “Pentecostal” or “Charismatic.” It is merely Christian. It is therefore often taken for granted and seldom picked up in Pentecostal/Charismatic polemics. This inadvertently diminishes Matthean input in the broader framework of “Pentecostal theology.”

There is an over-reliance upon Luke-Acts (and, to a lesser extent, the Pauline and Johannine charismatic passages) in the recent attempts to construct a biblical foundation for the Pentecostal understanding of the Baptism in the Spirit.<sup>1</sup> It may be true that Luke-Acts provides sufficient biblical foundation for the distinctive Pentecostal experience. However, unless we move out from our emphasis on Luke-Acts, we will always be trapped in a continuing polemics for the Pentecostal experience and never build a broad-based scriptural foundation for a truly *biblical* (instead of merely Lukan or Pauline) Pentecostal theology. To be truly biblical, Pentecostal theology must move beyond the confines of the Lucan and Pauline corpuses. Matthew can therefore be a good place for Pentecostals to explore.

### **Significance**

There is a general consensus that Matthew is a carefully constructed literary work. Matthew’s deliberate - though cautious - description of the Spirit’s role must therefore be taken seriously.<sup>2</sup> Coupled with Matthew’s strong ethical emphasis, today’s Pentecostal/Charismatic

---

<sup>1</sup>In a survey of biblical studies in the Pentecostal tradition, Wonsuk Ma does not list any work based on Matthew. The more significant ones are all based on Luke-Acts and First Corinthians. Wonsuk Ma, “Biblical Studies in the Pentecostal Tradition” in *Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel*, eds. Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Petersen (Oxford, UK: Regnum, 1999), 52-67. Another case in point is Roger Stronstad’s *Spirit, Scripture and Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective* (Baguio, Philippines: APTS Press, 1995), where only Lukan, Johannine and Pauline texts are being considered.

<sup>2</sup> Blaine Charette has argued quite convincingly the case for more investigation into Matthew’s theology of the Spirit, *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew’s Gospel*, Journal of Pentecostal Supplement Series 18 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 11-13.

community simply cannot ignore the message of Matthew. Therefore, this study will not only help broaden the scriptural base for Pentecostal theology but will also hopefully provide the basis for a Pentecostal dialogue with Matthew. It will be too naïve of me to expect that this study alone will provide all the answers to the relationship between Pentecostal power and holiness. However, it can perhaps provide a basis for a more holistic understanding of the Spirit for Pentecostals – hopefully helping to produce the right balance of “power and purity” in Pentecostal theology.

With Matthew being the most prevalent and recognizable authority in the early church for the life and ministry of Jesus, a study of Matthew’s pneumatology will perhaps help us reconstruct the earliest *formal* Christian pneumatology. As the first book of the New Testament canon and generally recognized as having been written from the situation of the early church’s decisive break from synagogue Judaism, Matthean pneumatology will also be significant in that it provides a bridge between Old and New Testament pneumatologies.

### **Purpose Statement & Choice of Critical Methods**

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to demonstrate the possibility of a critical and meaningful role for a Matthean pneumatology within a broad-based biblical Pentecostal theology. This study is *minimalist* and *preliminary*, based almost entirely on Matthew’s explicit references to the divine Spirit in the Greek text.<sup>3</sup> This research will deal only briefly with the

---

<sup>3</sup> While our focus is on the Greek text of Matthew, there are reasons to suspect that Matthew could have been originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic. Papias’ famous reference to Matthew’s “logia in the Hebrew dialect” has been used as suggestions that perhaps Matthew was originally in Hebrew. However, there are untranslated Aramaic terms (e.g. “mammon” in Mt. 6:24 and “Gehenna” in Mt. 5:22, 29, 30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15, 33) that point to a possible Aramaic Matthew as the original. “Hebrew dialect” may, in fact, be a reference to Aramaic. David R. Bauer, “The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, eds. David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996), 151.

issue of authorial intent and other such matters that go behind the text. While the findings of redaction criticism will be taken into account, this paper will not focus just on the changes that Matthew made to his sources. Instead, what Matthew has chosen to retain and keep unchanged from his sources are also considered as equally valid evidences of Matthew's theological agenda. The focus is therefore on the "product" rather than the "process" of Matthean composition.<sup>4</sup>

However, this does not mean that I am foregoing the possibility of discovering the objective historical meaning and that I am subscribing to a totally subjective, reader-response approach to interpretation. What is being assumed here in this paper is that a basic Matthean understanding of the Spirit can and should be derived primarily from the Matthean text itself. Any extra-textual matter should underscore rather than overwhelm the exercise. The main thrust of this exercise will therefore be an exegetical word study of Matthew's usage of πνεῦμα ("spirit"), when it is applied to the divine Spirit.<sup>5</sup> While some matters of etymology and lexicology may also be explored, the study will be mainly synchronic in nature - limited mainly to Matthew's text.

Rather than limiting this exercise to a certain methodology, there will be a "principled eclecticism"<sup>6</sup> in the choice of the critical methodologies to be employed. Having made that

---

<sup>4</sup> Bauer and Powell, eds., *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, 2-3.

<sup>5</sup> Despite his view that "it is not possible to gain a thorough understanding of Matthew's theology of the Spirit simply by means of a careful examination of those texts in which 'Spirit', or related vocabulary occurs," Blaine Charette concedes that this is still a "necessary element" (emphasis mine) in researching the topic of Matthean pneumatology. Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 12-13. Scot McKnight similarly affirms word studies: "Word studies are basic for both the exegete and preacher of the Synoptics," *Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels*, Guides to the New Testament Exegesis, ed. Scot McKnight (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988), 107.

<sup>6</sup> W. D. Davies, and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew, vol. 1*, The International Critical Commentary, gen. eds. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield, and G. N. Stanton. (Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 61. Please see p. 32 of this paper for a further explanation of what I understand to be "principled eclecticism."

commitment for a “principled eclecticism” in the choice of methodologies, as with Davies and Allison, I must concede that the methods actually employed will “inevitably vary according to (my) competence . . .”<sup>7</sup> Therefore, “textual matters” in this paper does not suggest the highly technical exercise of textual criticism. It merely refers to a focus on the canonical Matthean text at hand.

### **Thesis Statement**

Matthew’s usage of the word πνεῦμα for the divine Spirit – especially when read against Matthew’s nuanced presentation – suggests a developed and balanced, post-Pentecost understanding of the Spirit, evidenced by a Trinitarian pneumatology that is both charismatic and democratic in its eschatological expectations as well as ethical and relational in its practical requirements.

### **Presuppositions**

The two-source hypothesis (allowing for Marcan priority) has become the more popular solution to the “Synoptic Problem” in recent studies of the Gospels.<sup>8</sup> While recognizing that tendency in contemporary studies of the Gospel, this paper will also give due recognition to the fact that Matthew’s apostolic authority was accepted by the early church before Mark was accepted as authoritative. Indeed, the early church took for granted the historical priority of Matthew. Matthew will therefore be allowed to speak on its own authority as a canonical text and will not be subsumed under Mark or Luke or any other book of the Bible. Anyway, historical

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> A comprehensive survey of the variety of solutions to the so-called “Synoptic Problem” is available at the *Synoptic Problem Homepage*, <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/index.html>; Internet. The site is illustrative of how the “Synoptic Problem” is far from finding any definitive solution.

priority is often not critical. After all, “distinctiveness can be perceived even where direct literary dependence cannot be assumed.”<sup>9</sup>

It will be presupposed that the Pentecostal event of Acts 2 will have as much a profound effect on the early church as the Easter event. The interpretation of the Christian gospel should therefore observe at least two loci: the Christ Event of Easter and the Spirit Event of Pentecost. Matthew’s distinctive Jewish flavor brings to fore another important locus for the interpretation of the Gospel: the Father event of Creation.<sup>10</sup> Frank Stagg notes that it is a “highly precarious” exercise to “draw sharp lines of distinction between the work of the Holy Spirit as over against that of Father or Son.”<sup>11</sup> Therefore, while it is not unreasonable to expect Matthew to have access to Jewish traditions of the Spirit, one should also expect that this basic Jewish understanding of the Spirit will be affected by traditions of Jesus’ teachings on the Spirit as well as the church traditions following the Pentecost event. Indeed, one will find allusions to the Trinity in many places in Matthew; especially in the πνεῦμα texts.

---

<sup>9</sup> R. T. France, *Matthew*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, gen. ed. Leon Morris (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids, 1985), 38.

<sup>10</sup> An example of this *locus of Creation* for the meaning of Matthew’s text is seen in Matthew’s allusion to Genesis in the opening verses of Matthew, Mt. 1:1. This is followed up in Mt. 1:18, where the Spirit can perhaps be seen as being actively involved in a new creative work.

<sup>11</sup> Frank Stagg, “The Holy Spirit in the New Testament” *Review and Expositor*, 63 (1966): 146. A good example of how this necessary Trinitarian approach can be applied to Christian theology and praxis can be seen from Christian Schwarz’s recent development of a holistic theology for his *Natural Church Development* ministry philosophy. Christian A. Schwarz, *Paradigm Shift in the Church: How Natural Church Development Can Transform Theological Thinking* (Ohio, IL: Churchsmart Resources, 1999).

## II. REVIEW OF SOME KEY PRECEDENT LITERATURE

Despite the huge amount of work already done on Matthew<sup>12</sup>, there is very little precedent literature that deals specifically with this subject of Matthean pneumatology. Most Matthean scholars brush off the possibility of a Matthean theology of the Spirit and instead speak of a Matthean “ambivalence” or even “silence” on the subject of the Spirit. This brief review of key precedent literature will however not be limited to just the specific subject of Matthean pneumatology but will cover the broader subject of Matthean studies as a whole. This review – and this paper as a whole – will however be limited mainly to sources in the English language.

### **Greek Texts, Grammars and Word Studies**

Nestle-Aland’s 26<sup>th</sup> edition of the *Greek New Testament* will serve as the main biblical text. The English text will be my own translation from the Nestle-Aland text. Bruce Metzger’s *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*<sup>13</sup> and the United Bible Society’s *A Translator’s Guide to the Gospel of Matthew*<sup>14</sup> by Robert G. Bratcher will be helpful tools to see how the Greek text has made the transition into the variety of English texts. Bauer, Arndt,

---

<sup>12</sup> As an illustration of the huge amount of work already done on Matthew, Craig Keener’s latest commentary on Matthew has a 150-page long bibliography of secondary sources and a 141-page long index of ancient sources. Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999).

<sup>13</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London & New York: United Bible Societies, 1971).

<sup>14</sup> Robert G. Bratcher, *A Translator’s Guide to the Gospel of Matthew* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1981).

Gingrich and Danker's *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*<sup>15</sup> will be the standard lexicon consulted. Daniel B. Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*<sup>16</sup> will be the main text consulted on issues pertaining to Greek syntax. For word studies, Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*<sup>17</sup> and Colin Brown's *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*<sup>18</sup> would be important standard references. Papers by A. A. Anderson<sup>19</sup> and George Johnston<sup>20</sup> will provide some basic understanding into the Qumran usage of the word רוח (*ruach*) and therefore also provide a background for the possible ways the concept of the "Spirit" could have been handled by Matthew's community. However, as this study is mainly synchronic in nature, etymological issues raised in these articles will only be taken up if there is a proven line of development from the Qumran to the Matthean community and if that line of development is significant to our understanding of the Matthean πνεῦμα.

---

<sup>15</sup> Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Christian Literature*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., trans. and adapted by William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick Danker (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1979). This will be referred to as "BAGD" in this paper.

<sup>16</sup> Daniel B Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996).

<sup>17</sup> Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976). This will be referred to as "TDNT" in this paper.

<sup>18</sup> Colin Brown, Gen. ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978 & 1986). This will be referred to as "NIDNTT" in this paper.

<sup>19</sup> A. A. Anderson, "The Use of 'Ruach' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 17 (1962): 293-303.

<sup>20</sup> George Johnston, "'Spirit' and 'Holy Spirit' in the Qumran Literature," in H. E. McArthur, ed., *New Testament Sidelights* (Hartford: Hartford Sem. Found., 1960): 27-42.

## Commentaries on Matthew

Because of the paucity of specific works on Matthean pneumatology, general Matthean commentaries become important sources for this paper. Commentaries can perhaps be classified generally as tending towards three directions: exegetical-critical, doctrinal-theological and pastoral-devotional. Among the more recent commentaries available to the English-speaking world, the International Critical Commentary series is perhaps the premier example of commentaries in the exegetical-critical category. Following up on an earlier volume by W. C. Allen,<sup>21</sup> the latest commentary on Matthew in this series is the monumental three-volume contribution by W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison.<sup>22</sup> Like W. C. Allen's work, Alan Hugh McNeile's<sup>23</sup> & Alfred Plummer's<sup>24</sup> may be a little dated but still valuable. Other more recent commentaries having an exegetical-critical tendency include D. A. Carson's,<sup>25</sup> Donald Hagner's,<sup>26</sup> Robert Gundry's<sup>27</sup> and Ulrich Luz's works. Volume one, volume two and parts of volume three of Luz's commentary on Matthew have already been translated into English.<sup>28</sup> All

---

<sup>21</sup> Willoughby C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1912).

<sup>22</sup> W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 3 vols, The International Critical Commentary, gen. eds. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield, and G. N. Stanton, (Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1988-1997).

<sup>23</sup> Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1915).

<sup>24</sup> Alfred Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew* (London, UK: Robert Scott, 1909).

<sup>25</sup> D. A. Carson, "Matthew" in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), vol. 8:3-599.

<sup>26</sup> Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13, vol. 33A & Matthew 14-28, vol. 33B* Word Biblical Commentary, gen. Ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Dallas, TX: Word, 1993).

<sup>27</sup> Robert Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids, UK: Eerdmans, 1994).

<sup>28</sup> Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. Wilhelm C. Linss (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1989); and *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, *Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Helmut Koester (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2001).

these commentaries are more focused on the Matthean text and often have detailed analyses of the Greek text. Because of the nature of this paper, critical-exegetical commentaries will feature more prominently among the sources consulted.

Doctrinal-theological commentaries often take a theological pre-supposition and are more eager to draw broad theological conclusions than to get involved in detailed verbal analyses of the text. Therefore, some will take a purely historical-critical rather than a historical-grammatical approach to interpreting the text, e.g. Eduard Schweizer.<sup>29</sup> An example of a purely doctrinal-theological commentary on Matthew will be the one by Jack Dean Kingsbury in the “Proclamation Commentaries” series,<sup>30</sup> except that most will not consider the book as a commentary, because Kingsbury does not use the more conventional commentary format of following the order of the text of Matthew in his commentary. He merely picks up the Matthean theological themes (which, for Kingsbury revolve around the Messianic “son of God” title) and comments on them. John P. Meier has responded to Kingsbury’s conclusion with his own theological commentary on Matthew that focuses on Jesus’ moral message presented by Matthew, as a “nexus” between Christ and the Church.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>29</sup> Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, trans. David E. Green (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1975).

<sup>30</sup> Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew*, Proclamation Series: The New Testament Witnesses for Preaching, ed. Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977). This book is actually a re-working of an earlier book by Kingsbury entitled, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1975).

<sup>31</sup> John P. Meier, *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1979).

For those doctrinal-theological commentaries that follow the more conventional commentary formats, Frederick Dale Bruner's two-volume commentary on Matthew,<sup>32</sup> David E. Garland's *Reading Matthew*,<sup>33</sup> and perhaps the volume on Matthew in the Anchor Bible series,<sup>34</sup> have a doctrinal-theological tendency – taking Matthew as teaching and doctrinal material for the church. Despite the expressed purpose that his commentary will help readers reapply Matthew's instructions in today's contexts, Craig Keener's latest commentary<sup>35</sup> on Matthew is far too involved in historical-critical issues. I will categorize his commentary as a doctrinal-theological commentary because he often draws theological truths from the text with little or no detailed verbal analysis.

There are many commentaries that fit the pastoral-devotional category, where the commentary is often done in a “less academic” and “more readable” way so as to make it accessible to both the clergy and the laity. These commentaries are concerned with the relevance of the Gospel of Matthew in the daily lives of Christians in today's contexts and therefore often include suggestions on how Matthew's message could be applied in specific circumstances. Some of them may also be organized around sermon outlines. They include those done by J. C. Fenton,<sup>36</sup> William Barclay,<sup>37</sup> John Walvoord,<sup>38</sup> Warren W. Wiersbe,<sup>39</sup> Michael Green,<sup>40</sup> Ivor

---

<sup>32</sup> Frederick Dale Bruner, *Matthew: A Commentary, The Christbook 1-12*, vol. 1 (Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1987) and *Matthew: A Commentary, The Churchbook 13-28*, vol. 2 (Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1990).

<sup>33</sup> David E. Garland, *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel* (New York, NY: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1993)

<sup>34</sup> W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, The Anchor Bible, gen. eds. William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freeman (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1984).

<sup>35</sup> Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).

<sup>36</sup> J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew* SCM Pelican Commentaries, ed. D. E. Nineham (London: SCM, 1963).

Powell,<sup>41</sup> Robert Mounce,<sup>42</sup> and R. V. G. Tasker.<sup>43</sup> Although their commentaries on Matthew are a little more academic, R.C. Lenski,<sup>44</sup> David Hill,<sup>45</sup> Ed Glasscock,<sup>46</sup> Craig Blomberg,<sup>47</sup> Leon Morris,<sup>48</sup> F. W. Beare,<sup>49</sup> R. T. France,<sup>50</sup> and - more recently - James Montgomery Boice<sup>51</sup> have all produced commentaries that can perhaps be included in the pastoral-devotional category as well.

Together with John Meier's commentary, Daniel J. Harrington's volume in *Sacra Pagina*<sup>52</sup> and George T. Montague's *Companion God: A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of*

---

<sup>37</sup> William Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 2 vols., rev. ed. The Daily Study Bible Series (Edinburgh: The Saint Andrew Press, 1975).

<sup>38</sup> John F. Walvoord, *Matthew: Thy Kingdom Come, A Commentary on the First Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1974).

<sup>39</sup> Warren W. Wiersbe, *Be Loyal: Following the King of Kings* (Colorado Springs: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1980).

<sup>40</sup> Michael Green, *The Message of Matthew: The Kingdom of Heaven The Bible Speaks Today*, ed. John Stott (Leicester, England: IVP, 1988 & 2000).

<sup>41</sup> Ivor Powell, *Matthew's Majestic Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1986).

<sup>42</sup> Robert H. Mounce, *Matthew* New International Biblical Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque (Peabody: Hendricksen, 1991).

<sup>43</sup> R. V. G. Tasker, *Matthew* Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, gen. ed. R. V. G. Tasker (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids, 1961).

<sup>44</sup> R. C. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel*. (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943).

<sup>45</sup> David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew* The New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972).

<sup>46</sup> Ed Glasscock, *Matthew* Moody Gospel Commentary (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1997).

<sup>47</sup> Craig Blomberg, *Matthew* The New American Commentary, gen. ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1992).

<sup>48</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992).

<sup>49</sup> F. W. Beare, *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Commentary* (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1981).

<sup>50</sup> R. T. France, *Matthew* Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, gen. ed. Leon Morris (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids, 1985).

<sup>51</sup> James Montgomery Boice, *The Gospel of Matthew: The King and His Kingdom, vol. 1, Matt. 1-17* and *The Triumph of the King, vol. 2, Matt 18-28* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001).

<sup>52</sup> Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, *Sacra Pagina*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991).

*Matthew*<sup>53</sup> provide the Roman Catholic perspectives on Matthew. Montague's work can be classified as pastoral-devotional while Harrington's work would probably be closer to an exegetical-critical commentary.

Among the most recent English commentaries on Matthew, Craig S. Keener's 1,000-page commentary on Matthew could be valuable for this paper because of his background as a former Pentecostal. Ulrich Luz's four-volume commentary on Matthew in German may also be interesting because of his "history of influence" (*Wirkungsgeschichte*)<sup>54</sup> approach to interpreting Matthew. Emerson Powery notes in a review of Luz's work that the approach taken by Luz may prove helpful for a Pentecostal reading of Matthew.<sup>55</sup> Together with the commentaries by Davies and Allison, by Robert Gundry and by Donald Hagner, Keener's and Luz's commentaries make up perhaps five of the most important and comprehensive Matthean commentaries for the English-speaking world today.

### **General Matthean Studies**

Among the most important books on general Matthean studies is *The Interpretation of Matthew*, edited by Graham Stanton.<sup>56</sup> This book contains eight watershed articles on topics related to Matthean studies, all of which have been translated into English for this book. Apart from Stanton, the other contributors are: Ernst von Dobschutz, Otto Michel, Nils Alstrup Dahl,

---

<sup>53</sup> George T. Montague, *Companion God: A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1989).

<sup>54</sup> The "history of influence" (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) concept as a dimension of hermeneutics was introduced by Gadamer. H. G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York, NY: Seabury, 1975), cited by Ulrich Luz, "The Final Judgment (Matt 25:31-46): An Exercise in 'History of Influence' Exegesis" trans. Dorothy Jean Weaver; in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, 271.

<sup>55</sup> Emerson B. Powery, "Ulrich Luz's *Matthew in History*: A Contribution to Pentecostal History?" in *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 1 (April 1999): 3-17.

<sup>56</sup> Graham N. Stanton, ed., *The Interpretation of Matthew*. (London, UK: SPCK, 1983).

Kirster Stendahl, Georg Strecker, Günther Bornkamm, Ulrich Luz, and Eduard Schweizer. A recent follow-up to Stanton's approach is a book edited by Bauer and Powell, *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*.<sup>57</sup> Bauer and Powell's book has more recent contributors, mostly from the English-speaking world. *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson*, edited by David E. Aune, is the latest book taking a similar approach.<sup>58</sup>

In the area of Matthew's literary structure, David R. Bauer's *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*<sup>59</sup> can be a good reference while R. T. France's *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*<sup>60</sup> has a good account on historical and background matters. Both Bauer and France are well documented and can lead to good primary sources. Because this thesis is focused on the exposition of just one word of the Matthean text, care will be taken not to get too involved with these sources unless they impinge on the understanding of the specific Matthean texts being considered.

### **The Internet & Electronic Media**

As many of the major journals are already on the Internet, there will be sites on the Internet that could be helpful for this thesis. An important Internet resource is the *B-Greek*<sup>61</sup> discussion group on the Internet. Searches done on the *B-greek* archives located at

---

<sup>57</sup> David R. Bauer and Mark Allan Powell, eds. *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contributions to Matthean Studies* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>58</sup> David E. Aune, *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001).

<sup>59</sup> David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988).

<sup>60</sup> R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989).

<sup>61</sup> *B-Greek* [mailing list]; available from <http://metalab.unc.edu/bgreek>; Internet; accessed 4 October 2003.

<http://lists.ibiblio.org/pipermail/b-greek/><sup>62</sup> can sometimes prove helpful in providing leads to other primary and secondary sources. Aleck Crawford's expository notes from his book *The Spirit: A General Exposition on New Testament Usage*<sup>63</sup>, is another resource available from the Internet. Crawford's notes are however very basic and often idiosyncratic.

I have searched electronic library catalogues and computer databases for resources where the topics "Matthew" and "Spirit" would converge. Unfortunately, I have found none. I even tried the tedious method of listing all articles (from 1980-1993) in the *Religious Index One* that contains specific scriptural references from Matthew that are relevant to this paper. I found none that dealt specifically with Matthean pneumatology.

Other electronic media include software versions of some of the sources from the library of books available from *The Scholar's Library* produced by Logos Reserch Systems,<sup>64</sup> *Theological Journal Ver. 4* produced by Galaxie Software,<sup>65</sup> and the *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* produced by Thomas Nelson.<sup>66</sup> For translation of the Greek text into English, *Bibleworks*<sup>67</sup> proved to be a very helpful tool. These softwares have been particularly helpful for word searches and cross-referencing.

---

<sup>62</sup> Accessed on 4 October 2003.

<sup>63</sup> Alex Crawford, *The Spirit: A General Exposition on New Testament Usage* [book on-line] (Hallett Cove, South Australia, 1990, accessed on 4 October 2003); available from <http://www.christadelphia.org/books/spirit/index.html>; Internet.

<sup>64</sup> *Scholar's Library*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. [CD-ROM] (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1999).

<sup>65</sup> *The Theological Journal Library 4.0* [CD-ROM] (Garland, TX: Galaxie Software, 1999).

<sup>66</sup> Colin Brown, ed., *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Zondervan Reference Software ver. 2.7 [CD-ROM] (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989-1999)

<sup>67</sup> *BibleWorks for Windows*, ver. 5.0.020w [CD-ROM] (Big Fork, MT: BibleWorks, 2001).

### Specific Precedent Literature on Matthean Pneumatology

Blaine Charette has written a number of articles on Matthew, particularly on the Spirit's role in Israel's eschatological and Messianic expectations. Most of his articles have been updated and collected in his recent book, *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. Charette suggests that the Matthean Spirit is the divine agent of re-creation for the Messianic age and is being restored to the renewed Temple, which is raised up to replace the temple of the Old Testament. Charette describes this restorative work of the Spirit in the three areas of Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology, the outline being taken from Mt. 1:21. Jane Schaberg's dissertation entitled, *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*<sup>68</sup> deals with the climactic "Spirit" passage in Matthew. She however takes a rather narrow approach to interpreting the baptismal formula, interpreting it almost totally in the light of the Danielic vision of Dan. 7. She also focuses on the implications of this verse to the development of Trinitarianism in general rather than the climactic induction of the Holy Spirit into the Godhead, which would be our specific interest in this paper.

Leander E. Keck's article, "Matthew and the Spirit" from a festschrift for Wayne H. Meeks,<sup>69</sup> has some insightful thoughts related to my topic; especially with reference to the concluding Great Commission passage of Matthew. Keck takes a rather negative approach and argues mainly from his perception of Matthew's "ambivalence" to the Spirit.

---

<sup>68</sup> Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic phrase in Matthew 28:19b*. SBL Dissertation Series 61, ed. William Baird. (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).

<sup>69</sup> Leander E. Keck, "Matthew and the Spirit" in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne H. Meeks*, eds. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995), 145-155.

Some from the Pentecostal/Charismatic tradition have written on Matthew. They include John Christopher Thomas,<sup>70</sup> Emerson Powery,<sup>71</sup> Charles Holman<sup>72</sup> and Craig S. Keener.<sup>73</sup> We can also include James B. Shelton,<sup>74</sup> who contributed the article on Matthew for the *Full Life Bible Commentary to the New Testament*, and Ben C. Aker, whose article on the Gospel of Matthew is in the *Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movement*,<sup>75</sup> in the list. George T. Montague's *Companion God: A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*<sup>76</sup> could perhaps be considered as giving a Catholic Charismatic perspective on the interpretation of Matthew. All of these Pentecostal/Charismatic authors, however, do not deal with the issue of the Spirit in Matthew specifically.

---

<sup>70</sup> John Christopher Thomas, "The Kingdom of God in the Gospel According to Matthew," *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 136-146.

<sup>71</sup> Powery has written a critique of Ulrich Luz's methodology, which we referred to earlier in this paper.

<sup>72</sup> Holman has written one short article on Matthew, Charles L. Holman, "A Lesson from Matthew's Gospel for Charismatic Renewal" in *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley M. Horton*, ed. Paul Elbert (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 63.

<sup>73</sup> Although an ordained minister in the National Baptist Convention, Keener had his roots in the Assemblies of God. (Information from a conversation with Paul Lewis, 30<sup>th</sup> July 30, 2001 and re-confirmed by Robert P. Menzies.) Apart from his recent, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* by Eerdmans, Keener has two other titles that may be pertinent to the subject of Matthean pneumatology: *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997); *Matthew*, IVP New Testament Commentary Series, ed. Grant R. Osborne (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1997). For the rest of this article, Keener's commentary by IVP will be referred to simply as *Matthew* while the one by Eerdmans will be referred to as *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*.

<sup>74</sup> James B. Shelton, *Full Life Bible Commentary to the New Testament: An International Commentary for Spirit-Filled Christians*, eds. French L. Arrington & Roger Stronstad (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999), 9-253.

<sup>75</sup> Ben C. Aker, "Matthew, Gospel of" in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*, eds. Stanley M. Burgess, Gary B. McGee and Patrick H. Alexander (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988), 588-598.

<sup>76</sup> George T. Montague, *Companion God: A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1989).

### III. PRELIMINARY ISSUES IN MATTHEAN STUDIES

#### Leading Questions in Matthean Scholarship

In surveying the leading questions in Matthean scholarship, John Riches provides his readers with what he describes as the “raw data” that has drawn the attention of scholars working on Matthew over the years:

1. Matthew has ten quotations from the Old Testament which are typically introduced by a formula of the form: “to fulfil what the Lord declared through the prophet”: Matt. 1:22-23; 2:15, 17-18, 23; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:4-5; 27:9-10.
2. Matthew uses a range of titles for Jesus: Lord, Son of David, Son of Man, Son of God, Son, Christ, King of the Jews. Some of these titles occur more frequently than in Mark.
3. A number of traits in Matthew’s story indicate a strong sense of separation between Matthew’s community and the people of Israel: references to “their synagogues” (Matt. 12:9, cf. Mk. 3:1; Matt. 13:54, cf. Mk. 6:2); statements to the effect that the Kingdom has been taken away from the Pharisees and High Priests (Matt. 21:43, cf. 22:1-14); the crowd’s calling down Jesus’ blood on themselves and their descendents (Matt. 27:25); Jesus’ sending his disciples to the Gentiles after the resurrection (Matt. 28:18-20).
4. Nevertheless, Matthew has a strong interest in the Law as is evidenced by his grouping of Jesus’ teaching into the Sermon on the Mount and by the sayings strongly affirmative of the Law in that complex (Matt. 5:17-20, especially, 5:18). At the same time, however, Matthew underlines the difference between the traditional teaching of Israel and Jesus’ teaching by the “antitheses” in the Sermon on the Mount (statements of the form “You have heard it said . . . but I say unto you”: Matt. 5:21-22, 27-28, 31-32, 33-34, 38-39, 43-44).
5. Matthew is the only evangelist who refers to the “church” (ἐκκλησία): Matt. 16:18; 18:17.<sup>77</sup>

We may perhaps add to Riches’ “raw data” another item that has drawn the attention of scholars: the relative scarcity of the mention of the Spirit.<sup>78</sup> All the above five items listed by

---

<sup>77</sup> John Riches, *Matthew* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 13.

John Riches have determined the direction of Matthean studies. On the other hand, Matthew's infrequent mention of the Spirit has unfortunately determined where Matthean studies have traditionally *not* led to, although there are some rare scholars who have probed Matthew's pneumatology based on Matthew's "silence" on the subject.<sup>79</sup>

Graham Stanton's lengthy list of common questions in Matthean studies illustrates the kind of questions that could be drawn from Riches' "raw data":

Was the evangelist himself a Jew or a Gentile? Were his Christian readers mainly Jews or Gentiles? Was Matthew's community still under strong pressures from neighboring Jewish synagogues? Or was Jewish persecution of Christians a matter of past history for the evangelist's community?

On what theological principles did Matthew rearrange and reinterpret his sources? Did he intend to set out his five lengthy discourses and related narrative sections as a counterpart to the Pentateuch? Is the evangelist primarily concerned with Christology or with ecclesiology? Is this Gospel a record of the life and teaching of Jesus as the central period in salvation history – a period of past time which has now been replaced by "the time of the Church"? Or is Matthew using his account of the actions and words of Jesus to address directly Christian readers in his own day? Does Matthew have a distinctive understanding of the significance of Jesus?

Can this Gospel be criticized as a retrogression from the teaching of Jesus or Paul – or, for that matter, of Mark? Do some parts of the evangelist's "anti-Jewish" teaching have to be rejected by Christians today as profoundly un-Christian? What criteria can the Christian theologian use in deciding which aspects of this Gospel to accept, which aspects to reject and which to neglect? If Matthew's Gospel was originally written to meet quite specific pastoral or historical circumstances towards the end of the first century, how can it still speak to Christians today?<sup>80</sup>

To be able to participate meaningfully in Matthean scholarship dialogues, a serious student of Matthew will have to honestly confront this list of questions despite the fact that many of the probings will produce only tentative and conjectural answers. Unfortunately, it is obvious

---

<sup>78</sup> Davies and Allison, Gundry and Luz have compiled in their books word lists of "Matthean" words. All of them leave out πνευμα, although Gundry includes ✠ἅγιον πνευμα/πνευμα ἁγιονι as a subheading under ἅγιον. Gundry, 641.

<sup>79</sup> Keck, 145.

<sup>80</sup> Stanton, *The Interpretation of Matthew*, 1-2.

from the list of questions that pneumatology does not feature at all. For most Matthean scholars, Matthean pneumatology may be read incidentally into Matthew's Christology and ecclesiology but it remains very much on the periphery of existing research into Matthew. In any case, the questions above are those that have intrigued and challenged many Matthean scholars in their endeavors. Serious Pentecostal participation in the dialogue on Matthean studies would no doubt open new grounds and move the discussion along oft-overlooked tracks like the pneumatology of Matthew.

### **General Areas of Matthean Studies<sup>81</sup>**

Depending on the leading questions they have chosen to major on and their convictions about the nature of Biblical literature, Matthean scholars have taken a variety of directions in their endeavors. All of these may however be generally categorized into three areas of investigation into the Gospel of Matthew: (1) Matthew's Historical Context; (2) Matthew's Literary Structure; and, (3) Matthew's Theology.

#### **Matthew's Historical Context**

This area of investigation assumes that it is possible to re-create Matthew's contemporary socio-historical context with some measure of meaningful historical accuracy. This may move beyond the text of Matthew and require us to employ interdisciplinary approaches.<sup>82</sup> The purpose is to arrive at what the text would have meant to Matthew's original readers. Issues dealt with in this area of research include historical background material, e.g., the date, authorship and

---

<sup>81</sup> Donald Senior also has a brief survey of Matthean studies. That survey is however based mainly on W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison's three-volume commentary. "Directions in Matthean Studies" in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Studies*, 5-21.

<sup>82</sup> David L. Balch, ed., *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1991).

provenance of Matthew, as well as the nature of the Matthean Christian community and the original purpose of the composition. The questions of date and authorship will also involve the Synoptic questions of the priority and sources of Matthew with respect to the Gospels of Mark and Luke.

Conservative scholars in this area of investigation often assume Matthew's historicity, with the onus of proof laid squarely on those who would choose to be skeptical of the historical reliability of Matthew's record. Alan Hugh McNeile's approach represents the historical-grammatical method of many conservative scholars. He says in the introduction to his commentary on Matthew, "The literary problems are important mainly in their bearing on the historical."<sup>83</sup> A historical approach is important for conservative scholars because an a-historical approach may be an "attempt to avoid the anchorage of the Christian faith of every age in the Christ-event of the first century (and consequently,) turn Christianity into a timeless Gnostic myth or a 'supreme fiction.'"<sup>84</sup> This search for historicity is, however, not limited to the historical-grammatical method. Robert Gundry relies on the redaction-critical method to help him identify Matthew's original historical agenda. His research leads him to conclude that the Matthean community is a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles at the critical point of the early church's break from Judaism. Therefore, for Gundry, Matthew was written as a "Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> McNeile, xii.

<sup>84</sup> Meier, 7.

<sup>85</sup> Robert Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994).

To deal with the Synoptic question, source criticism and redaction criticism have been employed.<sup>86</sup> The “two-document hypotheses” (i.e. Mark and “Q” as the sources for Matthew and Luke) has been widely accepted since Günther Bornkamm’s study of Matthew’s redaction of the stilling of the storm pericope, published in 1948.<sup>87</sup> Markan priority has been worked out by New Testament scholars during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; even though early Church Fathers like Augustine had always assumed Matthean priority.<sup>88</sup> The Synoptic question is still unresolved and it may have lost some of its significance in the studies of the Gospels because of the lack of concrete solutions. J. A. Fitzmyer concedes that “the history of Synoptic research reveals that the problem is *practically insoluble*.”<sup>89</sup> However, France advises that “an open verdict on the literary relationships of the Synoptics is not a barrier to fruitful study of the distinctive methods and message of each of them.”<sup>90</sup> We can still “listen to (Matthew’s) gospel as a whole, allowing it to make its own distinctive impact through its structure, its selection of themes, and its recurrent emphases.”<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> For an overview of the “Synoptic Problem” and the continuing discussion on the issue, see the *Synoptic Problem Homepage*, available from <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/index.html>; Internet; accessed 4 October, 2003.

<sup>87</sup> Graham N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark, 1992), 28.

<sup>88</sup> Augustine described Mark as “the follower and abbreviator (*pedisequus et breviator*) of Matthew,” *De Consensu Evangelistarum* I 2, cited by R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* (Grand Rapids, UK: Zondervan, 1989), 18.

<sup>89</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, cited by Morris, xi; emphasis Fitzmyer’s.

<sup>90</sup> France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 49.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

Perhaps, some of the most intriguing data in the historical area of Matthean research comes not from the text itself but from extra-biblical evidences.<sup>92</sup> E. Massaux's study on the influence of the Gospel of Matthew in the early church, indicates that the early Church Fathers were very familiar with Matthew.<sup>93</sup> Based on Massaux's findings, R. T. France could conclude that "in the first century after the writing of the New Testament gospels it was Matthew which quickly established itself as *the* (emphasis by France) gospel par excellence, the natural place from which to expect to derive the authoritative account of the words and deeds of Jesus"<sup>94</sup> and that "it is a fact that mainstream Christianity was from the early second century on, to a great extent Matthean Christianity."<sup>95</sup>

Ulrich Luz suggests that one important reason for Matthew's importance in the early church was that, unlike Mark and Luke, Matthew was regarded to have been written by an apostle.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, Matthew's apostolic authority seemed to have been recognized very early, with official recognition given by church synods as early as AD 119.<sup>97</sup> Luz also suggests the fact that Matthew has more direct sayings of Jesus compared with the other two synoptic gospels as

---

<sup>92</sup> Matthew's influence can be clearly seen in the following: Apollinaris of Hierapolis, Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, the Apocryphal Gospels, Justin, the Didache, etc., France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 15-16.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 15-18.

<sup>94</sup> France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 17.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>96</sup> Ulrich Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*, trans. J. Bradford Robinson, New Testament Theology, gen. ed. James D. G. Dunn (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 154.

<sup>97</sup> B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (London, UK: Macmillan, 1924) 525-526, suggests that a council in Rome in AD 119 accepted the Gospel of Matthew as apostolic. Offering further support for Matthew's apostolic authority, B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (London, UK: Constable, 1930) 50-59, concludes that "A Roman provincial synod was held under Sixtus I about 120 AD, whose verdict endorsed the title, 'According to Matthew.'" Cited by France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 16.

another reason for Matthew's popularity with the early church.<sup>98</sup> Furthermore, Matthew was popular because it "arranged the words of Jesus in an attractive and catechistically useful order."<sup>99</sup>

Riches sees the issue of Matthew's community as being of "enormous significance in the development of the cultures of Europe. . . . (because) it stands in the parting of ways between church and synagogue. It also marks a significant point in the development of the church into an institution with rules and formal organization."<sup>100</sup> Stephenson H. Brooks has followed others in studying the issue of Matthew's community by investigating the unparalleled material in Matthew (often designated the M source).<sup>101</sup> His conclusion is not unlike the general perception that Matthew was writing in the midst of a mixed Jew-Gentile Christian community at the juncture of its break with the synagogue. Apart from this ethnically-mixed trait of the Matthean community, Riches concludes that it was a community of "wandering charismatics and urban communities."<sup>102</sup> Geographically, E. Schweizer is inclined to identify Syria (or some areas in Galilee) as the Matthean community because of the central role of Peter in Matthew, rejecting Jerusalem because James, the brother of Jesus, would have featured in Matthew if Jerusalem had been the location of the Matthean community.<sup>103</sup>

As to the authorship of Matthew, the bulk of evidence seems to suggest that Matthew was accepted as apostolic and authoritative very early on in church history, perhaps well before Luke

---

<sup>98</sup> Luz, *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*, 154.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>100</sup> Riches, 44.

<sup>101</sup> Stephenson H. Brooks, *Matthew's Community: The Evidence of His Special Sayings* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 16 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987).

<sup>102</sup> Riches, 47.

<sup>103</sup> Eduard Schweizer, "Matthew's Church," in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, ed. Graham Stanton (London, UK: SPCK, 1983), 129-155.

and Mark were considered authoritative. This suggests that the apostle Matthew could well have been the author or at least the apostolic source providing the authority for the Gospel of Matthew.<sup>104</sup> Some scholars are now inclined towards an early date for Matthew, with the final form of Matthew settled possibly even before the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.<sup>105</sup> Matthew's provenance has been suggested as Syrian Antioch because of the Jewish-Gentile character of Matthew.<sup>106</sup> The missionary mood of Syrian Antioch would also have fit well with the universalistic commission of Matt. 28:18-20.

### **Matthew's Literary Structure**

The investigation into Matthew's literary structure has dominated recent studies into Matthew. Some have noticed that this new interest in Matthew's literary structure is concurrent with the emergence of literary criticism in Biblical studies.<sup>107</sup> Despite the confidence of some of those involved in the investigation into Matthew's historical context, there is increasing skepticism of the reliability of the historical data that can be obtained. George Montague suggests that sometimes the research into the historical context of Matthew amounts to little more than "guesswork":

In the text of Matthew before us, there are three different levels of historical development: (1) The events and the words of the historical Jesus; (2) The reshaping of those events and words by the oral and early tradition of the early church in the first decades after

---

<sup>104</sup> It must be noted, however, that while many scholars may be reluctant to commit clearly to the apostle Matthew as the author, the great majority of them would identify the author as a Hellenistic Jew - which would probably fit the profile of the apostle Matthew anyway. See table in pp. 10-11, Davies and Allison.

<sup>105</sup> Gundry argues in detail for a date earlier than A.D. 63. Gundry, 599-609.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, 609.

<sup>107</sup> David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 7. Hagner, vol. 33A, xxxix, concurs: "It is not an exaggeration to say that a paradigm shift is currently taking place in the study of the Gospels . . . Whereas the Gospels have previously been approached mainly as historical documents, now they are being studied very deliberately as literature."

Jesus; (3) The final shape of the tradition under the pen of Matthew. The only level immediately available to us is the third. Recovering the first two levels is a difficult process and sometimes it is guesswork. Thus, while there is no serious reason to doubt Matthew's fidelity to the *meaning* of Jesus, we must remember that the Jesus we are seeing and hearing in this gospel, is *Matthew's* Jesus. . . . (who is) in a *text*. Even so, that text becomes living in the church that lives and preaches it and in the person who reads it with faith. So there is a fourth level of meaning in Matthew's gospel, and that is the here-and-now meaning for today's reader.<sup>108</sup>

Scholars are now suggesting that the way around this is to focus on the final form of the canonical text given to the church.<sup>109</sup> As such, Bauer suggests that literary criticism<sup>110</sup> is “uniquely qualified to deal with the issue of the structure of Matthew's Gospel, since in fact literary structure has to do with the arrangement of materials in the final document. Moreover, one of the concerns of literary criticism is the identification of rhetorical elements that point to the literary structure of books and passages.”<sup>111</sup> Others like, Donald A. Hagner, however, are more cautious about this trend towards literary criticism; suggesting that the methodology has perhaps moved beyond mere literary criticism to narrative criticism (sometimes also called “new literary criticism”), where the Gospels “are increasingly regarded as documents worth studying in their own right, *apart altogether from any referential aspect* (emphasis mine).<sup>112</sup> He also

---

<sup>108</sup> Montague, *Companion God*, 5.

<sup>109</sup> Morris, x-xi, follows this growing chorus of scholars who are skeptical about the historical approach to Matthew: “I have tried to take this Gospel as a work in its own right and to see what it says to us as it is, no matter how it came to be put together. . . . I must (say) that with the information at our disposal we cannot be sure of either the date or the place of this Gospel, . . . Without such knowledge we may engage in more or less plausible speculation, but we can do no more. . . . My basic concern is with meaning. . . . Throughout (this commentary) I have been concerned with making as clear as I can what I consider to be *the meaning of the Greek text that Matthew has bequeathed to the church*.”(emphasis mine)

<sup>110</sup> “This discipline deals with a broad range of issues relating to the literary character and meaning of the extant text, including the issue of rhetorical elements that point toward the structure of the work,” Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 13.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 7-8. In this respect, Bauer's work is one of the more comprehensive works focusing on the rhetorical devices and literary structures in Matthew.

<sup>112</sup> Hagner, vol. 33A, xxxix.

warns that narrative criticism will inevitably entail a reader-response hermeneutic, “wherein the reader constitutes the meaning of the text *entirely apart from any consideration of the intention of the author* (emphasis mine).”<sup>113</sup> Davies and Allison warn against taking the attitude where the Gospels become “art for art’s sake.”<sup>114</sup>

Nonetheless, almost all scholars agree that Matthew has carefully and deliberately structured his Gospel. Matthew’s literary structure (or, at least Matthew’s rhetorics) must have impressed Gundry, who subtitled the earlier edition of his book as: “*A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*.”<sup>115</sup> Interest in Matthew’s structure has inspired a number of scholarly investigations that focused solely on Matthew’s literary structure.<sup>116</sup>

One striking feature of Matthew’s literary art is its use of the Old Testament. Matthew is easily the most Jewish or Hebraic of the Gospels. The fulfillment “formula-quotations”<sup>117</sup>, “This was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet, saying . . .” is typically Matthean. France notes that, “if the quotation and its formula were removed, the story would flow on without an obvious gap.”<sup>118</sup> It illustrates the critical role of this first Gospel in the canon, as a bridge between the Old and New Testaments.

---

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, xl.

<sup>114</sup> Davies and Allison, 1, 4.

<sup>115</sup> Gundry, xi. Despite his apparent admiration for Matthew’s literary art, Gundry rejects all the traditional structures advanced by earlier scholars and concludes that Matthew is “structurally mixed,” 11.

<sup>116</sup> For example, Janice Capel Anderson, *Matthew’s Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 91 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); and, David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew’s Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Sheffield, UK: Almond Press, 1988).

<sup>117</sup> France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, 38-39.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

Introducing his work on the literary criticism of Matthew, Bauer offers four general views of Matthew's structure that have been propounded by various scholars<sup>119</sup>:

1. Structured along topical outlines based on the contents of individual sections, with little regard for the movement of the book as a whole. (This may perhaps be viewed as a "geographical-chronological" structure with a "life-of-Jesus" approach.<sup>120</sup>)
2. Structured along the role of the major discourses of the book. This was advanced by B. W. Bacon, who divided Matthew into five "books" based on the Pentateuch. Each "book" culminates with a discourse and closes with a formula, "and it happened when Jesus finished . . ." or some similar phrases.<sup>121</sup>
3. Structured along the formulaic sayings of Matt. 4:17 and 16:21, "From that time Jesus began . . ." This would divide Matthew into three major sections.<sup>122</sup>
4. Structured along the concept of salvation history. For example, Georg Strecker<sup>123</sup> would divide Matthew into the three epochs of salvation history: the ages of prophecy, of Jesus, and of the church.

Having considered the various approaches and possibilities to structuring Matthew, Bauer suggests that one of the ways to consider the structure of Matthew is to see the "five books" and other structural features of Matthew climaxing in 28:16-20. The themes in Matthew which Bauer sees as coming to a climax in the passage are: (1) the authority of Jesus; (2) universalism; (3) presence of Jesus with his community.<sup>124</sup> The variety of Christological (Messianic) titles accorded to Jesus in Matthew is climaxed with "all authority in heaven and on earth" given to Jesus. The Jew-Gentile tension throughout the book is resolved with this climactic universal

---

<sup>119</sup> Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 11-12.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, 22-23.

<sup>121</sup> B. W. Bacon, "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews," *Expositor* 15, 8<sup>th</sup> series (1918), 56-66.

<sup>122</sup> This structure was advanced by J. D. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 7-25.

<sup>123</sup> Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, FRLANT, 82, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), cited by Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 12.

<sup>124</sup> Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 109-128.

commission. The climactic structure is bound together with another structural feature, the *inclusio* (or literary bracket) formed by the symbolic promise of Emmanuel (“God with us”) in Matt. 1:21-23 and the climactic promise of Jesus’ presence in Matt. 28:16-20. Some have also noticed the book is neatly framed by *γενεσις* (“beginning”) of Mt. 1:1 and *συντελεια* (“end” or “completion”) of Mt. 28:20.<sup>125</sup>

### **Matthew’s Theology**

This area of investigation makes the important assumption that Matthew has a theological underpinning. It should be easily apparent that this area of study is very dependent on the results of the investigation into Matthew’s history and Matthew’s literary structure. However, despite all the hard work done on Matthew’s history and literary structure, it is impossible *and unnecessary* to probe Matthew’s consciousness so as to get at a complete Matthean systematic theology. Matthean theology is not necessarily the apostle Matthew’s theology. Matthean theology should be postulated based on what is expressly revealed in the Matthean text. Data from studies in Matthean history and literary structure can however underline and even enhance our postulation of a Matthean theology.

Regardless of the views that Matthew is not systematic, coherent or consistent enough to be labeled a theologian,<sup>126</sup> there is enough said in Matthew about God and his dealings with His people to derive a Matthean theology. R. T. France lists four central emphases in Matthew’s theology:<sup>127</sup> (1) The fulfillment of all of God’s purposes in Jesus; (2) The identity of Jesus as

---

<sup>125</sup> Bauer, “The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew’s Gospel,” in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, 159.

<sup>126</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 4, 42-43. France is evidently in agreement with Stanton’s view on the matter when he titled his book, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*.

<sup>127</sup> France, *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*, 38-56.

the Christ; (3) The resolution of the Law in the church age, and, (4) The nature of the true people of God. Stanton, preferring to see Matthew's concerns as mainly "pastoral and catechetical" still manages to identify Christological, ecclesiological and eschatological concerns in Matthew.<sup>128</sup>

When speaking of Matthean theology, Ulrich Luz's alternative approach to Matthew carries exciting possibilities. Luz's stinging critique of the historical-critical method is that it "creates a distance between the biblical text of the past and us, but it does not by itself offer the possibility of bringing the text back to us."<sup>129</sup> With that, Luz suggests that we employ yet another approach to interpreting scripture, which he describes as a "history of effects" or "history of influence" (*Wirkungsgeschichte*) approach;<sup>130</sup> an approach which Luz demonstrates by applying to his commentary on Matthew. In his approach, Luz takes into account the shaping of the meaning of the text over time; how it has spoken to the church through successive phases of church history.<sup>131</sup> Luz's approach is perhaps comparable to Thomas C. Oden's theological methodology of "lay consensus," where theological developments throughout church history are brought to bear upon contemporary formulation of theology.<sup>132</sup> Church history is used to help our

---

<sup>128</sup> Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People*, 43.

<sup>129</sup> Ulrich Luz, *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence, and Effects* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994), 8

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>131</sup> Luz differentiates "history of influence" from "history of interpretation." In the "history of interpretation," he means the "history of interpretations of a text in commentaries and other theological writings." Under "history of influence," Luz means "the history, reception, and actualizing of a text in media other than the commentary, thus, e.g. in sermons, canonical law, hymnody, art, and in the actions and sufferings of the church." Thus, the "history of influence" is inclusive of the "history of interpretation." Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, 95-99.

<sup>132</sup> However, unlike Oden, Luz is perhaps more committed to contemporary relevance. Oden declares: "I am dedicated to unoriginality. I am pledged to irrelevance if relevance means indebtedness to corrupt modernity," Thomas C. Oden, *Life in the Spirit: Systematic Theology Vol. 3*. (New York, NY: Harper Collins, 1992), vii.

understanding of Matthew. Luz's hermeneutic finds a sympathetic critique in Pentecostal scholar, Emerson Powery: "If the recent direction of Pentecostal hermeneutics takes seriously Scripture, community and the Spirit's activity, then Luz offers us a component not only for appreciating Scripture but also the interpretive tradition of Scripture by the community."<sup>133</sup> If strictly adhered to, Luz's approach is tedious, but the direction taken should certainly excite Pentecostals, who have always maintained that the real power of the scriptures is in its actualization in the life of the believer.

The data currently available from historical and literary investigations shows a clear Christological focus in Matthew. The *inclusio* and climax are particularly telling as evidences to this Christological focus. The story begins with Jesus the Emmanuel, "God with us" and concludes with Jesus the promised presence. Jane Schaberg, in her study of Matthew's ending, could conclude: ". . . I can safely say that Matthew's conception of God and of the Holy Spirit is central in the revelation of and by Jesus of Nazareth. The conception of Jesus in this Gospel, on the other hand, is centered in the belief that his source and destiny are one: in God and through the Holy Spirit."<sup>134</sup> If the unique, climactic ending of Matthew is taken seriously, Schaberg's comment on the Holy Spirit should be worth a second thought.

### Summary

Many methods have been employed in the three general areas of Matthean studies. Is there one method better than others? Is there one field of investigation more critical than another? In this respect, the observation from Davies and Allison is particularly pertinent:

---

<sup>133</sup> Powery, 16.

<sup>134</sup> Schaberg, 334.

. . . the multiplicity of genres in Matthew calls for flexibility in method and aim. No one approach or aim should have a monopoly: each needs the stimulus of the other. Many, if not most, literary and structuralist scholars, for example, assume the necessity and importance of the historical approach as well as of their own. And biblical critics from the beginning have frequently employed historical-critical and literary methods simultaneously and have sometimes raised the question of the place of documents in the Canon. The choice of method or methods will, however, inevitably vary according to the competence of the commentators.<sup>135</sup>

Davies and Allison further propose a “principled eclecticism” in the choice of methods in Matthean studies.<sup>136</sup> If we are to capriciously ignore other methods in favor of only one method, we will only emphasize our blind-spots. And, to limit ourselves to only one area of investigation in Matthean studies will close other important windows to a clearer understanding of the Matthean text. There must be openness to different approaches so that we allow as much light to fall on the text as possible.

It should be apparent by now that Matthean studies have had only a tenuous working relationship with Pentecostal studies. Quite unlike investigations into the Lukan, Johannine and Pauline corpuses, Matthew has drawn very little interest from Pentecostal scholars. So far, only a handful of Pentecostal/Charismatic scholars can be identified as having written directly on topics related to Matthew: Emerson B. Powery, Blaine Charette, John Christopher Thomas, Charles Holman, Ben C. Aker, James Shelton and Craig S. Keener. Almost all of these, however, write generally on Matthew. Only Charette has focused specifically on the subject of the Spirit in Matthew.

Perhaps, part of the reason for the lack of Pentecostal interest in Matthew is alluded to by Ben Aker in his suggestion that, in the dispensationalist schema of the Bible, Matthew pertains

---

<sup>135</sup> Davies and Allison, 3.

<sup>136</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

mainly to the national interest of Israel – with little relating to the church.<sup>137</sup> Therefore, despite being in the New Testament, Matthew is seen in many ways as belonging to the Old Covenant. Even the applicability of such crucial Matthean passages as the Sermon on the Mount for the church age is being questioned.<sup>138</sup> With many Pentecostals being traditionally dispensationalist, their lack of interest in Matthew is perhaps understandable.

However, the main reason is really the unfortunate misconception – drawn from Matthew’s *apparent* lack of reference to the Spirit – that Matthew has little interest in the Spirit. This has led George T. Montague to title his chapter on Matthew as “The Discreet Pneumatology of Matthew.”<sup>139</sup> Leander E. Keck, in his article, “Matthew and the Spirit,” had to infer from Matthew’s “marked silence”<sup>140</sup> and “ambivalence”<sup>141</sup>; implying that the effort was akin to a detective making inferences from “the dog that did not bark.”<sup>142</sup> Charles Holman confessed that he had to “read between the lines”<sup>143</sup> in Matthew to come up with some interesting things for his article, “A Lesson from Matthew’s Gospel for Charismatic Renewal.” However, it does not seem to be good practice to draw theology from what is *not* said in the Bible. If we are going to draw any pneumatology from Matthew, it must be from what Matthew does say on the matter. Fortunately, as the following sections will demonstrate, there is enough said about the divine

---

<sup>137</sup> Aker, 589.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>139</sup> George T. Montague, S.M. *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1976).

<sup>140</sup> Keck, 148.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 149.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.

<sup>143</sup> Holman, 49.

Spirit in Matthew and that to label Matthew as “silent” or “ambivalent” on the subject of the Spirit may be to ignore the statistical evidence.

#### IV. OVERVIEW OF THE PNEUMA PASSAGES IN MATTHEW

While it may be true that Matthew's contribution to pneumatology may not be as significant as that of Luke or John, the incidences of πνεῦμα in Matthew is at least comparable to the other Gospels. Therefore, it may be unfair to suggest that Matthew lacks a theology of the Spirit. There are, in fact, enough references to suggest a rather developed Matthean pneumatology. The following are passages in the Gospel of Matthew where πνεῦμα, in all of its various forms, is found.<sup>144</sup>

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Mt. 1:18-20 (2 times)  | πνεῦμα in the Birth Narrative                        |
| Mt. 3:11               | πνεῦμα in the Baptist's Prophecy                     |
| Mt. 3:16               | πνεῦμα in the Baptism of Jesus                       |
| Mt. 4:1                | πνεῦμα in the Testing of Jesus's Sonship             |
| Mt. 5:3                | Human disposition (πνεῦμα Poverty in the Beatitudes) |
| Mt. 8:16               | Evil spirits   |
| Mt. 10:1               | Evil spirits   |
| Mt. 10:20              | πνεῦμα in the Commissioning of the Twelve            |
| Mt. 12:18              | πνεῦμα upon Messianic Servant of God (Is 42:1-4)     |
| Mt. 12:28              | πνεῦμα in Exorcism by Jesus                          |
| Mt. 12:31-32 (2 times) | πνεῦμα in Teaching of Unpardonable Sin               |
| Mt. 12:43-45 (2 times) | Evil spirit  |
| Mt. 22:43              | πνεῦμα upon David (Ps 110:1)                         |
| Mt. 26:41              | Human disposition/spirit                             |
| Mt. 27:50              | πνεῦμα at the Death of Jesus                         |
| Mt. 28:19              | πνεῦμα in the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula          |

---

<sup>144</sup> The list is based on a computer-aided search on Nestle Aland's 26<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Greek New Testament from the *Scholar's Library* [CD-ROM]. The result has also been manually re-checked.

Of the 19 occurrences of πνεῦμα, 4 clearly refer to evil spirits: Mt. 8:16, 10:1 and 12:43-45. Mt. 5:3 and Mt. 26:41 are probably referring to the human spirit or disposition.<sup>145</sup> Quoting Liddell-Scott, Luz concludes that it is “philologically impossible” to translate πνεῦμα in Mt. 5:3 as the divine Spirit.<sup>146</sup> Luz also refers to the immediate context in Mt. 5:8, where τῆ καρδία (“the heart”) parallels πνεύματι, as support for interpreting πνεῦμα here as human spirit.<sup>147</sup> πνεύματι in Mt. 5:3 is therefore probably a dative of reference to qualify οἱ πτωχοὶ (“the poor”) so that they are not economically poor but poor in reference to their disposition or attitude; that is, they are humble.

The majority of scholars give πνεῦμα in Mt. 26:41 an anthropological connotation although there are a few who take the view that it may refer to the divine Spirit.<sup>148</sup> The context seems to suggest that the word should properly refer to the human spirit. πνεῦμα here is the human spirit seen in contradistinction to the σὰρξ (“flesh”) side of man. The πνεῦμα side of man is “the moral life, including will and emotions.”<sup>149</sup> Therefore, Mt. 26:41 will not be included in the list of πνεῦμα references to be investigated in this paper.

Although many scholars tend to interpret Mt. 27:50 as referring to Jesus’ human spirit or psyche, it could also very well be referring to the divine Spirit that had come upon Jesus at His

---

<sup>145</sup> Bratcher is in agreement that both should be translated with an anthropological connotation. Bratcher, 37 and 339-340.

<sup>146</sup> Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, 232.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>148</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 986. He also cites Calvin and Schweizer as among those who prefer to interpret the πνεῦμα reference here as the divine Spirit.

<sup>149</sup> McNeile, 391.

conception in Mary's womb (or at his baptism).<sup>150</sup> Logically, Jesus would have to give that Spirit up before he could die physically. Furthermore, the human spirit could have been described with the Greek ψυχη (cf. Gen. 35:18 LXX) instead of πνεῦμα. In fact, Bruner notes that the "usual way to depict death in Jewish writings is to write, 'he gave up his ψυχη.'" <sup>151</sup> If it is accepted that Mt. 27:50 refers to the Holy Spirit in Jesus, the πνεῦμα references would be quite evenly spread over the whole book of Matthew, covering every important aspect of the life and ministry of Jesus - from His miraculous conception to His death. This may be yet another evidence of Matthew's literary art.

A cursory perusal of the texts will show how closely the activity of the Spirit is related to the Messianic identity of Jesus. Matthew's pneumatology can also be seen to develop through the book. Matthew takes the Jewish understanding of the Spirit further so that from being an empowerment of the Messiah, the Spirit becomes the Father's Spirit (Mt. 10:20) and later to become a "blasphemable" (and thus, divine) Personality (Mt. 12:31-32), climaxing in Mt. 28:19 where the Spirit becomes an equal member of the Trinitarian Godhead.

### **Distribution of Πνεῦμα in Matthew and the Other Gospels**

F. D. Bruner's "deliberately and provocatively overstated" comparisons among the four Gospels illustrate how Matthew is perhaps the richest of the four in terms of theological formulations:

Matthew took Mark's rough technicolor stories and "catechized" them in Matthew's distinctively black and white, rounded, christologically focused, doctrinally stylized, and easily memorized narratives and discourses. Matthew is Revised Standard Version Mark and

---

<sup>150</sup> Blaine Charette notes that Matthew is unique among the Synoptics in describing Jesus' death as His giving up of the πνεῦμα. Blaine Charette, "'Never Has Anything Like This Been Seen in Israel': The Spirit as Eschatological Sign in Matthew" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996): 31-51, 48.

<sup>151</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 1056.

the church's Iron Catechism. Mark is the Gospel for evangelists, Matthew for teachers, Luke for deacons or social workers, and John for elders and spiritual leaders.<sup>152</sup>

We should therefore expect Matthew’s choice of words to be much more deliberate and carefully thought out. Charette suggests that Matthew has “a thoughtful and carefully nuanced description of the activity of the Spirit.”<sup>153</sup> Indeed, Graham Stanton describes Matthew as a “Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus.”<sup>154</sup> An investigation into the distribution of the word, πνεῦμα in the Gospels - collated from the data in Appendix I - demonstrates in some way the differences between the four Evangelists. There are 102 occurrences of πνεῦμα (in its various forms) in the Gospels distributed as follows: 19 in Matthew, 23 in Mark, 36 in Luke and 24 in John. Of these occurrences, 13 in Matthew,<sup>155</sup> 6 in Mark, 17 in Luke and 15 in John can be identified as referring to the divine Spirit. The tables below show how these occurrences are distributed.

**TABLE 1: Distribution of πνεῦμα Incidences in the Gospels**

|                       | <b>Matthew</b> | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Luke</b> | <b>John</b> |    |
|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----|
| <b>Divine Spirit</b>  | 13             | 6           | 17          | 15          | 51 |
| <b>Evil spirit(s)</b> | 4              | 14          | 12          | 0           | 30 |
| <b>Others</b>         | 2              | 3           | 7           | 9           | 21 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>          | <b>19</b>      | <b>23</b>   | <b>36</b>   | <b>24</b>   |    |

---

<sup>152</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, xvii .

<sup>153</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 11.

<sup>154</sup> Graham Stanton, “Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus” in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 257.

<sup>155</sup> We are taking Blaine Charette’s argument that the unique construction of Mt. 27:50 suggests a reference to the Holy Spirit instead of merely the human spirit of Jesus, *Restoring Presence*, 92-96.

**TABLE 2: Distribution of Incidences Where πνεῦμα Refers to the Divine Spirit**

|  | <b>Matthew</b> | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Luke</b> | <b>John</b> |
|--|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>John the Baptist's birth</b>          |                |             | 1           |             |
| <b>Jesus' Birth Narratives</b>           | 2              |             | 1           |             |
| <b>John the Baptist's Prophecy</b>       | 1              | 1           | 1           | 1           |
| <b>Other Sayings of John the Baptist</b> |                |             |             | 1           |
| <b>Baptism of Jesus</b>                  | 1              | 1           | 1           | 2           |
| <b>Temptation of Jesus</b>               | 1              | 1           | 2           |             |
| <b>Teachings/Sayings of Jesus</b>        | 6              | 3           | 3           | 11          |
| <b>At Jesus' death</b>                   | 1              |             |             |             |
| <b>O.T. Quotation</b>                    | 1              |             | 1           |             |
| <b>Spirit upon Jesus during ministry</b> |                |             | 2           |             |
| <b>Spirit upon individuals</b>           |                |             | 5           |             |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                             | <b>13</b>      | <b>6</b>    | <b>17</b>   | <b>15</b>   |

Tables 1 & 2 can help debunk the myth about Matthean ambivalence concerning pneumatology. In fact, Table 2 demonstrates that, except for John, Matthew has perhaps the most didactic material on the Spirit. More than half (7 out of 13) of the πνεῦμα occurrences in Matthew are reported as a part of Jesus' teachings; compared to half (3 out of 6) in Mark and only less than a quarter (4 out of 17) in Luke. Almost all of the occurrences in Matthew and Mark revolve around the person and ministry of Jesus while Luke has at least 6 instances where the Spirit is at work in individuals (including John the Baptist while he was still in the womb) other than Jesus. Luke's narrative perhaps anticipates the work of the Spirit in the church in Acts.

## V. EXEGESIS OF MATTHEAN PNEUMA PASSAGES

As stated earlier in this paper, this exegesis section is mainly a word study, focusing specifically on the usage of πνεῦμα in Matthew. The exegesis will be done generally under three headings: Contextual Analysis, Verbal Analysis and Theological Analysis. Under “Contextual Analysis,” I will investigate the siting of the word πνεῦμα within the specific pericope and, where useful, also consider how the said pericope relates with the larger context of Matthew’s Gospel. Some background matters may also be discussed under this section. Where necessary and helpful, parallel passages in the other Gospels will be referred to as well. “Verbal Analysis” means the lexical, grammatical and syntactical analysis of πνεῦμα and connected phrases or clauses. Related key words in the verse or pericope may also be similarly analyzed. The third heading, “Theological Analysis,” is the theological commentary section. It will summarize the thoughts gleaned from the investigation into the pericope that will help in advancing an understanding of Matthew’s pneumatology. The three headings serve only as a rough guide for the exegetical process as well as the organization of this paper, and it should be expected that there are overlapping elements in these three sections. Therefore, some repetitions may be necessary to maintain the flow of thought within the individual sections.

To facilitate the exegetical exercise, an English translation will be done from the Greek text of the verses concerned at the beginning of each section. The translation will be as literal as possible within the bounds of idiomatic English.

## Πνεῦμα in the Birth Narrative (Mt. 1:18-25)

Mt 1:18

Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου.

Mt 1:20

ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τὴν γυναῖκα σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἐστὶν ἁγίου.

### English Translation

Mt. 1:18

And thus was the beginning (or, birth) of Jesus Christ. His mother Mary was betrothed to Joseph; before they came together she was found to be pregnant (literally, “having in her womb”) from the Holy Spirit.

Mt. 1:20

And as he was pondering these things, behold an angel of the Lord was revealed to him as a dream saying, “Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary (as) your wife; for the one in her is begotten by the Spirit that is holy.”

### Contextual Analysis

This pericope is nestled within a set of narratives in the opening two chapters of Matthew that relate to the “genesis” (Mt. 1:1 and 1:18) or origin of Jesus. Luke is the only other Gospel to have recorded any similar material relating to the birth and infancy of Jesus. The Matthean version of the birth and infancy narratives is told from the viewpoint of Joseph, unlike the Lukan version, which is told from Mary’s perspective, perhaps suggesting two different sources for Matthew and Luke. Differences should be expected and there is no need to harmonize them because “these differences do not amount to contradictions . . . they are confined to details.”<sup>156</sup> Alfred Plummer suggests that the differences only confirm the general trustworthiness of both accounts because even though they have different sources, “the two accounts agree, not only as to the main fact of the Virgin-birth, but also as to the manner of it, - that it took place through the

---

<sup>156</sup> Plummer, 4.

agency of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>157</sup> For Plummer, the description of the role of the Holy Spirit in the virgin birth of Jesus was significant because:

(It) cannot be due to the influence of the Old Testament upon both writers. There is no such operation of the Holy Spirit on a virgin in the Old Testament, in which the very expression “Holy Spirit” is rare. And elsewhere in the New Testament the Incarnation is indicated in a totally different way (Jn. 1:14).<sup>158</sup>

The two accounts also differ in their genealogies of Jesus. The Matthean account opens with a deliberately reconstructed genealogy of Jesus Christ, which immediately reveals the author’s agenda. Much has been said about the significances of this genealogy and its Lukan counterpart. The genealogy traces Jesus back to Abraham and David. This identification of Jesus’ ethno-religious and royal origins is important for Matthew’s attempt to prove Jesus’ messiahship. To further this agenda of proving Jesus’ messiahship, Matthew also describes various incidents related to the birth of Jesus as fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament. These fulfilled prophecies identify Jesus as the promised messiah of the Old Testament that the Jews had waited for so earnestly. However, these alone do not seem enough for Matthew. Matthew needed to prove Jesus’ divine identity as well. His messiahship was to have more than nationalistic and religious significance. To do that, Matthew emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit in the conception of Jesus, twice assigning the conception to the Holy Spirit (Mt. 1:18, 20). The presence of the Holy Spirit seems to be the ultimate authentication for Jesus’ pedigree to be the Messiah.

---

<sup>157</sup> Plummer goes on to list also four other significant points of agreement between the two accounts: (1) Joseph and Mary were betrothed to each other, (2) the name of the child was to be Jesus, (3) the birth took place in Bethlehem of Judea, and (4) the child was raised up in Nazereth. *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid.*

## Verbal Analysis

The first two mentions of πνεῦμα appear in a passage that begins with what seems like a formal subtitle to the section: “This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about . . .” (NIV). The word γενεσις<sup>159</sup> – translated by the New International Version and almost every other English version as “birth” – could also be translated “beginning”<sup>160</sup> and perhaps harks back to the γενεσεως of Matt. 1:1, which in turn could well reflect Gen. 1:1. This hints at the Holy Spirit’s creative role in the new eschatological creation, counterpart to the creation of Genesis. Donald Hagner concedes that the argument that the creative role of the Holy Spirit is being suggested here, as “theologically sound, although it may be more than Matthew means to say.”<sup>161</sup> Τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (“of Jesus Christ”) should be objective genitive, likewise with Ἰησοῦ in Mt. 1:1; despite some scholars’ suggestion otherwise.<sup>162</sup> Therefore, it is the beginning *concerning* Jesus Christ rather than the beginning *effected by* Jesus Christ.

In both the instances of πνεῦμα in this passage, the word is anarthous. However, this does not mean that the word is not referring to the Holy Spirit. When πνεῦμα is modified by ἅγιος in the New Testament, the resulting phrase becomes a monadic or “one-of-a-kind” noun. Monadic nouns do not need the article to be definite.<sup>163</sup> Furthermore, it is the object of a

---

<sup>159</sup> A variant reading has γεννεσις instead, but the earliest witnesses have the word γενεσις. γεννεσις is limited to mean only “birth” while γενεσις carries a wider connotation and can mean “origin” as well as “birth.” *BAGD*, s.v. “γενεσις”.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>161</sup> Hagner, 17-18.

<sup>162</sup> David R. Bauer, “The Literary and Theological Function of the Genealogy in Matthew’s Gospel” in *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, 137.

<sup>163</sup> Wallace, 248.

preposition in both cases and objects of a preposition do not require the article to make them definite.<sup>164</sup>

Robert G. Bratcher, reading Luke 1:35 into the present passage, suggests that it is the “power of God” that is implied by the two πνεῦμα references in 1:18 and 1:20.<sup>165</sup> This is unnecessary and subsumes Matthew under Luke. Some have argued that the absence of the article is another evidence that the power is being referred to here rather than the Holy Spirit himself.<sup>166</sup> But, as pointed out earlier, the absence of the article is not significant and does not render πνεῦμα indefinite.

The passage uses the adjective “Holy” (ἅγιος) in two different grammatical positions: attributive in verse 18 and predicate in verse 20. If we are to be totally literal, verse 20 would be translated “the Spirit that is holy” rather than merely “Holy Spirit.” With the two variations appearing so close to each other in Matthew, it perhaps demonstrates Matthew’s understanding of the significance of the appellation. “The Spirit is called ‘Holy,’ an adjective not applied to him in Philo or Josephus. The idea that the Spirit is holy is distinctively Christian.”<sup>167</sup> Indeed, the designation, “Holy Spirit” is very rare in the Old Testament; found only in Psa. 51:11 and Isa. 63:10-11. For Matthew, the Holy Spirit is not merely a new title for the רוּחַ (*ruach*, “Spirit”) in the New Testament church. Georg Strecker suggests that Matthew is not just the result of a “historicization” of the Jesus tradition but an “ethicization” as well.<sup>168</sup> While this New Testament

---

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, 247.

<sup>165</sup> Bratcher, 7.

<sup>166</sup> See footnotes in Morris, 27.

<sup>167</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>168</sup> Georg Strecker, “The Concept of History in Matthew” in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, 74-77.

ethicization of the divine Spirit is not a Matthean innovation, Matthew seems to be making a deliberate effort here to put the emphasis on the “ethicized” Spirit.

In the Greek text, both mentions of  $\piνε\delta\mu\alpha$  are in the genitive case and preceded by the preposition  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ , which literally means “out of.” However, the New International Version has chosen to translate the two identical constructions differently. In 1:18,  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ +genitive is translated by the English “through” to indicate the idea of means or agency while the same construction in 1:20 is translated “from” to suggest the idea of source. Although some may prefer the New International Version to be consistent here, both translations are legitimate.<sup>169</sup> Perhaps, we can say that the virgin pregnancy has been effected by the Holy Spirit while the resulting child came from the Holy Spirit. In any case, the role of the Holy Spirit in the birth of Jesus is certainly highlighted by Matthew by this double reference.

$\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  appears a total of seven times in Matthew chapter one: twice in reference to the Holy Spirit’s role in Jesus’ birth and the five other times in reference to the women in Jesus’ genealogy, including Mary. Taking note of the unique way that  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  is used in the first chapter of Matthew, Bruner notices the significance of  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  here and involves it in a word-play of his own:

“ . . . Matthew’s Jesus comes to us literally “out of” ( $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ ) the Holy Spirit. This word means that ‘Jesus’ entry into the life of Mary (and thus of the world) is the work of the Holy Spirit and not of any human being.  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  (“out of” or “by”) is used seven times in the first chapter: four times of the four preceding mothers, a fifth time of Mary herself, and now twice of the Holy Spirit. By pointing to the *ek*-centric births of the four irregular women, Matthew was preparing the way for the eccentricity of the Spirit-conception of Jesus in the virgin Mary. God’s work is often, to human eyes, eccentric, off-center, odd, indeed even foolish and weak, as the cross most dramatically revealed (1 Cor. 1), but as now Christmas reveals, too.”<sup>170</sup>

The reference to Joseph as  $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma$  Δαυίδ (“son of David”) connects this passage with Mt. 1:1. If Davidic sonship is all that matters, this reference to Joseph’s pedigree should suffice.

---

<sup>169</sup> Wallace, 371.

<sup>170</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, 23.

However, the fulfillment quotation in Mt. 1:22 suggests that Matthew has a higher agenda than merely proving Jesus' Davidic lineage. Matthew needed to prove the presence of God with Jesus and he does it by giving the Holy Spirit a central role in the birth of Jesus. This perhaps envisages another Matthean  $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  passage in Mt. 22:41-46, where Jesus' Davidic sonship is irrefutably declared to be on a higher level than even David himself.

### **Theological Analysis**

The early reference to the Spirit in chapter one of the book “removes the tension, (and) presupposes knowledge of the reader.”<sup>171</sup> In fact, one can reasonably assume that Matthew's reader is post-Pentecost; and yet not too far off to have forgotten the power of Pentecost. Evidence in the text suggests that the Matthean community is still charismatic in nature, with a keen interest in the charismatic manifestations of the Spirit; e.g. Mt. 7:15-23. But, it is not just the power of the Spirit that is in focus here. Matthew directs his reader's attention to the holiness of the divine Spirit as well. Bruner sees the work of the divine Spirit in the human realm here as perhaps paradigmatic for the work of the Spirit in the disciples when he says that, “the greatest systematic importance in this text is the truth that the office of the Holy Spirit, from the very beginning of the Christian story, is to bring Jesus Christ into human life. . . . We can learn from Matthew's first two references to the Spirit that the Spirit's main work is the earthly, historical work of making Jesus a living person in the inner life of another historical person.”<sup>172</sup>

But, the Spirit is not just an instrument of God's purpose on earth. Matthew also presents the Spirit as the supreme authority. It is not just a divinely-inspired dream that convinced Joseph but the fact that the Holy Spirit is involved in the conception. That perhaps is evidence that the

---

<sup>171</sup> Luz, *Matthew*, vol. 1, 118.

<sup>172</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, 22.

Holy Spirit has already taken a very significant and authoritative role in the Matthean Community. By attributing the conception of Jesus to the work of the Holy Spirit, Matthew also gives the messianic identity of Jesus a divine authentication.

Although the divinity of the Spirit has yet to be overtly affirmed in this early stage of Matthew's narrative, some authors already see Matthew's Trinitarian theology even in this early mention of the Holy Spirit. For example, Michael Green observes:

This passage is strongly, if not unself-consciously, Trinitarian. God the Father reveals himself through his Son, Jesus Immanuel. But all this is brought about through the agency of the Holy Spirit. . . . All three persons of the Trinity are brought before our gaze, and this is not a dogmatic construction but a very natural piece of writing. The doctrine is not something superimposed on Scripture, . . . it emerges out of the natural allusions in the text itself.<sup>173</sup>

This pericope carries a veiled reference to Genesis and therefore also suggests an important carry-over in the understanding of the  $\text{רוח}$  ("Spirit") in the Old Testament to the New Testament Holy Spirit. And yet, there is a radical newness to the Spirit's New Testament work:

The Holy Spirit is not only the source of creation and life (Gen. 1:2) but also the initiator of the messianic age (Isa. 61:1). Jesus' conception is thus understood by Matthew to be an eschatological event of a new creation. It sets it off as a radical disruption of what preceded it in the genealogy in 1:2-16. Human genealogical possibilities have been completed and exhausted. God now steps in. This divine intervention marks a new beginning; and while there is continuity with the past, there is also an unmistakable discontinuity.<sup>174</sup>

While the roles of Jesus as the Son of David and descendent of Abraham suggests Jesus' continuity with human history, the role of the Holy Spirit in Jesus' birth speaks of the discontinuity of Jesus with that genealogy. Mt. 1:1-17, which begins with, "A record of the genealogy of Jesus Christ the son of David and the son of Abraham" (cf. Mt. 1:1) records his

---

<sup>173</sup> Green, 60-61.

<sup>174</sup> Garland, 23.

human ancestry and continuity with the sacred history of the Jews. On the other hand, the section of Mt. 1:18-25, which begins with, “This is how the birth of Jesus came about” (Mt. 1:18) records his divinity and describes how he is different from his human ancestors and therefore his discontinuity as the Son of God from human history. This discontinuity is emphasized by the manner of his birth and role of the Holy Spirit in his birth. “(Jesus’) father, in essence, was God, through the work of the Holy Spirit; his mother was the fully human woman, Mary.”<sup>175</sup> Although the title, “Son of God” is not used in this pericope, this title is by implication being applied to Jesus.

Charette suggests that the association of γένεσις with πνεῦμα conveys to Matthew’s readers the “two distinct and yet related events” of creation and redemption.<sup>176</sup> Matthew’s eschatological Holy Spirit that is at work in the *new creation* is the same Spirit at work during the original creation of the universe.

### Πνεῦμα in the Baptist’s Prophecy (Mt. 3:1-12)

Μτ 3:11

Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετανοίαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερος μου ἐστίν, οὐ οὐκ εἶμι ἱκανὸς τα ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ·

#### English Translation

Mt. 3:11

I (emphatic) baptize you (plural) in water into repentance, but the one who comes after me is stronger than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to carry; he (emphatic) will baptize you (plural) in the Holy Spirit and fire.

---

<sup>175</sup> Blomberg, 58.

<sup>176</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 38-39.

## Contextual Analysis

All the four Gospels describe the preparatory ministry of John the Baptist (Mt. 3:1-12; Mk. 1:3-8; Lk. 3:2-17 and Jn. 1:19-34). Narrative critics may perhaps label John the Baptist as the “reliable character” (cf. Mt. 11:7-11) of Matthew's story.<sup>177</sup> However, Robert Webb would argue that there is little value for the early church to create the Baptist traditions because for the people of Jesus’ time, Messianic identity finds its authority in the Old Testament and not in John the Baptist’s preaching.<sup>178</sup> In fact, Walter Wink even suggests that the early church has brought John the Baptist into the *kerygma* “at extreme risks to the uniqueness of Jesus.”<sup>179</sup> Therefore, the authenticity of the Baptist pericopes need not be doubted.

This pericope is part of a larger two-pericope section that is bounded by the *inclusio*, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near” (Mt. 3:2 and 4:17 NIV). Both the two pericopes within this larger section – the Baptist’s ministry and the temptation of Jesus – have a common theme: Jesus’ sonship with God.<sup>180</sup> The section therefore seems to have been structured to allow for a comparison between the ministries of John the Baptist and Jesus. Luz also notices how the description of John the Baptist’s successful ministry in Mt. 3:5 is paralleled by the description in Mt. 4:25 of Jesus’ successful ministry.<sup>181</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup> Keener, *Matthew*, 81.

<sup>178</sup> Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*, Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 62 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 266-275.

<sup>179</sup> Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*, Society for the New Testament Studies Monograph Series: 7 (London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1968), xi.

<sup>180</sup> Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, 164.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*

## Verbal Analysis

In the specific verse considered here where πνευμα is found, Mt. 3:11, the baptism offered by Jesus is contrasted against John's baptism. This is borne out by the μεν . . . δε (“on the one hand . . . on the other hand”) construction. The emphatic use of ἐγώ (“I”) and the intensive αὐτός (“he”) also emphasizes the contrast rather than merely comparing the two baptisms. The tone of this construction is expressed by the word “indeed” in the King James Version. Therefore, W. C. Allen’s suggestion that “baptism with water and baptism with the Holy Spirit need not be regarded as antithetical and exclusive”<sup>182</sup> may need to be qualified. While it is true that the two baptisms are not antithetical in that they are not opposed to each other, it still remains that John's statement is clearly aimed at demonstrating the enormous difference between the two. It seems unlikely from John's statement that he would claim any overlap between the two baptisms. The two baptisms seem to be at least exclusive – if not antithetical – as far as John is concerned. There is a higher and superior order to Jesus’ ministry in comparison to John’s ministry. This is perhaps the main significance to the πυρι (“fire”) symbol, which can be easily recognized as a contrast to water.

The immediate context of the Baptist’s preaching may suggest that πυρι should be more than a contrast to water but also a figurative reference to judgment. David Hill agrees to the judgment interpretation but makes a distinction between πυρι in Mt. 3:11 and in Mt. 3:12, suggesting that the fire of Mt. 3:11 is “redemptive judgment” while the fire of Mt. 3:12 is “destructive judgment.”<sup>183</sup> Redemptive, purifying or refining fire has Old Testament precedence

---

<sup>182</sup> Allen, 25.

<sup>183</sup> Hill, 94-95.

in Zech. 13:9 and Mal. 3:2-3. Beyond this understanding of fire as judgment, J. Daryl Charles, points out the “theophanic use” of fire in the Old Testament:

The OT witness to the severity of judgment notwithstanding, the significance of another aspect of fire, however, should not be lost sight of: its *theophanic* use. The presence and appearance of Yahweh was, of all things, most akin to fire. Fire and glory become virtually synonymous. Note in particular Exodus 13:21; 19:18; 24:17; Leviticus 9:23, 24; Deuteronomy 4:11, 12; Psalms 50:2, 3; Ezekiel 1:4, 13, 26-28; Daniel 7:9, 10.<sup>184</sup>

There is therefore only one baptism described by the βαπτισει ἐν πνευματι ἁγιῳ και πυρι (“baptism of the Holy Spirit and fire”). πυρι (“fire”) is only a symbolic further description of the Holy Spirit. That there is only one baptism described here is suggested by the fact that there is only one preposition, ἐν (“in”), governing both πνευματι ἁγιῳ and πυρι. It may not be possible to bring in Granville Sharp’s Rule<sup>185</sup> unless we apply that rule in an implicit and indirect manner by arguing that the article is implicit in a monadic noun like πνευματι ἁγιῳ and that πυρι is a personification and therefore functions as a personal pronoun. Nonetheless, the grammatical construction seems more likely to be indicating only one baptism instead of two different baptisms. Therefore, Keener’s suggestion that the reference is to two separate works of Jesus – “works inaugurated at the first coming of Jesus (such as baptism in the Spirit) . . . (and

---

<sup>184</sup> J. Daryl Charles, “The ‘Coming One’/‘Stronger One’ and His Baptism: Matt 3:11-12, Mark 1:8, Luke 3:16-17,” *Pneuma* 11:11 (Fall 1989): 39-40.

<sup>185</sup> “The rules given in Granville Sharp’s *Remarks on the Uses of the Definite Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament* are: (1) When two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative και, if the former has the definitive article, and the latter has not, they both relate to the same person. (2) If both nouns have the article, but not the copulative, they relate to the same person. (3) If the first has the article, and the second has not, and there is no copulative, they relate also to the same person. (4) If the nouns are not personal, they relate to different things or qualities. (5) If personal nouns, of the same case, are connected the copulative, and the first has not the article, they relate to different persons. (6) If they are connected by the copulative, and both have the article, they relate also to different persons.” David Thiele, Pacific Adventist University, Papua New Guinea; posted on B-Greek@lists.ibiblio.org, <http://lists.ibiblio.org/mailman/listinfo/b-greek> on 8 June 2003.

works) inaugurated at the second (such as baptism in fire)”<sup>186</sup> – seems overextended and unlikely.

Among those who agree that πνευματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ refers only to one baptism, Gundry suggests that πνευματι ἁγίῳ and πυρὶ may refer to two possible consequences of that baptism administered by Jesus; depending on the fruit produced. “Those producing good fruit will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. Those producing bad fruit will suffer unending punishment.”<sup>187</sup> Blomberg also subscribes to one baptism with two effects: “For believers this would most likely refer to the Holy Spirit’s purifying and refining activity, but the same convicting power when spurned by unbelievers leads ultimately to judgment.”<sup>188</sup> Still others see this construction as a hendiadys and interpret πυρὶ as adjectival, so that the phrase could be translated: “baptism in the fiery Holy Spirit.”<sup>189</sup>

As Jesus was described as “*coming up* from the water” (Mt. 3:16) after his water baptism, we can perhaps conclude that Jesus was *down in* the water at his baptism. If so, ἐν here will have to be dative-locative, especially in the first mention about water baptism. We may perhaps also conclude by virtue of the parallelism between the two baptisms that the second ἐν here, used in reference to Spirit baptism, would also be dative-locative.

As pointed out earlier, πνεῦμα ἁγίου is monadic and the absence of the article does not make it indefinite. Therefore, despite E. Schweizer’s suggestion to the contrary,<sup>190</sup> the absence of

---

<sup>186</sup> Keener, *Matthew*, 81.

<sup>187</sup> Gundry, 49.

<sup>188</sup> Blomberg, 80.

<sup>189</sup> Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 175

<sup>190</sup> Schweizer, 51.

the article is not significant and there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that πνεῦμα here refers to “wind” instead of “Spirit.” And even if we allow for the meager manuscript evidence that ἄγιω may have been a scribal addition to the Lukan parallel (Lk. 3:16), it does not substantially change the meaning of the verse.<sup>191</sup>

Matthew has the substantive participle ὁ ἐρχομενος instead of the indicative verb ἐρχεται in Mark and Luke. This perhaps allows for Matthew’s readers to understand ὁ ὀπισω μου ἐρχομενος (“The One who comes after me”) as the “Coming One,” which has become a technical term for the Messiah in later messianism (cf. Mt. 11:3; 21:9; 23:39; cf. Heb. 10:37; Ps. 118:26).<sup>192</sup> Jesus’ ministry is then recognized as the fulfillment of John the Baptist’s announcement about “the Coming One” and the coming Kingdom of God.

### **Theological Analysis**

The appearance of John the Baptist in the Gospel story has an important theological significance because he represents the Old Testament and the Law. After four centuries of prophetic silence, if John the Baptist had not come on the scene, the continuity between Jesus as the Christ of the New Testament and the Messiah of the Old Testament will not be evident. Therefore, Bruner characterizes John as “the law of God in person” while Jesus is “the gospel of God in person.”<sup>193</sup>

John the Baptist’s ministry should also have special significance to Pentecostals. After all, it was John the Baptist who coined the term, “baptism in the Holy Spirit.”<sup>194</sup> In fact, it has been

---

<sup>191</sup> Montague, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*, 239.

<sup>192</sup> Hagner, 51. Also, Davis and Allison, 313-314.

<sup>193</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, 111.

<sup>194</sup> Gordon Fee, “Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Issue of Separability and Subsequence,” *Pneuma*, vol. 7:2 (Fall, 1985): 92.

noted that the phrase, “to baptize with the Holy Spirit” occurs in the New Testament “only in connexion with, and contrast to, John’s baptism with water (Mt. 3:11, Mk. 1:8, Lk. 3:16, Jn. 1:33, Acts 1:5, 11:16).<sup>195</sup> Pentecostals will perhaps note the strong contrast made between the figures of John the Baptist and Jesus as well as between the two baptisms represented by them. It is unlikely that Matthew will have any problem with the Pentecostal doctrine of the separability of Spirit baptism from regeneration represented by the initiatory rite of water baptism.

John Chrysostom also seems to imply two different baptisms as he describes dramatically the relationship and the different effects of the two baptisms - in water and in the Holy Spirit/fire:

He took dust from the earth and made the man; He formed him. The devil came, and perverted him. Then the Lord came, took him again, and remolded, and recast him in baptism, and He suffered not his body to be of clay but made it of harder ware. He subjected the soft clay to the fire of the Holy Spirit. . . . He was baptized with water that he might that he might be remodelled, with fire that he might be hardened.<sup>196</sup>

In fact, we can see the two baptisms as paradigmatically different. The Christian initiation rite of baptism in water is clearly a carry over from John the Baptist’s water ritual, with “John’s baptism (serving) as the prototype for Christian baptism,”<sup>197</sup> just as the Jewish Passover meal is the prototype for Christian Holy Communion. However, the contrast between John’s repentance-water baptism and Jesus’ Spirit-fire baptism is so strongly emphasized that it seems unlikely that the two can be considered as belonging to the same paradigm.

---

<sup>195</sup> J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, *A Translator’s Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1971), 173.

<sup>196</sup> Cited by Oden, 180.

<sup>197</sup> Harrington, 60.

## Πνεῦμα in the Baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:13-16)

Mt 3:16

βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν [αὐτῷ] οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν [τὸ] πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστέρην [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον ἐπ’ αὐτόν·

### English Translation

Mt. 3:16

And after he was baptized, Jesus immediately came up from the water; and behold the heavens were opened [to him], and he saw the Spirit of God coming down like a dove [and/even] coming on him.

### Contextual Analysis

The pericope of Mt. 3:13-16 begins in a similar fashion as that of Mt. 3:1-15 with the same word παραγινεταί (“appear”) introducing John in Mt. 3:1 and Jesus in Mt. 3:13. Matthew is calling his readers to compare the ministries of these two men by placing these two pericopes next to each other.

. . . the real point of the passage is not the baptism of Jesus itself but the threads of continuity and discontinuity between John and Jesus. Only through contact with the forerunner can Jesus be launched into his own ministry. That contact and the formal beginning of Jesus’ ministry are filled with theological significance.<sup>198</sup>

The baptism of Jesus seems to have strong foundations in the gospel traditions, with all the Synoptics reporting the event (Mt. 1:13-17; Mk. 1:9-11; Lk. 3:21-22). Although John did not describe the event, he refers to it in a way to suggest that he has knowledge of it (Jn. 1:31-34). The incident of the baptism of Jesus at the Jordan River is the only direct encounter between Jesus and John the Baptist recorded in the Gospels. However, one may reasonably assume that Jesus and John the Baptist could have some contact growing up because of the close relationship

---

<sup>198</sup> Hagner, 54-55.

between Mary and Elizabeth.<sup>199</sup> Matthew expands on this contact at the baptism of Jesus with an exchange between Jesus and John in Mt. 3:14-15. The baptism of Jesus by John the Baptist is intriguing from a theological viewpoint and Matthew wants to provide an explanation for the event.<sup>200</sup> E. Schweizer doubts the authenticity, especially of the exchange here between Jesus and John, because if John were to have said what was reported here, John would have to become a follower of Jesus.<sup>201</sup> However, the very implausibility of that exchange within the narrative may very well suggest an authentic non-Matthean tradition and militates against any innovation on Matthew's part.

Although we can imply from Matthew's record that Jesus was baptized by John the Baptist, Matthew (and Luke) does not describe the actual baptism of Jesus. Instead, Matthew focuses on what happens immediately after Jesus was baptized. Mark alone records explicitly that Jesus was baptized by John (Mk. 1:9).

### **Verbal Analysis**

Matthew alone has πνεῦμα θεου ("Spirit of God"); Luke has πνευμα ἁγίου ("Holy Spirit") while Mark and John have πνεῦμα ("Spirit"). Some manuscripts have the article before πνευμα and θεου but the presence or absence of the article does not affect the meaning. This is the first time in Matthew where πνεῦμα is modified with something other than ἅγιος. πνευμα ἁγίου is almost totally a New Testament appellation whereas πνευμα θεου has clear Old Testament precedence. το πνευμα του θεου is interchangeable with το πνεῦμα του κυριου

---

<sup>199</sup> Mounce, 24.

<sup>200</sup> Harrington suggests that the dialogue in Mt. 3:14-15 "indicates that early Christians felt some embarrassment about the episode (of John baptizing Jesus) and needed an explanation of how it came about," 63.

<sup>201</sup> Schweizer, *The Good News According to Matthew*, 57.

(the Spirit of the Lord) and therefore could be an allusion to the Old Testament anointing of the Servant of the Lord in Isa. 11:1ff, 42:1ff and 61:1ff.<sup>202</sup> These verses are alluded to in the Holy Spirit resting upon Jesus after the baptism as well as in the declaration by the voice from heaven in Mt. 3:17.<sup>203</sup>

Gundry, however, sees Matthew's *τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ* as signaling a trinitarian emphasis for a continuity between Jesus' baptism and later Christian baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>204</sup> This is reasonable as it would be inconceivable for Matthew to make reference to baptism without any thought of the climactic passage of Mt. 28:16-20 where the command to baptize is given. The Matthean "Spirit of God" is perhaps Matthew's effort to draw attention to the Spirit's divinity in a context where both the Father's and the Son's divinity is clearly implied. Gundry further strengthens his argument by suggesting that the Matthean *ἐρχόμενον* here and *ἐρχόμενος* in Mt. 3:11 (both of which are not in Markan and Lukan parallels) are Matthew's deliberate effort to advance "a trinitarian correspondence between the Spirit as coming and Jesus as the one who is coming."<sup>205</sup>

*ἐρχόμενον* is neuter singular, agreeing with *πνεῦμα*, so that the one that is coming upon Jesus is not the physical dove but the Holy Spirit. The word, especially when read together with its usage in Mt. 3:11, also emphasizes Matthew's interpretation of the significance of Jesus'

---

<sup>202</sup> Michael Welker quotes these Isaianic texts as prophetic description of the the Spirit's role in the Messiah. "These texts announce God's chosen bringer of salvation, upon whom the Spirit not only comes in a surprising way, but upon whom the Spirit also 'remains.' The understanding of the Spirit of God now appears to be settled in the truest sense of the word: *The Spirit of God 'rests'* (emphasis Welker's)." Michael Welker, *God the Spirit*, tr. John F. Hoffmeyer (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994), 108-109.

<sup>203</sup> Apart from the Isaianic passages, Mt. 3:17 could also have drawn part of its inspiration from Ps. 2:7.

<sup>204</sup> Gundry, 52.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

baptism - and the Spirit's role - in the authentication of Jesus as the Messiah. It is possible that καὶ should be translated with the emphatic “even,” to further reflect Matthew's intention for the emphasis on the Spirit's coming upon Jesus.

Robert Hanna describes οἱ οὐρανοὶ (“the heavens”) as “an exceptional use of the plural (because) generally the singular is used for the material sense of ‘sky’.”<sup>206</sup> Perhaps, it will not be so “exceptional” if we consider that Matthew may be referring to something more than a physically open sky. Οἱ οὐρανοὶ here refers to both the sky that has physically parted and to the abode of God, which was the source of the “dove.” McNeile comments that οἱ οὐρανοὶ is “virtually, though not actually, a periphrasis for God.”<sup>207</sup> We may also reference this to the Lord's Prayer where God is “Our Father in the heavens” (ΠΑΤΕΡ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).

ὥσει περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν (“as a dove upon him”) describes the coming of the Holy Spirit upon Jesus the Messiah. ὥσει almost negates the physical dove and transforms it into a mere metaphor for the Holy Spirit. It is unlikely that Matthew is challenging Luke's account of an actual physical dove (Lk. 3:22). Matthew simply wants to divert the focus away from the physical dove so that his readers will focus on the Holy Spirit. It was not simply a dove that is coming upon Jesus – it was the Holy Spirit from heaven.

περιστερα is usually translated “dove” but Morris comments that word could refer to a variety of doves and pigeons.<sup>208</sup> “The dove which, from the viewpoint of ancient natural science

---

<sup>206</sup> Robert Hanna, *A Grammatical Aid to the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983), 14.

<sup>207</sup> McNeile, 32.

<sup>208</sup> Morris, 66-67.

has no bile, was for the early Christians the symbol of all kinds of virtues.”<sup>209</sup> However, one should not read future Christian symbolism into the dove here.

Some have compared Gen. 1:2 (but no dove appears there) and Gen. 8:8-12 (but the Spirit does not appear there). The lack of OT precedent and the failure of the comparison to appear in known Jewish literature of the NT era favor historical tradition over ecclesiastical invention.<sup>210</sup>

Davies and Allison cites sixteen different possible explanations for the symbolism of the dove<sup>211</sup> but the meaning of that symbolism seems mainly to be one of gentleness (even weak and naive, cf. Hos. 7:11) and purity, and perhaps attenuates somewhat the more violent “fire-purity” symbolism of John’s prophecy in Mt. 3:11.

### **Theological Analysis**

The coming of the Holy Spirit at this point cannot be interpreted as evidence for an adoptionist Christology in Matthew. Matthew’s account shows that the Holy Spirit had already been actively working in Jesus’ earthly life from the very beginning. Matthew had already mentioned the Holy Spirit twice in the birth narratives (Mt. 1:18, 20). With the dialogue between Jesus and John the Baptist just before the baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:14-15), Matthew was indicating that both of them were aware of the Messianic identity of Jesus. Jesus did not *become* the Son of God at his baptism. He was already the Son of God before his baptism.

Up to this point, the Messianic identity of Jesus has only been implied by the miraculous conception and the Baptist’s prophecy. But now, his messianic identity is spectacularly and publicly announced. Despite the suggestion in the text that only John and Jesus witnessed the

---

<sup>209</sup> BAGD, s.v. “περιστερα.”

<sup>210</sup> Gundry, 52.

<sup>211</sup> Davies and Allison, 331-334.

open heavens and the dove, neither of them needed to be informed of Jesus' messianic identity. Therefore, "the voice from heaven is a narrative aside directed to the reader."<sup>212</sup> This suggestion is strengthened by Matthew making the voice from heaven an "open proclamation" ("This is my son . . ." Mt. 3:17) compared to Mark's "personal word" ("You are my son . . ." Mk. 1:11).<sup>213</sup>

The divine Sonship of Jesus implies the Fatherhood of God, which is picked up again in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:1-7:27, especially the Lord's Prayer – where the disciples were commanded to pray, "Our Father . . .") and the Commission to the Twelve (Mt. 10:5-42). In the Sermon on the Mount and the Commission to the Twelve the divine Fatherhood is extended beyond being just the Father of Jesus to include the disciples. In this Baptism episode, the significance of that divine Fatherhood comes through the activity of the Spirit. This close association of the Father and the Spirit is further highlighted in the Commission to the Twelve by the uniquely Matthean appellation for the Holy Spirit, "the Spirit of your Father" (Mt. 10:20). Reading Mt. 10:20 and 3:16 together may perhaps suggest that, as we share in Jesus' divine sonship, we should also share in His anointing of the Spirit. The same Spirit that came upon the Son of God now comes upon the children of God.

The appellation  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ , the open heavens and the "incipient trinitarianism",<sup>214</sup> all point to the divinity of the Holy Spirit. It also identifies the Christian "Holy Spirit" with the Old Testament's "Spirit of God." Even at this early point in Matthew's gospel, one can see evidence of a "high" Matthean pneumatology where the Spirit is divine. The Spirit is not just the "power of God" to accomplish God's purposes on earth. In Matthew, the Spirit is

---

<sup>212</sup> Garland, 37.

<sup>213</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1975), 63.

<sup>214</sup> Blomberg, 82.

more than a functionary of Yahweh. Just like Jesus, the Spirit is also “the Coming One” – God Himself coming down from the heavens.

### **Πνεῦμα in the Testing of Jesus’ Sonship (Mt. 4:1-11)**

Mt 4:1

Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 4:1 Then Jesus was led up into the desert by the Spirit to be tempted by the devil.

#### **Contextual Analysis**

All the Synoptic Gospels describe the temptation episode (Mt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12-13; Lk. 4:1-13), with Matthew and Luke describing it in detail. All the three records place the temptation episode immediately following the baptism of Jesus. And, all three describe a key role of the Spirit in the episode, although they imply slightly different roles to the Spirit. In Mark, the Spirit forcefully “drives” or “casts” Jesus out into the desert. In Luke, the emphasis seems to be on the abiding presence of the Spirit that has remained since the baptism and continues during the whole temptation episode. Matthew describes Jesus as being led by the Spirit, less dramatic than the Markan version but more straightforward than the Lukan version.

In all the three Synoptic Gospels, the temptation pericope is closely related to the baptism pericope. At the baptism, Jesus was declared the Son of God. The criterion of true sonship is obedience, and now that obedience will be tested. The first two temptations focus overtly on Jesus’ sonship: “If you are the Son of God . . .” (Mt. 4:3, 6 NIV). Gundry suggests that Jesus’ postbaptismal obedience to the law of Moses is a paradigm for postbaptismal obedience in a

Christian to the law of Christ, and that Matthew was thus attacking antinomianism.<sup>215</sup> Hagner points out that the motif of testing occurs again later (in Gethsemane) but it is here “in a definitive and tone-setting manner.”<sup>216</sup> The same Spirit that came upon him at the baptism in the Jordan River now leads him to be tested in the wilderness.

### Verbal Analysis

By using τότε (“then”) here, Matthew connects the temptation pericope logically to the declaration of Jesus’ divine Sonship. The temptation only makes sense *after* the declaration of Jesus’ divine Sonship at his baptism. The main verb Matthew chooses here, ἀνήχθη (“lead” or “bring up”), is not as dramatic as Mark’s ἐκβαλλει but it is more straightforward than Luke’s attempt to emphasize the Spirit’s continued presence throughout the whole temptation episode. The Matthean nuance on the episode suggests Jesus’ role in responding willfully to the Spirit’s leading while Mark and Luke focus on a stronger role of the Spirit.

τὴν ἔρημον (“the wilderness” or “desert”) probably refers to the local desert in the Transjordan area. In Matthew’s narrative, this continues the comparison between Jesus and John the Baptist, whose ministry has been characterized by its “wilderness” accent (Mt. 3:1-4). However, it also reminds Matthew’s readers of Israel’s past history, especially when this wilderness reference is read together with the number forty in Mt. 3:2.<sup>217</sup>

This is the first instance in Matthew where πνεῦμα is not accompanied with a modifier in the appellation. It is close enough to Mt. 3:16 to identify this as the same Spirit that came upon Jesus at his baptism. The article also makes πνεῦμα here definite so that there is no confusion as

---

<sup>215</sup> Gundry, 54.

<sup>216</sup> Hagner, 62.

<sup>217</sup> “The shift from forty years to forty days is not difficult in rabbinic typology (in the OT, cf. Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6),” Hagner, *Ibid.*, 64.

to the meaning. Matthew's *πειρασθῆναι* is infinitive of purpose and defines the objective of the Spirit's leading upon Jesus. The Markan and Lukan parallel passages acknowledge the role of the Spirit but do not have Matthew's description of the Spirit's purposefulness. Matthew recognizes here a definite purpose to the leading of the Spirit. The Spirit is not a capricious spiritual force but is wise and purposeful.

There are two ὑπὸ ("by") phrases here: ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ("by the Spirit") and ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου ("by the devil"), representing the roles of the Spirit and the devil. Hagner finds it significant that the Spirit's role is prior to that of the devil.<sup>218</sup> The devil does not have the initiative here.

### **Theological Analysis**

Keener suggests that the temptation is a test of Jesus' mission as the Son of God "*vis-a-vis* some contemporary models of divine sonship," and a demonstration that Jesus is not a magician, a deluded visionary or a political revolutionary.<sup>219</sup> In fact, his sonship is representative of the relationship that Israel has with God.

In the temptation episode, Matthew seems to be deliberately drawing his readers into a comparison between the experiences of Jesus and those of Israel in the wilderness:

After the experience of her deliverance from Egypt and the establishment of the covenant relationship, Israel experienced a season of testing in the wilderness. The sequence in Matthew's account is similar: following the return from Egypt, we have the baptism (likened, by some scholars, to Israel's crossing of the Sea of Reeds), the divine declaration of Jesus as God's son, and the time of testing in the wilderness. The parallel is heightened by the fact that all of Jesus' answers to the tempter are drawn from Deut. 6-8, the very passage that describes her hopes, repeats in his own experience the experience of Israel – with, of course,

---

<sup>218</sup> Hagner, 64.

<sup>219</sup> Keener, *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*, 100.

the one major difference, that whereas Israel failed its test in the wilderness, Jesus succeeds, demonstrating the perfection of his own sonship.<sup>220</sup>

As the nation Israel was Yahweh's son, so is Jesus (Hos. 11:1; Mt. 2:15) in Matthew. Therefore, Jesus, under the Holy Spirit's leading, becomes the embodiment of the new Israel. Similarly, the temptation is also "archetypal"<sup>221</sup> of the spiritual conflict between God's Spirit and the Enemy. His victory in this temptation episode brings assurance of victory for Matthew's Spirit-led Community.

As in the baptism, the temptation of Jesus is another defining moment in the development of the Messianic persona of Jesus Christ. While the pericope is sometimes given a "parenthetic interpretation" to "show how Jesus withstood the human temptations of gluttony, of vainglory and of greed and thus admonish the community,"<sup>222</sup> a Christological interpretation is perhaps more likely to be Matthew's intention. It is Jesus' divine sonship that is at stake here, "If you are the Son of God . . ." (Mt. 4:3, 6 NIV). The close association between the temptation and the baptism, where the heavenly declaration of Jesus' sonship was made, also suggests that a Christological interpretation is more likely. However, with the suggestions in the immediate literary context of this pericope that Jesus may be identifying with the people of God, this victory of the Spirit-led Son of God can also be seen as a victory for all who are Spirit-led and who declare God as the Father. Therefore, a Christological interpretation of this passage does not necessarily have to exclude the parenthetic interpretation.

This is the first instance in Matthew's story where Jesus responds to the leading of the Holy Spirit. The ministry of Jesus was Spirit-led even from the beginning. Abraham Kuyper

---

<sup>220</sup> Hagner, 62.

<sup>221</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 66.

<sup>222</sup> Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 184.

remarks, “The Church has never sufficiently confessed the influence of the Holy Spirit exerted upon the work of Christ. The general impression is that the work of the Holy Spirit begins when the work of the Mediator on earth is finished. . . . Yet the Scripture teaches us again and again that Christ performed His mediatorial work controlled and impelled by the Holy Spirit.”<sup>223</sup> The role of the Spirit is critical and continuing in the divine program of redemption.

### **Πνεῦμα in the Commissioning of the Twelve (Mt. 10:17-20)**

Mt 10:20

οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 10:20 For you (plural) are not the ones who are speaking but the Spirit of your Father (is) the One speaking through you (plural).

#### **Contextual Analysis**

This πνεῦμα reference comes after a lapse of more than five chapters, the last reference coming from Mt. 4:1. Between 4:1 and 10:20 there was the inaugural ministry of Jesus in Galilee, the calling of the His disciples, the description of the growth of His ministry, the great Sermon on the Mount section (ch. 5-7), and the reports of powerful miracles in His ministry (including healings, exorcisms, calming of a storm, and even the raising of a dead girl). All this led to growing crowds following Jesus. Jesus therefore called twelve disciples and delegated them to have authority to drive out evil spirits and to heal. H. J. Held makes the point that the great teaching section of chapters 5 to 7, followed by the collection of the accounts of the miraculous deeds of Jesus in chapters 8 and 9, has the Christological function of presenting Jesus

---

<sup>223</sup> Abraham Kuyper, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, tr. Henri Devries (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1941), 81.

as the “Messiah of the word” and also as the “Messiah of deed.”<sup>224</sup> Matthew’s intention that these two groups of chapters (5 - 7 and 8 - 9) be read together can perhaps be seen in the “framework-verses”<sup>225</sup> of Mt. 4:23 and 9:35.

The reference to the twelve disciples in 10:1 and 11:1 form an *inclusio* marking out the entire chapter 10 as an identifiable block. It follows the lament in Mt. 9:37 of the lack of workers. Chapter 10 responds with the calling and commissioning of the twelve apostles. The specific verse that is of interest to this paper forms part of the instructions given to the twelve apostles at their commissioning. This commissioning was given for the exclusive purpose of reaching the Israelites. “Matthew was eager to record that Jesus sent his disciples first exclusively to the Jews, thus highlighting the fulfillment of the promises to Israel and confirming that Christianity is not a different ‘religion’ nor one intended primarily for the Gentiles, although Jews were quickly becoming a minority in the Church of Matthew's day.”<sup>226</sup> It is perhaps also significant that these instructions to preach only to the “lost sheep of Israel,” comes just before the remarks of Jesus about John the Baptist in chapter 11. The reader will be reminded that John the Baptist represents the Old Covenant directed towards Israel.

Ulrich Luz, however, goes beyond this common interpretation that the commissioning of the Twelve was to fulfill the divine obligations of the Old Covenant to Israel.<sup>227</sup> For Luz, Matthew chapter 10 is fundamental to a Matthean ecclesiological perspective and should be seen

---

<sup>224</sup> Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, trans. Percy Scott (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963), 246.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, 249.

<sup>226</sup> Hagner, 273.

<sup>227</sup> Luz, “Itinerant Radicals, Settled Communities, and the Church Today” in *Matthew in History*, 39-55.

as the “ecclesiological prolongation of chapters 5-9.”<sup>228</sup> Indeed, the formulation καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν (“and healing every disease and every sickness”) in 10:1 closely follows that of Mt. 4:23 and 9:35, suggesting an identification of the disciples here with the ministry of Jesus.<sup>229</sup> Chapter 10 therefore challenges today’s mere “conceptual definition” of the church and confronts us with a “non-idealistic understanding” of the church – one that is dynamic “in its obedience and its deeds”:<sup>230</sup>

For (Matthew), the church is not something static and primarily institutional. His concept is that of a dynamic church. The church in its institutional appearance is not yet the church, but only in its obedience and its deeds. It is the church insofar as it has a task, authority, and power from the Lord and insofar as it *lives* according to its mission, is obedient, and *practices* what is given and commanded to it (emphases all Luz’s).<sup>231</sup>

Hagner, however, takes a somewhat softer stand about applying chapter 10 to the church. He doubts if Matthew’s church would be expected to fulfill literally the commandments given here. Nonetheless, he still believes that the church “was called to exhibit a similar mindset . . . (allowing) nothing to distract from the call to spread the message of the kingdom. . . . (And,) be prepared for a mixed response to their message”<sup>232</sup>

Morris follows up on this opinion that chapter 10 may apply to the church but limits its application only to certain sections of the chapter. For him, 10:16ff forms a different section and refers perhaps to a future situation beyond the immediate mission of the twelve. Instructions given by Jesus in the earlier section (10:5-15) seem to suggest that the twelve will expect a

---

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, 42.

<sup>229</sup> Bornkamm, Barth and Held, 249.

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid.*, 54-55.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.

<sup>232</sup> Hagner, 274.

friendlier reception, unlike the section of 10:16ff, which suggests that the twelve should expect to undergo severe persecution.<sup>233</sup>

In fact, the Matthean context for the saying of Mt. 10:19-22 is unique among the Synoptics. Both Mark and Luke have the eschatological teachings of Jesus as the context for the same sayings (Mk. 13:11-13; Lk. 21:12-17). Matthew seems to have a much more contemporaneous application for this saying with perhaps a continuing application for the church of all ages, rather than a purely futuristic application.

### **Verbal Analysis**

The main finite verb in the sentence, εἶστε (“you are”) is in the present tense so that the promise of help to the disciples becomes more vivid. Very likely, Matthew’s readers are already experiencing the fulfillment of this promise.

τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν (“the Spirit of your Father”) is a uniquely Matthean contribution. The phrase is found nowhere else in the New Testament. Mark has the Holy Spirit (Mk. 13:11-13) in the parallel passage while Luke leaves out the Spirit entirely (Luke 21:12-15). Matthew relates the Spirit very closely to the Father. The phrase is also very specific and speaks of *your* (i.e. the disciples’) Father. This description of the Spirit as the Spirit of the Father seems closer to the more developed Johannine (Jn. 14:26) and Pauline (Rom. 8:15; Eph. 2:18) pneumatologies.

πατρὸς (“father”) anticipates the following verses (Mt. 10:21 and 34ff) where family members will betray each other as well as 10:29-32 where the Heavenly Father is also mentioned. πατήρ is one of Matthew's favorite words, found 20 times in Matthew, only once in

---

<sup>233</sup> Morris, 251-252.

Mark and 3 times in Luke. The reference to the Father in the midst of persecution echoes Mt. 5:44-45 in the Sermon on the Mount, “But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven . . .”

πατὴρ ὑμῶν (“your Father”) will surely also echo the Lord’s Prayer’s, πατὴρ ἡμῶν, (“our Father”) especially when read together with Mt. 10:32 and 33. Matthew, in fact, places πατήρ in critical places of his story-telling. One could also relate these references to the promised provisions of the Father in 6:31-34 in the Sermon on the Mount. The fatherhood of God is a very important theme here as well as the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:16, 45, 48, 6:4, 6:9, 6:15, 6:18, 6:32, 7:11, 7:21, 10:20, 10:29, 10:32). In Mt. 7:21, the concept of the fatherhood of God is applied to the test of a true charismatic: a true charismatic (cf. Mt. 7:22) is one “who does the will of (Jesus’) father in heaven.” ὑμῶν makes the Spirit available to the disciples who are children of the Heavenly Father. Harrington perhaps unwittingly highlights the importance of this word here when he notes that, “(it) is unusual to talk about the availability of the gift of the Holy Spirit to the disciples, since during his ministry Jesus is the primary bearer of the Spirit.”<sup>234</sup>

Davies and Allison ask provocatively if there was an early Christian tendency to use λαλέω (“speak”) rather than λέγω (“speak”) for inspired or ecstatic utterance (cf. 1 Cor. 12:3; 13:1; 14:2).<sup>235</sup> Despite Grundmann’s suggestion,<sup>236</sup> most interpreters prefer to take ἐν (“in”), as a dative of instrument and translate the phrase as “speaking *through* you.” However, if we translate ἐν as “in” and take Davies and Allison’s suggestion seriously, we can easily follow

---

<sup>234</sup> Harrington, 145.

<sup>235</sup> Davies and Allison, 185.

<sup>236</sup> Bruner cites Grundmann’s argument against the instrumental understanding of ἐν here. Bruner, *The Christbook*, 383.

Keener to see the “Holy Spirit of prophecy”<sup>237</sup> here. France even suggests that Matthew may have Joel 2:28-29 in mind here.<sup>238</sup>

### **Theological Analysis**

Despite the importance of this verse for understanding Matthew’s pneumatology, there is little theological follow up in commentaries on this verse. In fact, Luz notes that “a certain reserve toward this promise is frequently evident” in the history of interpretation.<sup>239</sup> Luz suggests that this could be due to the concern that preachers may neglect careful study of the scriptures and take the lazy way of “depending on the Spirit of their Father”!<sup>240</sup>

The unique phrase, “the Spirit of your Father,” is another important evidence of Matthew’s “advanced” pneumatology, reflecting once again Matthew’s Trinitarian pneumatology. It hints at the Trinitarian baptismal formula that will climax his narrative. The phrase also allows us to relate Matthew’s pneumatology with Johannine and Pauline pneumatology. This “advanced” pneumatology is Matthew’s own post-Pentecost reading of his tradition. There are perhaps three implied elements in Mt. 10:20 that should especially interest Pentecostals today: the *prophetic-missionary* dimension, the *democratic* dimension and the *ethical* dimension.

The missionary dimension is implied by the context of this verse, where the “Spirit of the Father” is promised for those who are being commissioned to preach the good news. The related prophetic dimension is seen in the specific application of this promise to inspired speech. The

---

<sup>237</sup> Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 324.

<sup>238</sup> France, *Matthew*, 183.

<sup>239</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 90.

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*

disciples are promised supernatural help in their witness before “governors and kings.” The activity of the Father’s Spirit here is to inspire prophetic speech to be a witness, which is one of the common approaches to understanding the Pentecostal Spirit.<sup>241</sup> Luz agrees: “Behind this promise is the experience of early Christian prophecy.”<sup>242</sup>

The democratic dimension is suggested by the possessive pronoun, ὑμῶν. Apart from Mt. 10:20, the Baptist’s prophecy in Mt. 3:11 is the one other place in Matthew where the Spirit is made available to the disciples, although Luz sees the Trinitarian baptismal formula in Mt. 28:19 as yet another evidence of Matthew’s understanding of Spirit’s availability to the disciples.<sup>243</sup> In Matthew, although the Holy Spirit is seen mainly as an endowment for the Messiah, the Holy Spirit is also clearly available to the Messiah’s disciples. Matthew’s post-Pentecost community will understand that the Spirit is available to them: “. . . the Spirit, though it is that of the transcendent Father, is immanent in the disciples.”<sup>244</sup> Here, the disciples are promised that they will have the Spirit *in* them and it is the same Spirit that was upon Jesus.

The appellation of God as the disciples’ Father could refer back to the Lord’s Prayer, which is the central focus of the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>245</sup> This relationship between Matthew’s understanding of the Spirit and the Sermon on the Mount is also highlighted by Matthew’s

---

<sup>241</sup> William W. Menzies and Robert P. Menzies, *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000), 90.

<sup>242</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 89.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*, 90.

<sup>244</sup> McNeile, 140.

<sup>245</sup> Luz demonstrates convincingly that the Sermon on the Mount is structured symmetrically with “ringlike inclusions” around the Lord’s Prayer as the center. “The structure of the Sermon on the Mount already clearly gives indications as to how it should be understood: The Lord’s Prayer as its central text.” Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 211-213.

repetitious usage of πατηρ as an important “catchword”<sup>246</sup> in the Sermon on the Mount. Janice Capel Anderson has made a case for reading the Sermon on the Mount as part of the Matthean narrative and she concluded that if one does that, one should see that “there are important links between sermon and story.”<sup>247</sup> If so, we may bring to fore the relationship between the Pentecostal Spirit and the Kingdom ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. Those who have the Spirit of the Father are expected to have the Spirit speak through them (Mt. 10:20) and at the same time, do the will of the Father (Mt. 7:21). Thus, Matthew’s unique appellation here can perhaps be seen as having an ethical dimension, in addition to the prophetic dimension.

### **Πνεῦμα upon Messianic Servant of God (Mt. 12:15-21)**

Μτ 12:18

ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 12:18 Behold my child/servant whom I have chosen, my beloved in whom my soul takes delight; I will place my Spirit on him, and he will proclaim judgment to the nations (or, Gentiles).

#### **Contextual Analysis**

The passage “bears a remarkable formal similarity”<sup>248</sup> to 8:16-17. Both 8:16-17 and here report the powerful healing ministry of Jesus, followed by Isaianic quotations about the Messianic servant of God. This pericope comes after the revelation of a plot to kill Jesus (12:14) and after Jesus commanded those he had healed, not to tell who he was (12:15-16). The

---

<sup>246</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>247</sup> Janice Capel Anderson, “Matthew: Sermon and Story” in *Treasures Old and New: Contributions to Matthean Studies*, 247.

<sup>248</sup> Hagner, 336.

quotation taken from Isa. 42:1-4 does not seem to have come from the LXX or the Hebrew Masoretic Text. It seems to have been a free rendering done to remind the reader of the baptism of Jesus (3:13-17) as well as to anticipate the Mount of Transfiguration (17:1-8). “It also links up nicely with the following pericope, where the theme is Jesus and the Spirit (12:22-37).”<sup>249</sup> There are evidences that this passage has been drawn from pre-Matthean tradition, especially the fact that the quotation contains several Matthean *hapax legomena*.<sup>250</sup> It is therefore unlikely, that Matthew provided this liberal translation of Isaiah. The authenticity of the usage of the Isaianic quotations about the Messianic servant of God in the Jesus traditions is also affirmed by the frequent quotations from Isaiah in the Gospels. Isa. 42:1 is either quoted or intimated elsewhere and by other evangelists as well (cf. Mt. 3:17; 17:5; Lk. 3:22; 9:35; 23:35), but it is only here in Matthew that all four verses are used. Matthew’s unique quotation of the whole passage of Isa. 42:1-4 seems like a tradition that is either unavailable to the other evangelists, or one they have not seen the need to use.

This free rendering from Isa. 42:1-4, the longest Old Testament quotation in Matthew’s gospel, seems to be used here as an explanation for the “Messianic secret” motif. The quotation also serves other purposes as well because, if the “Messianic secret” motif is the only purpose, v. 19 would have been sufficient.<sup>251</sup> For Luther, this passage “paints the whole Christ.”<sup>252</sup>

Garland suggests that the reason for Jesus not allowing those who had been healed to testify of him was the unreliability of the crowd.<sup>253</sup> Jesus’ lack of confidence in the crowd is also

---

<sup>249</sup> Davies and Allison, 324.

<sup>250</sup> αἰρετιζω, ἐριζω, κραυγαζω, συντριβω, καταγνυμι, τυφω, νικος , Davies and Allison, 323.

<sup>251</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 192.

<sup>252</sup> Luther, cited by Luz, *Ibid.*

<sup>253</sup> Garland, 138.

hinted at in 10:17 (“Be on your guard against men . . .”) and in 16:13-20 (Peter’s Confession of the Christ). Jesus therefore turned to the scripture as a witness for his Messianic identity.

Matthew’s report of the voice from heaven in the baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:17) and the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt. 17:5) both are free adaptations of portions from this Isaiah passage. The other reliable witness to Jesus’ Messianic identity, John the Baptist, also quoted from Isaiah.

### Verbal Analysis

ὁ παῖς may be translated servant or child. The second chapter of Matthew uses a diminutive form of παῖς (παιδιον) nine times to refer to the child Jesus. When read in the context of ἠρέτισα (“chosen” or “adopted”<sup>254</sup>) and ὁ ἀγαπητός μου (“my beloved”), it probably seems more logical to translate ὁ παῖς with “child.” Therefore, Gundry sees this free adaptation of 42:1-4 as an effort to “underscore the Father’s love for Jesus in the midst of his suffering persecution.”<sup>255</sup> Once again, we see the Spirit featuring prominently in conveying the divine fatherhood of God.

However, in the declarations from heaven in Mt. 3:17 and 17:5 – both of which seem to have the same Isaiah passage in view – Matthew uses υἱὸς instead of παῖς. This change from υἱὸς in Mt. 3:17 and 17:5 to παῖς in Mt. 12:18 is significant enough to support Hagner’s opinion that this passage is of “central significance to Matthew’s servant Christology.”<sup>256</sup> Another evidence that Matthew may have intended for παῖς to be translated “servant” is the omission of “Son of God” found in the Markan parallel text of Mk. 3:11. This quotation from the Old Testament anticipates the rest of Matthew 12 – especially vv. 46-50, suggesting that

---

<sup>254</sup> BAGD, s.v. “αἰρετίζω.”

<sup>255</sup> Gundry, 229

<sup>256</sup> Hagner, 337.

Matthew understands Jesus' works in the chapter as characteristic of this "Son-Servant ambiguity."<sup>257</sup>

τὸ πνεῦμα μου ("my Spirit") clearly identifies the source of the Spirit. The Spirit comes from the Father to rest upon the Son-Servant. When read together with the phrase in Mt. 10:20, "the Spirit of your (disciples') Father," we may imply that as much as the disciples have his Spirit, they also have his Son/Servant messianic mission.

καὶ κρίσιν ("and judgment" or "and justice") could be positive<sup>258</sup> ("justice" or "righteousness") or negative<sup>259</sup> ("judgment"). When read in the positive context of Mt. 12:21 ("In His name the nations will put their hope."), κρίσιν seems to carry a positive connotation. τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ ("he will proclaim to the nations or Gentiles"), together with Mt. 12:21 anticipates the climactic commission of Mt. 28:19-20 where Gentiles or nations are the target of that commission.

### **Theological Analysis**

Jesus' healing ministry is interpreted not in terms of his position of power and authority, e.g., "Son of God" or "Son of David." It is perhaps ironic that, after declaring himself to be the Lord of the Sabbath and demonstrating it by healing on a Sabbath, Jesus should interpret his actions in terms of Yahweh's Spirit-anointed *Servant*. The power element is very evident in the healings and miracles but the Spirit's anointing also has an ethical and non-charismatic element as well. By quoting the entire passage of Isa. 42:1-4, Matthew is able also to present an irenic

---

<sup>257</sup> O. Lamar Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5 (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976), 44ff. Also, Harrington, 181.

<sup>258</sup> Gundry, 229; Hagner, 337; and, Carson, 286.

<sup>259</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 194. However, Luz concedes that vv. 20, 21 "indicate that this judgment of God may turn out to be positive for the Gentiles."

Jesus who will not quarrel or cry out in the streets (Mt. 12:19), while continuing to affirm Jesus' messianic identity. Jesus' irenic approach contrasts with the antagonism of the Pharisees towards Jesus.<sup>260</sup> “(These verses from Isaiah 42) show the Christ who practices the Sermon on the Mount . . .”<sup>261</sup> Matthew's Spirit-anointed Son needs also to be the Spirit-anointed Servant to become the divine Savior of the nations.

The Old Testament Yahweh is speaking here and the reader is made to understand that He is the Father who has not only sent the Son/Servant Jesus but that the Father has also sent the Spirit to rest upon the Son/Servant. As noted earlier in this paper, the ultimate authentication of the Son/Servant is the presence of the Spirit in Him. That this affirmation of the Spirit's presence upon the Son/Servant comes immediately after the record of Jesus' healing ministry is indication perhaps of Matthew's intention to highlight the fact that the authentication provided by the Spirit supersedes the affirmation provided by supernatural manifestations like miracles, healings and exorcisms. The supernatural may draw the curious crowds but genuine disciples focus on the presence of the Holy Spirit. This became evident when after healing a demon-possessed man who was blind and mute, instead of having his messianic status or divine Sonship affirmed, Jesus was accused of using the power of Beelzebub, the prince of demons. Supernatural manifestations do not automatically authenticate the Messiah . . . even those who had asked for a sign were not impressed!

The twin themes of Spirit and nations/Gentiles here are programmatic in Matthew.<sup>262</sup> These two themes appear together again in the Great Commission passage of Mt. 28:19-20. The divine “name” also appears together with these twin themes in both Mt. 12:15-21 (especially v.

---

<sup>260</sup> Carson, 285.

<sup>261</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 195.

<sup>262</sup> Carson, 286.

21) and the Great Commission. Matthew's universalistic theology has the divine Spirit and the authority of the divine name ultimately invested beyond Israel into the nations/Gentiles. Those who truly have the Spirit of God will be inclined to see a universalistic vision.

### **Πνεῦμα in Exorcism by Jesus (Matt 12:22-28)**

Mt 12:28

εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 12:28 And if by the Spirit of God I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you..

#### **Contextual Analysis**

The passage was Jesus' answer to two groups of people: the crowd in v. 23 and the Pharisees' in v. 24. These two groups represented two different responses to Jesus' healing of a blind and mute demoniac. The crowd's response was an honest query: "Could this be the Son of David?" The Pharisees, on the other hand, accused Jesus of collaborating with Beelzebub, the prince of demons. This "sub-pericope" is actually part of a bigger pericope that resolves the contrasting responses of these two groups with the concluding words of Jesus in vv. 36 & 37: "But I tell you that men will have to give account on the day of judgment for every careless word they have spoken. For by your words you will be acquitted, and by your words you will be condemned."

Matthew continues to draw from the long Isaianic quotation in Mt. 12:18-21 and perhaps extends the application of that passage by attributing Jesus' activity of exorcism and supernatural healing to the presence of the Spirit upon Jesus. Matthew does this by combining different

sources into “a long reflection on the Holy Spirit as the source of Jesus’ power.”<sup>263</sup> When compared with the parallel passages in the Mark (Mk. 3:22-30) and Luke (Lk. 6:43-45; 11:14-15; 12:10), the composite nature of the Matthean pericope is evident.

The mention of the Pharisees here, especially the reference to “brood of vipers,” (cf. 3:7) suggests a continuing rivalry between the religious tradition of the Pharisees and the prophetic lineage of John and Jesus.

### Verbal Analysis

ἐἰ (“if”) is a first class condition; that is, “if, as is actually the case.” Verses 26 and 27 also begin with the first class condition. While it is expected that Jesus believes he is driving out demons by the Spirit of God, it is unlikely that He believes that Satan is driving out Satan (v. 26) or that He is driving out demons by Beelzebub (v. 27). Verses 26 and 27 may perhaps be suggesting: “If, as you say, . . .” Verse 28, on the other hand, is a logical conclusion Jesus is drawing, in contrast to the illogical arguments of Pharisees. δε (“and” or “but”) is an adversative conjunction, signifying the contrast between Jesus’ exorcist activity with that of the “Pharisees’ sons” (Mt. 12:27).

ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ (“by the Spirit of God”) is definitely the emphasis here, being placed in front of even the emphatic subject ἐγώ (which is missing in the best manuscripts of the Lukan parallel). The emphasis is further heightened when this construction is compared to v. 27, where ἐγώ comes before ἐν Βεεζεβουλ. The emphasis is therefore not simply on the fact that Jesus casts out evil spirits; it is the fact that He did that by the agency of the Spirit of God. Once again, the presence of the preposition and the θεοῦ as the modifier renders the article unnecessary. The

---

<sup>263</sup> Harrington, 185.

use of θεου to modify πνεῦμα in this verse is again, a suggestion of the trinity. ἐν (“in”) will be instrumental so that it should be translated “through” or “by,” ἐν πνεύματι θεου (“in the Spirit of God”). When the phrase is used as such - with ἐν in the instrumental sense - in the context of ministry, there is often the suggestion of charismatic or supernatural empowerment.

The phrase, πνεύματι θεου, is δυκταλῷ θεου (“finger of God”) in the Lukan parallel (Lk. 11:20). Despite Robert Menzies<sup>264</sup> and James Dunn’s suggestions to the contrary,<sup>265</sup> there seems to be a majority accepting Luke’s “finger of God” as the authentic words of Jesus.<sup>266</sup> If the “Spirit of God” were the original phrase of Jesus, “Luke would probably have kept the phrase because of his overpowering interest in the Holy Spirit.”<sup>267</sup> The question is then, “Why would Matthew make that change?” Gundry suggests the main reason is that Matthew wanted to provide “a more exact antithesis to ‘by Beelzebul’ (v. 27).”<sup>268</sup> Notwithstanding Menzies’ contention that “a plausible motive for Matthew’s alteration of the text is lacking,”<sup>269</sup> Gundry sees also four other possible reasons for Matthew to make that alteration:

(1) fulfillment of Isa 42:1; (2) a closer parallel with the “kingdom of God” in v. 28b; (3) a lead into the (pericope on the) blasphemy of the Holy Spirit (vv. 31-32); and (4) a trinitarian allusion to the Spirit, God, and Jesus (as in 3:16; 28:19).<sup>270</sup>

---

<sup>264</sup> Robert P. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 6 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 161-163.

<sup>265</sup> However, Dunn confesses that his arguments are less than convincing even to himself: "I must confess that I find it difficult to reach a final opinion on whether 'Spirit' or 'finger' was original in Q . . .", Dunn, 45-46.

<sup>266</sup> E.g., Luz, McNeile, Davis and Allison, Hagner, Gundry, Harrington and Keener all agree that Luke’s “finger of God” is more likely the original.

<sup>267</sup> Gundry, 235.

<sup>268</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>269</sup> Menzies, , *Empowered for Witness*, 162.

<sup>270</sup> Gundry, 235.

ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (“the Kingdom of God”) is used for the first time by Matthew, probably to parallel πνεύματι θεοῦ (“Spirit of God”). This effort on Matthew's part to opt for ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ instead of his usual ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν (“the Kingdom of heaven”) is striking when one considers that Matthew uses ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ only four times (Mt. 12:28; 19:24; 21:31, 43) compared to thirty-three for ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. The suggestion that Matthew did not make the change here from Q's ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ to ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν because “(he) has hurried over the Q version of Mt. 12:28 without stopping to modify it as he would normally have done,”<sup>271</sup> glosses over the issue and perhaps illustrates how subjective and inconsistent redaction analysis can be. W. C. Allen explains that it is ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ here instead of ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν because “(Matthew) always uses ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν in an eschatological sense, which would here be out of place.”<sup>272</sup> ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ can also be serving as the direct verbal opposite to the reference to the kingdom of Satan in v. 26.<sup>273</sup>

ἔφθασεν is literally, “to come upon.” In the aorist passive, it may also be translated “to be overtaken” or “to be surprisingly overcome.”<sup>274</sup> Of this word, Hagner comments that it:

. . . necessitates the conclusion that the kingdom of God has in some sense actually become present, a clearer statement than that made by ἐγγιζειν, “is near,” of 4:17; 10:7. Admittedly, this has happened without the fullest effects that one must associate with the kingdom; we thus have fulfillment but fulfillment short of consummation.<sup>275</sup>

---

<sup>271</sup> Dunn, 45.

<sup>272</sup> Allen, 135.

<sup>273</sup> Hagner, 343.

<sup>274</sup> Bruner, citing Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthaus* (1929), 405; and Benjamin W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (1930), 291.

<sup>275</sup> Hagner, 343.

Explicit emphasis on the presence of God's kingdom is rare in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>276</sup> Therefore, for Blomberg, Mt. 12:28 is "arguably the single most important teaching of Jesus on realized eschatology – the present aspect of the kingdom."<sup>277</sup>

### **Theological Analysis**

There seems to be a deliberate effort on Matthew's part to place before his readers two clear alternatives: the Kingdom of God represented by Jesus, the Son of David, with the power of the Spirit of God; and, the kingdom of Satan, represented by Beelzebub and his demons. Up to this point in Matthew's Gospel, the contrast has been between the old order (represented by John the Baptist) and the new order of Jesus. With the passage in Mt. 11:1-19 reporting the affirming words of Jesus about John, Matthew makes the effort to demonstrate that there is nothing bad about the old order of John the Baptist. It is just that the new order of Jesus is so much better and higher, and it is the culmination and fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of the old order. The pronouncement of the Son of Man as the Lord of the Sabbath (12:8) and the long quotation from Isa. 42:1-4 both emphasizes Jesus' fulfillment of the old order.

However, in the specific passage being considered here, Matthew seems to be moving away from merely comparing the old and the new orders. The contrast here is now between good and evil - between God and Satan. These two alternatives being presented to the people are two opposing alternatives. (The strong contrast between the two alternatives is also in the "sub-pericope" to be considered next.) Based on the construction of vv. 27 and 28, Hagner says, "The contrast is an absolute one."<sup>278</sup> Morris puts it just as strongly, ". . . there is no neutrality."<sup>279</sup>

---

<sup>276</sup> Harrington, 187.

<sup>277</sup> Blomberg, 202.

<sup>278</sup> Hagner, 343.

Despite Hagner's contention that the main point is Christological: Christ is stronger than Satan,<sup>280</sup> the verbal construction suggests that the emphasis is placed on the role of the Spirit too. The new order is characterized by works empowered by the Spirit.

### **Πνεῦμα in Teaching of Unpardonable Sin (Matt 12:30-32)**

Μτ 12:31

Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

Μτ 12:32

καὶ ὅς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 12:31 Therefore I say to you (plural), every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven men, but the blasphemy of the Spirit will not be forgiven.

Mt. 12:32 And whoever speaks a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him; but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him; neither in this age nor in the coming (age).

#### **Contextual Analysis**

This passage is a sub-pericope and actually belongs to the same pericope as the passage discussed just before this. But, because the significance of Matthew's usage of πνευμα is different here, the passage is considered separately. However, the resolution to the theological difficulty presented by the πνευμα passage here may only be found in a consideration of the pericope of Mt. 12:22-37 as a whole.

There is no argument against the authenticity of this saying although there are a variety of views about their exact words and their arrangement, thereby allowing for a variety of interpretations. The two parallel verses appearing here could possibly have been recensions of

---

<sup>279</sup> Morris, 317.

<sup>280</sup> Hagner, 343.

the same saying. Mt. 12:31 is more general, contrasting all sin and blasphemy in general with blasphemy against the Spirit; while, v. 32 is more specific, contrasting sin against the Son of Man with sin against the Holy Spirit. “Blasphemy” in v. 31 is explained as “a word spoken against” while the “Spirit” becomes even more specific as the “Holy Spirit.”

### Verbal Analysis

Διὰ τοῦτο (“Therefore”) is found recently Mt. 12:27. Two concluding comments in quick succession draw the readers to make comparisons. This phrase therefore identifies the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit with the accusation of the Pharisees that Jesus healed “by Beelzebul.” πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία (“every sin and blasphemy”) is exhaustive and covers every sin and blasphemy.

τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (“the men”) is the dative object of ἀφεθήσεται (“forgive”). McNeile, however, suggests that these two words may have been “wrongly connected.” His contention is drawn from comparing the parallel texts in the Synoptics: Mt. 12:31 has τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (“the men”); Mk. 3:28 has τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (“the son of men”); Lk. 12:10 has εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (“against<sup>281</sup> the son of man”), leading him to conclude that the singular originally stood as in Mark but was altered so that it will not be misunderstood to mean that the Son of Man (i.e. Christ) would need forgiveness.<sup>282</sup> Therefore, for McNeile, τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in v. 32 would be a generic reference to “man,” that is, to any person.<sup>283</sup> Thus, the contrast for McNeile is between sins against the Holy Spirit and sins against any human person.

---

<sup>281</sup> “εἰς” here is translated in a “hostile sense.” *BAGD*, s.v. “εἰς,” 4c.

<sup>282</sup> McNeile, 178.

<sup>283</sup> τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (“Son of Man”) is a title used almost exclusively for Jesus. There are three major contexts in the Gospels where this title is used: “generic, passion predictions, or future figure.” Similar to McNeile, Harrington sees the generic sense being used here so that the blasphemy that can be forgiven is that which is against “Jesus as a representative figure for humankind.” Harrington, 184.

T. W. Manson takes an approach similar to that of McNeile's. Manson notices that both Mark and Luke distinguish "son of man" and Jesus. He suggests that Matthew's substitution of "I" for "son of man" is probably a later editorial work. However, instead of concluding that generic "man" is being meant by "son(s) of man" Manson had Jesus meaning the "Remnant" or the "true Israel" in the original saying.<sup>284</sup> Both McNeile's and Manson's theories are roundabout means to allow for "softer" interpretations of this hard saying but these theories are clearly built on misgivings about the plain meaning of the saying. In fact, Matthew seems to be making an effort to clarify this plain meaning by bringing together these two verses that seem to have come through different traditions.

This is the only time in Matthew where the preposition *κατα* ("against") is used with *πνευμα*. The entire Gospel of Matthew speaks for and on behalf of the Holy Spirit. *κατα* is used here "in a hostile sense" or "after words and expressions that designate hostile speech".<sup>285</sup> *εἶπη κατα* ("speaks a word against") of v. 32 parallels *βλασφημία* ("blasphemy") of v. 31. Blasphemy is therefore more than simply a word spoken against the Holy Spirit; it is a word spoken in hostility. There is a willful intention to malign the personhood of the Holy Spirit despite obvious evidence of his divine power.

Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is not merely a matter of bad language. It is far more deadly than that. It is the extremist form of opposition to God. He who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit has identified himself so completely with the kingdom of evil that for him evil is good, ugliness beauty, and falsehood truth; and so the workings of the Holy Spirit appear to him as madness.<sup>286</sup>

---

<sup>284</sup> T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957), 109-110.

<sup>285</sup> *BAGD*, s.v. "κατα".

<sup>286</sup> Manson, 110.

ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι was a current expression simply meaning absoluteness.<sup>287</sup> We can follow Plummer in interpreting this as “an emphatic periphrasis for ‘never’.”<sup>288</sup> It should not allow for a reverse argument that, except for the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, all sins may be forgiven in the age to come. Therefore, any suggestion that this supports the idea of a purgatory is rejected.<sup>289</sup>

### **Theological Analysis**

The topic of the “unpardonable sin” of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit has intrigued many because it seems to go against the grain of the Christian understanding of divine forgiveness.<sup>290</sup> Divine forgiveness is thought to be available to all who are genuinely repentant, no matter how gross the sin may be. Indeed, Davies and Allison see “no obvious meaning” for the verse and “remain stumped” in their exegesis of the verse!<sup>291</sup> To reconcile the strong language of this verse with the language of Christian grace, most commentators make an effort to “soften” this hard saying of Jesus.

Blomberg, citing support from E. Schweizer, suggests that sin against the Son of Man can be forgiven because of the ambiguity of Jesus’ identity as the Son of Man; while sin against the Holy Spirit cannot be forgiven in the context of Matthew 12 because it is a rejection of Jesus

---

<sup>287</sup> Peter Toon’s description of this as “an aeonian sin” (which he describes as “a sin relating to the age to come”), perhaps misses the contemporaneous impact of the saying to Matthew’s readers. Peter Toon, *Our Triune God: A Biblical Portrayal of the Trinity* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996), 176.

<sup>288</sup> Plummer, 180.

<sup>289</sup> This text has been used together with 1 Pet. 3:18-22 as proof-texts for purgatory, cited by Davies and Allison, 349.

<sup>290</sup> Actually, the church of the patristic age seemed to have accepted the seriousness of this saying at face value and believed the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit to be the “sin unto death” of 1 Jn. 5:16. Davies and Allison, 348.

<sup>291</sup> Davies and Allison, 348.

“when his actions clearly demonstrate the Spirit’s presence.”<sup>292</sup> However, Blomberg goes on to a more pastoral application by concluding that, “Probably blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is nothing more or less than the unrelenting rejection of his advances;” and that, “professing believers who fear they have committed the unpardonable sin demonstrate a concern for their spiritual welfare which proves they have not committed it.”<sup>293</sup>

Bruner echoes another common pastoral approach to the issue by suggesting that intent is the deciding factor to determine if someone has committed the “unpardonable sin”:

In context, in all three Gospels, the sin against the Spirit is not some arbitrary curse of deity or some foolish remark about either God or the Spirit per se, *it is trying to ruin Jesus in the eyes of others . . . intentionally* to speak against the Holy Spirit powerfully at work then in Jesus and now in the church’s message of Jesus, to question Jesus’ motives or “spirit,” *so that* others will not place their trust in him – this is quite another thing, this is quite another “spirit,” and it will not be forgiven (emphasis all Bruner’s).<sup>294</sup>

Keener is of a similar opinion and reiterates that the teaching on the unpardonable sin should be seen in the context here, referring specifically to the Pharisees who are on the verge of becoming incapable of repentance. Therefore, for Keener, “the sin is unforgivable only because it reflects a heart too hard to repent.”<sup>295</sup>

McNeile follows up his argument that the issue is really the contrast between sin against man and sin against the Holy Spirit by suggesting that Jesus’ statement here should be seen in the light of “Jewish phraseology.” McNeile suggests that “in Jewish phraseology serious sin was

---

<sup>292</sup> Blomberg, 204. Fenton also gives the same reasoning, “. . . to speak against the Holy Spirit is forgivable, because he is hidden and unknown; but to speak against his manifestation of God’s coming kingdom is to speak against what is revealed and can be known, and this is not forgivable.” Fenton, 199.

<sup>293</sup> Blomberg, 204.

<sup>294</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, 462.

<sup>295</sup> Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 232.

often spoken as unpardonable.”<sup>296</sup> He quotes Num. 15:30ff, 1Sam. 3:14 and Isa. 22:14 to support his proposition. Therefore, for McNeile,

If the Lord spoke as a Jew to Jews, and used a type of expression current in His day, and derived from the O.T., He meant, and would be understood to mean, no more than that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, by whose power He worked, was a terrible sin, - more terrible than blasphemy against man.<sup>297</sup>

Gundry tries to resolve the difficulty by assigning the miracles to the Holy Spirit. He takes the text at face value and suggests that sin against Jesus can be forgiven because Jesus did not conform to expectations. Sin against the Holy Spirit, on the other hand, cannot be forgiven because the Holy Spirit had presented himself unmistakably in powerful miracles of healing and exorcism.<sup>298</sup> However, contrary to Gundry, the opponents of Jesus clearly identify the miracles with Jesus. In fact, their accusation against Jesus rests on the very premise that it was Jesus who performed the miracles.

In the context about sinning against the Son of Man, we should perhaps note the implication that even Peter’s denial of Jesus (sin against the Son of Man) could be forgiven. One should perhaps also ask if Matthew’s construction in v. 32, with the mention of the Son of Man, could in fact be a suggestion for Peter’s benefit - that his denial of Jesus has indeed been forgiven. This could be an affirmation of Peter’s apostolic leadership in the church. And, if Peter were to be seen as representative of the church, then the rest of the disciples who have sinned against Jesus while he was on earth would have been forgiven too. The warning here is for them not to take the grace and power of God for granted. The probability of the church taking the

---

<sup>296</sup> McNeile, 179.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>298</sup> Gundry, 237.

power of God for granted becomes even more likely, now that the Holy Spirit is also resident in the Church.

Instead of “softening” this hard saying, we should perhaps interpret the passage from an overall consideration of Matthew’s perspective on divine forgiveness. The explanatory note to the Matthean Lord’s Prayer in Mt. 6:14-15 and the Parable of the Unmerciful Servant in Mt. 18:23-35 indicates that Matthew does not always go along with an evangelical understanding of unconditional divine forgiveness. It does not seem to be beyond Matthew to speak of an “unpardonable sin.” Therefore, while this passage on the unpardonable sin may not go down very well with modern day evangelicals, it fits in rather well with Matthean understanding of divine forgiveness. Playing down the hardness of this passage may in fact go against the overall strong ethical demands of Matthew.

In the mire of the theological difficulty presented by the issue of the unpardonable sin, it is important not to miss one of the most valuable contributions to Matthean pneumatology in these two verses: the Spirit’s distinct personality and divinity are affirmed in these verses. One can only sin against persons and one can only blaspheme against deities. The Holy Spirit is seen as distinct from the Son of Man; not merely derived from or dependent on the Son of Man. This verse may even be echoing Num 15:30ff and suggests a parallel between the Holy Spirit and the Old Testament Yahweh.<sup>299</sup>

Chapter 12 has the largest concentration of  $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$  references: vv. 18, 28, 31 and 32. These references have to do with the critical role of the Spirit in the authentication of Jesus’ messianic identity, the empowerment for His ministry, and the presence of the Kingdom of God.

---

<sup>299</sup> Toon, 176.

Without the Holy Spirit's role none of those are possible. Therefore, to deny the role of the Holy Spirit is the "ultimate" blasphemy; even more serious than blasphemy against the Son of Man.

### **Πνεῦμα upon David (Mt. 22:41-46)**

Mt 22:43

λέγει αὐτοῖς· πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων·

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 22:43 He says to them, "How then does David-in-the-Spirit call him lord saying,

#### **Contextual Analysis**

Gundry suitably subtitles this passage, "The Besting of the Pharisees by the Son of God."<sup>300</sup> This passage is perhaps patterned after a rabbinic dialogue and it follows a series of previous similar dialogues between Jesus and the Pharisees and religious establishment of the day where they deliberately questioned Jesus with the intention of trapping him (Mt. 12:1; 15:1; 19:3; 21:23; 22:15, 23, 34). They had also demanded from Jesus a "miraculous sign" (Mt. 14:38) as well as a "heavenly sign" (Mt. 16:1) to prove his authority. These confrontations were getting more and more frequent in the narrative, leading up to this passage where Jesus took the initiative and questioned them instead. He asked the question: "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" The Pharisees responded with the obvious answer: "The son of David." Jesus picked up on their answer and followed it up with a question for them based on a quotation taken from Psa. 110:1.

The confrontation with the religious establishment in Mt. 22:41-46 seems to have handled the ultimate question on everyone's mind. Jesus' handling of the issue dealt the religious establishment a final defeat in their running debate with Jesus. Matthew reports that, after this,

---

<sup>300</sup> Gundry, 450-452.

no one dared ask him any more questions (22:46). Instead, Matthew was able to lead on from here to an entire chapter (Mt. ch. 23) of denunciations of the Pharisees by Jesus.

### Verbal Analysis

λέγει is in the historic present tense (unlike the Lukan and Markan parallels, which have this in the past tense) so that Matthew's narrative becomes more vivid. αὐτοῖς refers to the Pharisees who are representative of the Jewish religious establishment in Matthew's narrative. πῶς οὖν ("how then") indicates that Jesus' rhetorical question is logically derived from the Pharisees' answer that Jesus is the Son of David (22:42b).

Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι - The placing of Δαυὶδ right next to ἐν πνεύματι "suggests a shift in meaning from David's speaking in the Spirit to David being in the Spirit, that is, David is in a visionary state; perhaps, accentuating the prophetic character of the quotation."<sup>301</sup> The phrase can be literally translated, "David-in-the-Spirit" to suggest a "heightened prophetic authority."<sup>302</sup> Gundry follows up on a similar vein and suggests that the anarthous phrase reflects apocalyptic usage (Rev. 1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10; cf. Eze. 11:24; 37:1; Lk. 2:27) where the prophet is often seen as being in a visionary state.<sup>303</sup>

καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον ("he calls him Lord") is in the indicative present, as λέγει earlier in the same sentence. The Spirit continues to call Jesus Lord. This, in fact, became the litmus test of the presence of the Holy Spirit for the early church (1 Cor. 12:3).

---

<sup>301</sup> Gundry, 451.

<sup>302</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 802.

<sup>303</sup> Gundry, 451.

## Theological Analysis

A spirit-filled David spoke with prophetic authority and declared the Son of David as his Lord. It is not consequential here that “majority scholarship cannot trace this Psalm (Psa. 110) to David,”<sup>304</sup> because Jesus’ audience and Matthew’s readers were not expected to challenge Davidic authorship for the said Psalm. Matthew’s construction here, placing the emphasis on the Spirit’s role in David, implies that both Jesus and the Pharisees are in agreement that a Spirit-filled person would have the authority to speak on behalf of God. The validity of the answer to this most crucial question of the Messiahship, Sonship and lordship of Jesus depended on the authority accorded to one who is “in-the-Spirit.” Ultimate authority for authenticating the person of Jesus Christ as the Messiah, divine Son of God and Lord is the Spirit of God.

The question posed by Jesus in this passage is the most crucial issue of biblical Judeo-Christian faith. All the other questions posed by the Pharisees can only be meaningful if Jesus is the Christ. If Jesus is not the Messiah, He need not be taken seriously and neither do his answers to the Pharisees’ earlier questions need to be taken seriously. If Jesus is Lord, then his teachings become all important. If not, no one needs to bother with them. Indeed, this claim of Jesus’ lordship is so critical, Harrington sees an understanding of this text as necessary for the resolution of the difference of opinion between Christians and Jews about the person of Jesus Christ.<sup>305</sup>

---

<sup>304</sup> So notes Bruner. However, it is unnecessary to follow Bruner in trying to assert Jesus’ humanity as a reason for Jesus’ seemingly mistaken belief that David wrote this Psalm. Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 804.

<sup>305</sup> Harrington, 319.

The one who has the Spirit will recognize the supreme lordship of Jesus Christ and submit to Him. Perhaps we can also say that one who demonstrates obedience to Jesus is displaying evidence of the presence of the Spirit.

### **Πνεῦμα At the Death of Jesus (Mt. 27:45-56)**

Μτ 27:50

ὁ δε Ἰησους παλιν κραξας φωνη μεγαλη ἀφηκεν το πνευμα.

#### **English Translation**

Mt. 27:50 And Jesus, having cried out again in a loud voice, gave up the Spirit.

#### **Contextual Analysis**

This verse is part of a pericope that describes Jesus' last moments on the cross. Matthew's and Mark's accounts are very similar here, except for Matthew's inclusion of a difficult passage about the opening of tombs and the resurrection of the saints to life. Both Matthew and Mark do not include the contents of the last cry of Jesus on the cross. John reports that the last cry on the cross was, "It is finished" (Jn. 19:30 NIV) while Luke reports that the last cry was: "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit." (Lk. 23:46 NIV) Matthew's report of Jesus's death as "giving up the Spirit" is similar to John's, although John uses a different verb: παρέδωκεν instead of ἀφηκεν. "Giving up the Spirit" has some similarity also to Luke's report of Jesus' last cry on the cross, and Matthew may even have interpreted the tradition quoted by Luke.

Albright and Mann, prefer instead to see Matthew's description of the death of Jesus as "a dramatization of a saying preserved in the Johannine tradition," leading them to conclude that Matthew's report is "in complete agreement with the Johannine tradition" – even in the theological presuppositions, i.e., "the gift of the Spirit is bound up with the passion and the

resurrection.”<sup>306</sup> Their main reason for rejecting the possibility of Matthew and Luke sharing a similar tradition here is that Matthew - unlike Luke - has no account of the exaltation of Jesus and impartation of the Spirit. Matthew and John share a commonality here in that both do not have a separate account of the exaltation of Jesus and the impartation of the Spirit.<sup>307</sup> However, despite acknowledging the different constructions describing Jesus’ death in all four Gospels, Bruner is still able to see a common vein in all of them: “The Gospel writers may be suggesting in their different ways that when Jesus died he gave the Spirit.”<sup>308</sup>

### Verbal Analysis

παλιν κραξας φωνη μεγαλη (“again having cried out in a loud voice”) indicates that this last saying on the cross follows the previous saying in Aramaic, “*Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani*”. κραξας is Matthean and is perhaps much more dramatic (and “more forceful”<sup>309</sup>) than Luke’s φωνήσας or Mark’s ἀφείς. The Matthean word may suggest that Matthew has Psalm 22 in mind when describing the death of Jesus, where the same word occurs in vv. 2, 5 and 24 of the LXX.<sup>310</sup> Bruner has overextended his interpretation of this last cry of Jesus on the cross when he suggests that this could be the “oral gospel” or even “the gift of tongues.”<sup>311</sup> For Bruner, the “gift of tongues” is the “Great Voice of Christ” which the church shares in and which is “the

---

<sup>306</sup> Albright and Mann, 351.

<sup>307</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>308</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 1056.

<sup>309</sup> Davies and Allison, 628.

<sup>310</sup> France, *Matthew*, 400. Also, Shelton, 248.

<sup>311</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 1056-7.

vehicle of the Spirit.”<sup>312</sup> He supports his interpretation with two proof-texts, Gal. 3:2, 5 and Jn. 6:63.

ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (“gave up the spirit”) replaces Mark’s and Luke’s ἐξεπνευσεν (“die”). This “has the purpose and result of making Jesus, who is a majestic and authoritative figure throughout the first gospel, die of his own accord. He does not die with a last gasp, but by an act of will.”<sup>313</sup> Most commentators interpret this phrase in an anthropological sense, so that πνεῦμα is simply the human spirit or the “breath of life.”<sup>314</sup> Gen. 35:18 is often referred to for an anthropological understanding of ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα.<sup>315</sup> However, Gen. 35:18 has ψυχή instead of πνεῦμα. If Matthew had Gen. 35:18 in mind, he could have used ψυχή. Apart from Gen. 35:18, James B. Shelton quotes also 1 Esdras 4:21, Sir. 38:23 and Wis. 16:14 to support his suggestion that this is an expression used in the LXX for death.<sup>316</sup> Sir. 38:23 and Wis. 16:14 use πνεῦμα but their constructions do not have ἀφίημι and thus do not leave the impression that Matthew may have been influenced by them. Only 1 Esdras 4:21 has a construction with ἀφίημι but, like Genesis, 1 Esdras also has ψυχή instead of πνεῦμα. Harrington may therefore be glossing over the issue when he describes Matthew’s unique construction here as a “(simple) eloquent understatement.”<sup>317</sup>

Even within the Matthean narrative itself, the description of Jesus’ death is unique, because in all of the other descriptions of death in Matthew (e.g. 2:19-20; 9:18, 24; 14:1-5,

---

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, 1057.

<sup>313</sup> Gundry, 575.

<sup>314</sup> France states emphatically, “Spirit here refers simply to Jesus’ human ‘spirit’ (i.e. his life); there is no reference to the Holy Spirit,” France, *Matthew*, 399.

<sup>315</sup> Hill, 355.

<sup>316</sup> Shelton, 248.

<sup>317</sup> Harrington, 402.

21:39; 22:23-27), there is none that makes any reference to the giving up of the πνεῦμα. In fact, Matthew does not even use the expression suggesting the giving up of the human ψυχή.

Charette presents a further argument (albeit a weak one) that the substantive τὸ πνεῦμα itself could be another evidence suggesting that Matthew intends to refer to the divine Spirit.<sup>318</sup> However, one must admit that the definite article here – although not always necessary to indicate that the divine Spirit is being referred to – *does not weigh against* Charette’s argument; even if it does not help very much. The strongest evidence for Charette’s argument is perhaps the uniqueness of Matthew’s construction here when compared to Luke and Mark as well as within the Matthean narrative itself.

### **Theological Analysis**

Despite Matthew’s seemingly deliberate construction here, Harrington and many others<sup>319</sup> do not see any significance in Matthew’s description of Jesus’ death - except perhaps merely affirming the voluntary nature of Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross. Charette, Albright and Mann, and Bruner are among the few who choose to see a further theological significance than merely affirming the voluntary nature of Jesus’ death. If we are to follow the generally nuanced approach of Matthew’s narrative style, we will have to accept the unusual phrase in Mt. 27:50 to be more than just a simple description of Jesus’ death. This is where Charette is coming from in his contention that Matthew intended this text to be read as Jesus willingly giving up the divine Spirit, and not just the human “breath of life”:

---

<sup>318</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 93-94.

<sup>319</sup> Blomberg, 420; Mounce, 260; Gundry, *Matthew*, 575; Shelton, 248; Fenton, 443; Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, 684; France, *Matthew*, 399; Hagner, 846; Davies & Allison, 628; *NIDNTT*, vol. 3:694, etc.

That Matthew should intentionally choose such an unusual expression when describing the death of Jesus, and one which calls to mind the Spirit of God, suggests that he is wanting to affirm, yet in his typically discreet way, that there is something more in view. He does wish to state through his language that Jesus has indeed died, yet at the same time wishes to intimate something more. Had Matthew only been interested in announcing the death of Jesus there would be no need for such an unusual turn of phrase. Rather, he seems intent on affirming that at the death of Jesus, the same Spirit which had conceived him, which anointed him at his baptism, which led him into the wilderness to be tempted and which empowered his ministry is now “released” by him at the very moment that marks the culmination of his messianic work.<sup>320</sup>

Once again, we have here a Matthean pneumatology that is akin to the more developed Johannine understanding of the Spirit. Albright and Mann “conclude that Matthew’s ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα is completely in agreement with the Johannine tradition – i.e., the gift of the Spirit is bound up with the passion and the resurrection.”<sup>321</sup> In fact, Albright and Mann imply that the Spirit was “handed on” to the church as Jesus died on the cross. They blame the “long liturgical use of the Pentecost narrative of Acts 2 . . . as the ‘birthday’ of the (church)” for “obscuring the salient fact that the (church) was born in the cross and the resurrection.”<sup>322</sup>

However, to come to Albright and Mann’s conclusion, one must read John’s language in Jn. 19:30 (παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα; “gave over or handed on the S/spirit”) into Matthew. It is more in keeping with the methodology of this paper to let Matthew’s text speak for itself and come to a simple conclusion that the Spirit of God is being referred to in the Matthean description of Jesus’ death. If we were to draw comparisons between the earthquake and the resurrection of the saints (Mt. 27:51-52) with Ezekiel’s vision in Eze. 37, we may perhaps come to the conclusion that there is a suggestion of new life here.<sup>323</sup> The tearing of the temple veil may

---

<sup>320</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 94.

<sup>321</sup> Albright and Mann, 351.

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>323</sup> Harrington, 403; also, Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 94-96.

also depict the threshold event of the *new* replacing the *old*.<sup>324</sup> Charette therefore describes Jesus' giving up of the Spirit as the "eschatological moment of regathering, cleansing and new covenant relationship."<sup>325</sup> The release of the Spirit at the conclusion of the Messianic mission meant that "the separation of Jesus' disciples and the Jews is complete," giving the Matthean church an understanding of its "peculiar existence . . . separated from the Jewish nation."<sup>326</sup>

But, one will need to concede that Matthew makes no use of his fulfillment formula here, despite having used it freely in the birth narratives. Perhaps, at the late stage in the narrative, Matthew's readers would be expected to see the connection between the fulfillment motif without the direct quotes from the Old Testament. Furthermore, the drama of the passion event would be diminished if the narrative were to be interrupted by numerous direct quotes. However, Charette seems to be reading a little too much into the passage when he attempts a suggestion that Matthew "intends his readers to detect in 27:50 a proleptic allusion to the Pentecost outpouring of the Spirit."<sup>327</sup> It is perhaps better to simply conclude that the divine Spirit is given up here in an eschatological moment, corresponding to the end of the Messianic mission that brought in the new - replacing the old - but no inference need to be made from this passage whether the Spirit is being handed over to the disciples in the process.

---

<sup>324</sup> Some early Christian writings interpret the tearing of the temple veil as a sign of departure of the Spirit to the Gentiles, Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 94.

<sup>325</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 96.

<sup>326</sup> Nils Alstrup Dahl does not deal with the issue of whether the πνεῦμα in 27:50 is the divine or human spirit but he still comes to the conclusion that the Matthean passion narrative has an aetiological significance of explaining the origin and continuing basis for the existence of the Church as the people of the new covenant, "The Passion Narrative in Matthew" in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, 51.

<sup>327</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

## Πνεῦμα in the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula (Matt. 28:18-20)

Mt 28:19

πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος,

### English Translation

Mt. 28:19 As you are going, therefore, disciple all the nations (Gentiles), baptizing them into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit,

### Contextual Analysis

This last instance of πνεῦμα in Matthew is within the verses commonly known as the Great Commission. It is also the only post-resurrection mention of the Spirit in Matthew. The Great Commission passage of Mt. 28:18-20 has three natural divisions: (1) the presentation of Jesus as the One who has all authority; (2) the commission of Jesus for the disciples to reach all nations; (3) the promise of Jesus' own presence with the disciples.<sup>328</sup> The introductory passage leading to the Great Commission begins with v. 16 where the familiar Matthean mountain motif is perhaps being brought to a climax with the last mention of a mountain.<sup>329</sup> The mountain motif provides the scenic background to the highlights of the disciples' experiences with Jesus: e.g. the Sermon on the Mount (5:1ff); the miracles sections (8:1ff; 15:29ff); and the Transfiguration (17:1ff). Jesus' investment in the lives of the disciples is now brought to bear upon their obedience to the Great Commission. Another element of the climactic nature of this passage is its stress on authority and teaching, which are emphases found in every section of the Gospel.<sup>330</sup> The climactic nature of the Great Commission passage in Matthew is also noted by Otto Michel

---

<sup>328</sup> Hagner, 882 and Keck, 148.

<sup>329</sup> Terrence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* JSNT Sup Series No. 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990).

<sup>330</sup> Hagner, 881.

when he describes Mt. 28:18-20 as “*the key to the understanding of the whole book* (emphasis Michel’s).”<sup>331</sup>

As Mt. 1:1, with its *γενεσις* reference is an allusion to Gen. 1:1, some may want to see this final passage of Matthew as an allusion to the last passage of the Hebrew scripture in 2Chron. 36:23. Charette puts quite a lot of emphasis on this in his suggestion that the Church is the new temple.<sup>332</sup> However, it is much more common to see an allusion to Dan. 7:13-14 in this last passage of Matthew.<sup>333</sup> This perhaps is closer to Matthew’s understanding. After all, Matthew’s narrative had Jesus alluding to Dan. 7:13-14 at his trial in Mt. 26:64.

It is perhaps comforting for Matthew’s readers to note that, despite the Gospel’s high demands for righteous actions from the disciples, it ends not with another command but with a promise of Jesus’ continuing presence – even to the end of the new age that has just been inaugurated at the conclusion of the Messianic mission. *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ* (“behold, I”) highlights and emphasizes this personal promise of the Messiah. Jesus’ personal promise of His presence closes the Gospel, in fulfillment of the promise of *Immanuel* (“God with us”) that was given at His birth (Mt. 1:23).

## Verbal Analysis

Gundry notes that every word of the first part of this verse, *πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* (“Going, therefore, disciple all the nations/Gentiles”), belongs to

---

<sup>331</sup> Otto Michel, “The Conclusion of Matthew’s Gospel: A Contribution to the History of the Easter Message,” trans. Robert Morgan, in *The Interpretation of Matthew*, ed. Graham Stanton (London: SPCK, 1983), 35.

<sup>332</sup> Charette, *Restoring Presence*, 110-113.

<sup>333</sup> Michel, 36; Blomberg, 431; Hill, 361; France, 413; Albright and Mann, 362; Keener, 716; and especially Schaberg, 335-336. However, in making this an allusion to Daniel 7:13-14, Schaberg does not accept that there is a full-fledged Christian understanding of Trinitarianism in Matthew’s text.

Matthew’s list of favored words.<sup>334</sup> Gundry notes other Mattheanisms in this verse as well: πατὴρς (“Father”), υἱοῦ (“Son”) and ἁγίου πνεύματος (“Holy Spirit”).<sup>335</sup> In fact, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα (“into the name”) is a favorite Matthean phrase that is found nowhere else in the Synoptics. Apart from the indication that this verse is Matthean in character, it is perhaps also indicative that the main themes of Matthew, which were presented mostly by a creative arrangement of sources,<sup>336</sup> are now being brought by Matthew to their climactic resolution here. However, the Mattheanisms here do not necessarily amount to a demonstration that Matthew composed this passage *ex-nihilo*.<sup>337</sup> Hagner has demonstrated that the passage as it stands, though unique to Matthew, has parallel elements in Luke, John and the longer ending of Mark.<sup>338</sup>

οὖν (“therefore”) suggests that the text here is dependent on what comes before it. The Great Commission is dependent on Jesus’ declaration in v. 18 that all authority in heaven and on earth has been given to him. The various titles attributed to Jesus in Matthew (Son of David, Son of Man, Son of God, etc.) are now brought together as Jesus is declared as having *all* authority. Following v. 18, “all” (πάντα) appears three times in the commission: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (“all the nations/Gentiles”); πάντα ὅσα ἐντειλάμην ὑμῖν (“all things which I have commanded you”); and, πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας (“all the days”). The all-encompassing nature of the Great Commission forms a fitting climax to Matthew’s narrative.

μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (“disciple all the nations”) is the only imperative in the Great Commission passage but because the present participles in the passage, πορευθέντες

---

<sup>334</sup> Gundry, 595.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>336</sup> “(Matthew’s) creativity is seen to lie primarily in the *rearrangement* of the sayings of Jesus in his traditions,” Graham Stanton, “Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus,” 258.

<sup>337</sup> Hagner, 883.

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid.*, 881.

(“going”), βαπτίζοντες (“baptizing”), and διδάσκοντες (“teaching”), are all dependent on the main verb, μαθητεύσατε, they are all imperatival in function as well. τὰ ἔθνη can be translated “nations” or “Gentiles” but the definite article and our interpretation of the passion narratives may suggest that the Matthean narrative here is looking forward to a new age with the Gentiles in view. However, it may also mean “the nations” so that the Community of the new age would include both the Jews and the Gentiles. An inclusive understanding of τὰ ἔθνη is more in line with the immediate context of the all-encompassing nature of the Great Commission.

βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα is literally “baptizing them *into* the name.” Citing Zerwick, Carson notes that Matthew avoids the confusion of εἰς and ἐν which is common in Hellenistic Greek.<sup>339</sup> In making the distinction between “baptizing *in*” and “baptizing *into*,” W. C. Allen suggests that “baptizing *in*” is a phrase that merely describes the ceremony itself while “baptizing *into*” emphasizes the result of the ceremony.<sup>340</sup> However, the distinction would make it difficult to interpret Mt. 3:11 where John’s baptism is described as a baptism “into repentance.” In the context of John’s preaching, it is highly unlikely that John’s baptism results in repentance. It seems more likely that John’s baptism follows repentance. Gundry makes the distinction between Christian baptism and John’s baptism and further suggests that Matthew may not have intended for the formula to be simply a ritual utterance:

. . . the formula does not imply utterance of the Trinitarian phrase at the time of baptism. Instead, “in the the name of” means “with fundamental reference to” and distinguishes Christian baptism, demanding allegiance to the triune God, from John’s baptism, requiring only repentance.<sup>341</sup>

---

<sup>339</sup> Carson, 597.

<sup>340</sup> Allen, 306.

<sup>341</sup> Gundry, 596.

Apart from the uncertain longer ending of Mark, the element of baptism (βαπτίζοντες) is found only in the Matthean version of the Great Commission. Even in the Markan version, baptism is not a part of the commission proper; it is only an expected consequence when the commission is being fulfilled. A theological understanding for the command here to baptize would therefore be found in Matthew's reflection of the baptism of Jesus as well as the Baptist's prophecy of Jesus as the Baptizer in the Holy Spirit.

τὸ ὄνομα ("the name") is singular, pointing to the fact that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one. However, πατὴρ (Father), υἱοῦ (Son) and ἁγίου πνεύματος ("Holy Spirit"), individually have definite articles attached to them; indicating that the three Persons of the Trinity are distinct. The repeated coordinating conjunction καὶ suggests the equal status of the three Persons of the Trinity, with the order suggesting the historical order in which they come into the theological consciousness of God's people. It has however been noted that Eusebius in his pre-Nicene works regularly quotes Mt. 28:19 in a shorter, non-Trinitarian form that reads: "Go and make disciples of all nations in my name."<sup>342</sup> This leads some to believe that the formula is a church liturgy given authenticity by being read back to Jesus' commission. In all the other references to Christian baptism in the New Testament, only Jesus' name was associated with the rite, suggesting that the Trinitarian<sup>343</sup> baptismal formula may not have been authentic. But, the Trinitarian formula occurs frequently in the New Testament (1Cor. 12:4-6; 2Cor. 13:14; Eph. 4:4-6; 2Thess. 2:13-14; 1Pet. 1:2; Rev. 1:4-6) so that its authenticity in the Great

---

<sup>342</sup> France, *Matthew*, 415.

<sup>343</sup> Jane Schaberg prefers the term "triadic" because the terms Trinity or Trinitarian carry connotations worked into them during later church councils – connotations that Matthew would probably not have thought of, 5-9.

Commission passage is not impossible.<sup>344</sup> In fact, it has been noted that there are only a few who subscribe to the authenticity of the shorter Eusebian form.<sup>345</sup>

This final passage of Matthew is the first and only time where the modifier ἁγίου (“holy”) appears before πνεῦμα (see Appendix II). In the entire Gospel of Matthew, the emphasis is always placed on πνεῦμα, with the modifier (either an adjective or a noun/pronoun/substantive in the genitive case) coming after it. The positioning of ἁγίου before πνεῦμα is also a rare construction among the other Gospel writers, occurring only two other times (Lk. 12:10 & 12) in all the Gospels (see Appendix I).

### **Theological Analysis**

Jane Schaberg notes that the climactic final Matthean pericope “is widely considered to be of central significance theologically and thematically to the entire Gospel of Matthew and the key to its understanding.”<sup>346</sup> The themes in Matthew which Bauer sees as coming to a climax in the passage are: (1) the authority of Jesus; (2) universalism; (3) the presence of Jesus with His community.<sup>347</sup> Leander E. Keck suggests that it was Otto Michel<sup>348</sup> who first demonstrated the significance of Matt. 28:16-20 for understanding the whole Gospel of Matthew and that “(t)he literature concerning this passage has become enormous.”<sup>349</sup> This climactic feature is heightened by the fact that Matthew has a unique ending compared to the other Gospels. Among other things, Keck notices that the Matthean ending is the only one where “Jesus neither promises nor

---

<sup>344</sup> Carson, 598.

<sup>345</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1962), 81.

<sup>346</sup> Schaberg, 3.

<sup>347</sup> Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew’s Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 109-128.

<sup>348</sup> Otto Michel, “The Conclusion of Matthew’s Gospel: A Contribution of the Easter Message,” 30-41.

<sup>349</sup> Keck, 147,

imparts the Holy Spirit. Instead, the Holy Spirit is confined to a liturgical formula to be used to mark one's entering the faith community, thereby replacing the link between Spirit and missionary with the link between Spirit and convert.<sup>350</sup> Therefore, despite its role not being overtly defined, the Holy Spirit remains very much in focus in the climax of Matthew's Gospel.

The rare construction, of having ἅγιον before πνεῦμα, in this final passage climaxes Matthew's narrative development of the divine Spirit. Matthew employs a wide variety of ways to refer to the divine Spirit: from the simple substantive (e.g., το πνεῦμα in Mt. 4:1, 12:13, 22:43 and 27:50), to the regular constructions (e.g. πνευμα ἅγιον in 1:18 and 12:3; πνευμα θεου in 3:16 and 12:28; or even πνευμα μου in Mt. 12:18), to the rather cumbersome (e.g., πνευματος ἐστιν ἁγιου in Mt. 1:20), and to the elaborate and theologically-laden (e.g., πνευματι ἁγιω και πυρι and το πνευμα του πατρος ὑμων). The climactic nature of this last passage, together with our observation of Matthew's highly-nuanced narrative, perhaps suggest that we should look at the possibility that ἁγιου πνευματος here can be interpreted as a culmination of Matthew's usage of the word for the divine Spirit. With the qualifier, "holy" coming before the divine Spirit, the emphasis falls on the word "holy." We can perhaps suggest that the culmination of Matthew's "ethicization" of the Spirit is being put forward here.

The lack of a Lukan-Johannine impartation of the Spirit to the disciples in the conclusion of Matthew has intrigued a lot of scholars.<sup>351</sup> Keck was led to conclude by his perception of the apparent silence about the Spirit in Matthew's Gospel that Matthew was more interested in maintaining the political stability in the church; because, Keck suggests, Matthew had the idea

---

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>351</sup> Keck, 146-147.

that those who relied on the Spirit threatened the stability of the church.<sup>352</sup> Keck's tentative approach has perhaps missed the point that, in Matthew's narrative scheme, the inclusion of the Spirit in the triadic name in this climatic passage already reflects a cumulative understanding of the availability of the Spirit for Matthew's charismatic community. Despite noting the un-charismatic, "wholly unecstatic" tone of Matthew's post-resurrection narrative, Michel concedes that "the triadic 'name' includes a liturgical echo of the gift of the Spirit."<sup>353</sup> Bruner further suggests that this baptism in the triadic name is "more than initiating ceremonial – it is sacramental and effectual, it is empowering and connecting."<sup>354</sup> The charismatic nature of Matthew's Community is evidenced by the mention of the charismatic gifts in the text (Mt. 7:22) and Jesus' demonstration of the presence of the Spirit - and of the Kingdom - through public exorcisms (Mt. 12:1ff; 22-28). Even though there seems to be some effort in the Matthean narrative aimed at correcting abuses of false prophets (Mt. 24:4-25), prophecy itself is not discredited. In fact, the possibility of inspired speech is affirmed in the promise of help from the "Spirit of your Father" (Mt. 10:20). Indeed, Michel suggests that *ὄνομα* be understood charismatically and not liturgically.<sup>355</sup>

This is the only explicit commission of Jesus Christ for his disciples to baptize. The only other references to baptism are in Matthew chapter 3. Baptism here should therefore be seen as having developed from the baptism belonging to John's order, to become the baptism that now belongs to Jesus' new order. John's baptism was "*into* repentance" while the baptism here is "*into* the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." However, this continuity

---

<sup>352</sup> Keck, 154-155.

<sup>353</sup> Michel, 38.

<sup>354</sup> Bruner, *The Churchbook*, 1100.

<sup>355</sup> Michel, 35.

between John's water baptism and Jesus' Spirit baptism should be tempered by our earlier note on the Baptist's prophecy: that the "baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire" belonging to the new order to be effected by Jesus is effectively different from the baptism in water offered by John the Baptist. While there is a continuity, there is also a clear discontinuity between what John the Baptist offers and what Jesus offers. Perhaps, we should ponder the possibility that Matthew may actually have in mind the "baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire" when he records the Great Commission episode. The focus here, then, is not on the ritual but on a new theological understanding for the Christian age.

## VI. THE PLACE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN MATTHEW'S THEOLOGY

Admittedly, Matthew does not have pneumatology as *the* theological theme of his narrative. However, without Matthew's understanding of the divine Spirit, Matthew's theological emphases of Christology, soteriology and ecclesiology cannot stand.<sup>356</sup> Although not being separately enumerated, Matthean pneumatology is woven into the tapestry of Matthew's overall theology. Matthew – whether wittingly or unwittingly - associates the Spirit with almost all of his important theological themes and motifs; e.g., the Messianic Identity (Mt. 1:18-20; 3:16; 12:15); the Fatherhood of God (Mt. 3:16; 10:20); the Kingdom of Heaven/God and the new eschatological age (Mt. 12:28; 12:31-32; 27:50; 28:19); the prophetic inspiration and authority of the Scripture (22:43); the Trinitarian Godhead (Mt. 1:18-20; 3:16; 10:20; 28:19); the universal mission of the church to the nations/Gentiles (Mt. 28:19); etc. To conclude this word study exercise, the following are some further reflections based on the theological analyses of the πνεῦμα texts in Matthew.

### **The Holy Spirit and Matthean Messianic Christology**

The core of Matthean pneumatology is Christological. This is perhaps inevitable when we consider that anchoring Matthew's narrative is the historical event of Christ, beginning from His birth to His death and resurrection. Matthew's Gospel began with Christ and concluded with

---

<sup>356</sup> Charette has organized his book, *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*, along the line of Mt. 1:21 where he identifies these three theological emphases being implied: "Jesus (Christological), for he will save ("soteriological") his people ("ecclesiological") from their sins," 14.

Christ. In Matthew's scheme of authenticating Jesus as the Messiah (or, "Christ") of the Old Testament, the Holy Spirit plays a key role.

We may say in summary that the Holy Spirit is the conceiving (Mt. 1), enduing (Mt. 3), defending (Mt. 10), and exorcising (Mt. 12) power of Jesus in the world. The Spirit's office is to help and to honor Jesus: first by bringing Jesus into the world, and then by defending his messianic (and necessarily modest) cause in the world.<sup>357</sup>

Matthew's use of Old Testament prophetic material to validate Jesus' messiahship is well-known. But, Matthew does more than provide a list of fulfilled Old Testament prophecies in the life of Christ. Blaine Charette argues that the references to the Holy Spirit in Matthew were intentionally used to reflect a theology that is "deeply rooted in the eschatological hopes found in Israel's prophets . . . constantly reflective of this Old Testament expectation."<sup>358</sup> Matthean eschatology is therefore focused on the Messianic age. While the fulfillment quotations trace the continuity of this new age with Old Testament prophecies and expectations, the Spirit's radical work in authenticating the Messiah demonstrates the discontinuity between the new and the old. In Matthew, the Spirit that authenticates the Messiah also brings in this new, Messianic eschatological age. Unlike in Luke, the Spirit does not come upon the John the Baptist in Matthew. There seems to be a clear distinction between the old order represented by John and the new Messianic order. The contrast made between John the Baptist and Jesus (Mt. 3:13-16) suggests this clear distinction.

The new Messianic age is the age of the Spirit as well. This age of the Messiah and of the Spirit has "already come" (ἔφθασεν in Mt. 12:28) because the Holy Spirit is already at work, evidenced by the exorcisms performed by Jesus. The same Spirit that empowers Jesus is upon

---

<sup>357</sup> Bruner, *The Christbook*, 458.

<sup>358</sup> Charette, "'Never Has Anything Like This Been Seen in Israel': The Spirit as Eschatological Sign in Matthew", 50.

those who are His disciples and who share in His Sonship with God as the Heavenly Father (Mt. 10:20). The Trinitarian baptismal formula culminates this understanding in Matthew that Jesus and His disciples belong to a new eschatological age.

Indeed, there seems to have been a deliberate development of the Spirit's relationship with Jesus in Matthew's Gospel, particularly in the events of Jesus' life where his messiahship is being defined. These events include His birth (Mt. 1:18-20), baptism (Mt. 3:16), temptation (Mt. 4:1), inauguration (Mt. 12:18), and victory over the Enemy (Mt. 12:28). Matthew's pneumatological intent is evident when Mt. 12:28 is compared with the parallel verse of Lk. 11:20 where Matthew has "Spirit of God" instead of "finger of God." Jesus had more than the power or presence of God. Matthew clearly has the intention to demonstrate that Jesus has the anointing of the Holy Spirit, qualifying Him to be the Messiah.

The role of the Holy Spirit in authenticating Jesus' messiahship is also seen in the passage of Mt. 22:41-46. While Luke left out the Holy Spirit's role in this pericope, Matthew follows Mark in highlighting the Holy Spirit's role. Matthew is consistent with his understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and the Messiah. This passage also carries the messiahship of Jesus beyond that of the Old Testament Davidic scion. Jesus is the Son of David and more. He is also the Lord of David. The same Spirit that authenticates the Son of David also authenticates the Lord of David.

In tracing the Spirit-authentication of Jesus' messiahship, Matthew's pneumatology can also be seen to develop through the book. Matthew takes the Jewish understanding of the spirit further so that from being an empowerment of the Messiah, the Holy Spirit became the Father's Spirit (Mt. 10:20) and later to become a "blasphemable" (and thus, divine) Personality (Mt.

12:31-32), climaxing in Mt. 28:19 where he becomes an equal member of the divine Trinitarian Godhead. The authenticator of the Messiah became ultimately self-authenticating.

### **The Holy Spirit and Matthean Trinitarian Theology**

Matthean theology is Trinitarian, from beginning to the end. Right from the early stages of the Matthean narratives where the story of the birth of the Messiah is being told (Mt. 1:18-21), we find an incipient Trinitarianism. In the birth of Christ, we find by implication Jesus' divine Sonship and God's Fatherhood. The role of the Holy Spirit is also highlighted in the birth narrative. One can perhaps understand if Matthew's Jewish agenda should cause him to be cautious and discreet about a Trinitarian God. The Jews, with their strict monotheism, would undoubtedly have found this difficult to grasp. Or, perhaps as Green suggests, this is "unself-consciously Trinitarian"<sup>359</sup> and Matthew may have only implied the Trinity unwittingly in the birth narratives. But, doubts about Matthew's consciousness of the Trinitarian Godhead should be settled with the use of the triadic name in Mt. 28:19. In the climactic passage, what was only incipient and implied becomes full-blown and confessional.

In between Mt. 1:18-20 and Mt. 28:19, we find further intimations to the Trinitarian Godhead. In the baptism of Jesus (Mt. 3:16-17), the pronouncement from heaven had the voice of the Father who addressed Jesus as His beloved Son, and the Holy Spirit as a dove coming down from heaven accompanied that voice. In the commissioning of the Twelve to preach to the lost sheep of Israel (Mt. ch. 10), we find the unique Matthean reference to the Holy Spirit as the "Spirit of your Father." (Mt. 10:20) This reference is a promise by the divine Son of God that the

---

<sup>359</sup> Green, 60-61.

Father will send the Holy Spirit. In both 3:16-17 and 10:20, we find all three members of the Trinity mentioned together.

Matthew's inclusion of the Holy Spirit into the Trinitarian Godhead reveals the Holy Spirit to be more than the Old Testament idea of the Spirit as a mere functionary for Yahweh. This inclusion of the Holy Spirit into the Godhead is not a modalistic understanding of the Godhead but simply the progressive nature of revelation. The person of the Holy Spirit has been progressively revealed through Scripture until he is clearly declared in Matthew as a member of the Trinity. As an equal member of the Trinity the Holy Spirit is God revealed – as much as the Son and the Father are also God revealed.

As Pentecostals, often laying claim to having the “*Full Gospel*,” we will do well to read Matthew and see the importance of this Trinitarian understanding of the Godhead. The Full Gospel is Trinitarian:

Do not think that all these displays are of the Spirit alone; the Father is there, the Son is there, and the Holy Spirit is there. Whenever God has come to anyone, the whole Godhead is manifested therein; it is the dynamic of the Godhead; the things of the Spirit are displayed in His sovereign working. This (Pentecostal) movement must be saved from saying that there is never any Spirit until there is Pentecostal fullness, and also after we get Pentecost, from saying it is the Spirit only. It is God! The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.<sup>360</sup>

### **The Holy Spirit and Matthean Ecclesiology**

The church today draws from the life, ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus. Matthew reports Jesus' declaration: “I will build my church . . .”(Matt. 16:18). With the ascension of Jesus, the church needed some way to understand its identity and its *raison d'etre*. John P. Meier suggests that the connection between Jesus' ministry and the church's ministry is Jesus' teaching

---

<sup>360</sup> D.W. Myland, cited by Steven J. Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 1 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 198-199.

on morality. He identifies Jesus in Matthew as “*the* teacher of Christian morality” (emphasis Meier’s)<sup>361</sup> and that the “nexus between Christ and church is the foundation on which Matthew builds his presentation of Christian morality.”<sup>362</sup>

It is certainly true that Jesus’ teaching on morality should guide Matthew’s charismatic community and in fact should form a part of the Christian message. Charles Holman makes a similar point that the Great Commission command to teach *everything that Jesus has commanded* (Mt. 28:20) refers to all of Jesus’ teachings as found in Matthew’s Gospel.<sup>363</sup> And, this would certainly include the moral teachings of Jesus, e.g. the Sermon on the Mount. In fact, Holman’s argument is that Matthew’s interest on the moral teachings of Jesus is motivated by a moral laxity in his charismatic community.<sup>364</sup> Both Meier and Holman are right in their assertions that the message of the church includes the moral teachings of Jesus.

However, it is unfortunate that Meier misses the significance of the Spirit in Matthew’s climactic final pericope. The same Spirit that played such a critical role in authenticating Christ as *the* teacher of Christian morality continues to work in the convert because he is baptized into the name of the Father, Son and the Spirit (Mt. 28:20). The only way the convert can live up to Jesus’ morality is to have the same Spirit that was upon Jesus. The transition between the Jesus tradition and the church is the focus of the climactic final Matthean pericope of Mt. 28:16-20. The Trinitarian formula, has only one name but includes together the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Father is the radicalized continuity of the Old Testament Yahweh. The Son’s presence will continue in the new church. How will this continuity between the Old and New

---

<sup>361</sup> Meier, 45.

<sup>362</sup> *Ibid.*, 264.

<sup>363</sup> Holman, 59.

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid.*, 54-61.

Testaments, and between the Jesus tradition and the church, be effected? It is the Holy Spirit who will be the *nexus*, not merely a set of moral principles. In Matthew, the Spirit does not leave its rootedness in Jesus' life and ministry. Unlike the Lukan and Johannine perspectives, the picture in Matthew is not one of the impartation and transfer of the Spirit. Matthew's picture of the nexus between the Jesus tradition and the Matthean community does not in any way imply the Spirit moving its abode from that of Jesus to the believers. It is when the same Spirit who has authenticated the Messianic identity of Jesus is recognized in the Matthean community, that the Jew-Gentile tension is resolved into a universal church and the transition from the Jesus tradition to the new church becomes complete.

## VII. CONCLUSION: “THE MATTHEAN PENTECOSTAL SPIRIT”

As a Pentecostal reading Matthew, the question that may come to mind is, “Does Matthew have any notion of a *Pentecostal* Spirit?” Perhaps, we should begin by asking, “What/Who is meant by the Pentecostal Spirit?” If, by Pentecostal Spirit, we mean only the Lukan presentation of the divine Spirit, then it is rather unfair to expect that Matthew should have the same presentation. But, if the Pentecostal Spirit is simply the Holy Spirit that God has invested into the church, to empower it to speak prophetically on His behalf and thus fulfill His Great Commission, then Matthew’s presentation is *Pentecostal*. While *glossolalia* remains the most distinctive (and therefore, the most controversial) characteristic of the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, the essence of the Pentecostal Spirit goes beyond merely speaking in tongues. Two of the most fundamental elements that characterize the Pentecostal Spirit are perhaps prophecy and missions. Together, they perhaps form the bases for understanding the essence of the Pentecostal Spirit. We will find in Matthew these same elements, and more.

Robert Menzies has argued that the Lukan Pentecostal Spirit is “nonostriological,” with no direct ethical impact on the individual believer.<sup>365</sup> For Menzies, the Pentecostal Spirit is presented in Luke as primarily a Prophetic Spirit.<sup>366</sup> Along a similar vein, Roger Stronstad suggests that the Reformers may have missed the mark somewhat when they developed the

---

<sup>365</sup> Menzies and Menzies, 89.

<sup>366</sup> Luke prefers “prophetic” to “charismatic” in describing the Lukan Pentecostal Spirit because he sees the Lukan presentation of the Spirit as “almost exclusively . . . the source of inspired speech and special revelation.” *Ibid.*, 90.

doctrine of the priesthood of believers instead of a “prophethood of believers.”<sup>367</sup> We can perhaps follow up on Menzies and Stronstad and speak of the modern Pentecostal/Charismatic movement as an eschatological prophetism.

Matthew, while keen on checking the abuses of prophecy, never discredits prophecy. Instead, we find Matthew affirming the Spirit’s role in prophecy by attributing prophetic authority to a David who is “in-the-Spirit” (Mt. 22:43) and by recognizing the empowerment for disciples for inspired speech as coming from the Spirit of their heavenly Father (Mt. 10:20). But, for Matthew, genuine prophets exhibit more than just inspired speech. They are also to do the will of the Father (Mt. 7:21) because it is the Father’s Spirit that has given them that prophetic empowerment (Mt. 10:20; 22:43). Therefore, Matthew is keen on preserving the teachings of Jesus and requiring that new members of the Spirit community obey all the teachings of Jesus (Mt. 28:18-20).

Quoting the famous missiologist, Roland Allen, Menzies also notes that this Prophetic Spirit is missiological in its purpose, describing the Lukan presentation of the Spirit as “the Spirit for others.”<sup>368</sup> John Michael Penney displays a similar missiological understanding of the Lukan Pentecostal Spirit in his book, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*,

. . . Luke gives a particular emphasis to this pneumatology, a missionary emphasis so marked that it can only reflect an intention to encourage his readers to expect the Holy Spirit to be actively empowering their witness. The Holy Spirit inaugurates, directs and empowers mission.<sup>369</sup>

---

<sup>367</sup> Roger Stronstad, “The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke’s Charismatic Theology” in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, eds. Wonsuk Ma and Robert P. Menzies; Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 11 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 61.

<sup>368</sup> Roland Allen, “The Revelation of the Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles,” *IRM* 7 (1918):160-67, cited in Menzies and Menzies, 90.

<sup>369</sup> John Michael Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 12 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 123.

Matthew's Spirit is present in both the Commission to the Twelve (Mt. 10:20) and the Great Commission (Mt. 28:18-20). It has also been noted in this paper that the twin themes of the Spirit and the nations/Gentiles are programmatic, both themes appearing together in Mt. 12:15-21 and Mt. 28:18-20. Matthew has a universalistic theology that views the new Messianic age as inclusive of the Gentiles. And, this universalistic theology has been invested with the Spirit of God. Matthew clearly has a missionary agenda and sees the Spirit as a part of that agenda.

Beyond the usual Pentecostal categories of prophecy and missions, we find in Matthew a balanced, attenuating pneumatology rooted in his understanding of the Trinitarian Godhead. The new Messianic age of the Gentile church is expected to have both the Spirit and the teachings of Jesus. The empowerment that becomes available from the Spirit for every member of the church does not negate the moral requirements of Jesus' teachings. However, these moral requirements are no longer binding as legal statutes. Instead, they take on a *relational* dimension. As children invested with the Spirit of the Heavenly Father, it is naturally expected of them to follow the example of the Messianic Son of God in obeying *all things*.

## EPILOGUE

Matthew's pneumatology should be of special interest to Pentecostals today. Pentecostals have today gone beyond the polemics of their founding fathers, who had sought mainly to argue for a biblical theology for the Pentecostal experience. John Christopher Thomas suggests that Pentecostal scholarship has gone through at least three generations of theological scholarship, with the fourth generation today expected to "construct Pentecostal theological paradigms from the ground up."<sup>370</sup> To do that, Matthew (for that matter, any other book of the Bible) must be allowed a rightful place alongside the Lukan, Johannine and Pauline corpuses. There is enough material on the Holy Spirit from Matthew to warrant its place in a Pentecostal theological paradigm. Pentecostal theology and praxis will be enriched by Matthew's contribution. Furthermore, Matthew stands as a critical bridge between the Testaments; between the Messianic-Jesus tradition and the ἐκκλησία. Indeed, one will be hard-pressed to find a coherent biblical pneumatology that will include both Old and New Testaments if Matthew were to be left out.

Pentecostals need not be so apologetic about Matthew's seeming lack of relevance to Pentecostals today. There is also no need to speak of a Matthean pneumatology built upon inferences and "arguments from silence." There are good and substantial reasons why Pentecostals can find Matthew meaningful to them.

---

<sup>370</sup> John Christopher Thomas, "Pentecostal Theology in the Twenty-First Century," *Pneuma* 20:1, (Spring 1998): 3-19.

## APPENDIX I<sup>371</sup>

### Distribution of πνεῦμα in the Gospels

There are 102 occurrences of πνεῦμα in 94 verses in the four Gospels.

Occurrences in Matthew - 19 occurrences in 19 verses (from a total of 18,305 words)<sup>372</sup>

| Reference | Literal English translation for πνεῦμα | The verse in Greek; πνευμα phrase in bold & underlined   |
|-----------|--|--|
| 1:18      | Holy Spirit                            | <sup>18</sup> Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν. μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ <b>Μαρίας</b> τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ <b>πνεύματος ἁγίου</b> .                                  |
| 1:20      | Spirit which is holy                   | <sup>20</sup> ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐνθυμηθέντος ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ λέγων· Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν <b>Μαρίαν</b> τὴν γυναῖκα σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ <b>πνεύματος ἔστιν ἁγίου</b> . |
| 3:11      | Holy Spirit                            | <sup>11</sup> Εγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερος μου ἔστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν <b>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ</b> καὶ πυρί·                 |
| 3:16      | (The) Spirit of God                    | <sup>16</sup> βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν [αὐτῷ] οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν <b>[τὸ] πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ</b> καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν·                      |

<sup>371</sup>This appendix is collated from a computer search done on the word, πνεῦμα, with the *Logos Library System*. Aland, Kurt, Black, Matthew, Martini, Carlo M., Metzger, Bruce M., and Wikgren, Allen, *The Greek New Testament*, (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart) 1983, in *The Scholar's Library* [CD-ROM].

<sup>372</sup>The word statistics are from R. Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zurich: Gotthelf, 1958), 164. Cited by Ben Witherington III, *New Testament History: A Narrative Account* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000), 22.

|       |                           |   |
|-------|---------------------------|---|
| 4:1   | The Spirit                | Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου.  |
| 5:3   | The spirit                | <sup>3</sup> Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> , ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.  |
| 8:16  | The spirits               | <sup>16</sup> Οψίας δὲ Γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλεν <u>τὰ πνεύματα</u> λόγῳ καὶ πάντα τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν,   |
| 10:1  | Unclean spirits           | Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν <u>πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων</u> ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν.  |
| 10:20 | The Spirit of your Father | <sup>20</sup> οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν</u> τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν.   |
| 12:18 | My (Yahweh's) Spirit      | <sup>18</sup> Ἴδου ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου· θήσω <u>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</u> ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ.   |
| 12:28 | Spirit of God             | <sup>28</sup> εἰ δὲ ἐν <u>πνεύματι θεοῦ</u> ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.  |
| 12:31 | The Spirit                | <sup>31</sup> Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.  |
| 12:32 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>32</sup> καὶ ὅς ἐάν εἴπη λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὅς δ' ἂν εἴπη κατὰ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου</u> , οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.  |
| 12:43 | The unclean spirits       | <sup>43</sup> Ὅταν δὲ <u>τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα</u> ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκει.  |
| 12:45 | Evil spirits              | <sup>45</sup> τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα <u>πνεύματα πονηρότερα</u> ἑαυτοῦ καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ. |
| 22:43 | Spirit                    | <sup>43</sup> λέγει αὐτοῖς· πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν <u>πνεύματι</u> καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων·  |
| 26:41 | The spirit                | <sup>41</sup> γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· <u>τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα</u> πρόθυμον ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.  |
| 27:50 | The spirit/Spirit         | <sup>50</sup> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφήκεν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> .  |
| 28:19 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>19</sup> πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ <u>τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος</u> .   |

Mark – 23 occurrences in 22 verses (from a total of 11,242 words)

|      |                            |   |
|------|----------------------------|---|
| 1:8  | Holy Spirit                | <sup>8</sup> ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν <u>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ</u> .  |
| 1:10 | The Spirit                 | <sup>10</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαίνον εἰς αὐτόν· <sup>11</sup> καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα. |
| 1:12 | The Spirit                 | <sup>12</sup> Καὶ εὐθὺς <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> αὐτὸν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.   |
| 1:23 | Unclean spirit             | <sup>23</sup> Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν <u>πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ</u> καὶ ἀνέκραξεν  |
| 1:26 | The unclean spirit         | <sup>26</sup> καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον</u> καὶ φωνήσαν φωνὴ μεγάλη ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.  |
| 1:27 | The unclean spirits        | <sup>27</sup> καὶ ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντας· τί ἐστὶν τοῦτο; διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν· καὶ <u>τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις</u> ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ.                                      |
| 2:8  | His (Jesus') spirit/Spirit | <sup>8</sup> καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ</u> ὅτι οὕτως διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν;   |
| 3:11 | The unclean spirits        | <sup>11</sup> καὶ <u>τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα</u> , ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.  |
| 3:29 | The Holy Spirit            | <sup>29</sup> ὅς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> , οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ ἔνοχος ἐστὶν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.   |
| 3:30 | Unclean spirit             | <sup>30</sup> ὅτι ἔλεγον· <u>πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον</u> ἔχει.   |
| 5:2  | Unclean spirit             | <sup>2</sup> καὶ ἐξεληθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν <u>πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ</u> ,  |
| 5:8  | The unclean spirit         | <sup>8</sup> ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ· ἐξελθε <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον</u> ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.   |
| 5:13 | The unclean spirits        | <sup>13</sup> καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἐξεληθόντα <u>τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα</u> εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ὡς δισχίλιοι, καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ.                          |
| 6:7  | The unclean spirits        | <sup>7</sup> Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν <u>τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων</u> ,   |
| 7:25 | An unclean spirit          | <sup>25</sup> ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἀκούσασα γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς <u>πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον</u> , ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ·  |
| 8:12 | His (Jesus') spirit        | <sup>12</sup> καὶ ἀναστενάξας <u>τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ</u> λέγει· τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ζητεῖ σημεῖον; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον.   |
| 9:17 | Speechless spirit          | <sup>17</sup> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ εἰς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου· διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντα <u>πνεῦμα ἄλαλον</u> ·   |

|       |  |   |
|-------|--|---|
| 9:20  | The spirit   | <sup>20</sup> καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν. καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> εὐθὺς συνεσπάραξεν αὐτόν, καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων.   |
| 9:25  | The unclean spirit<br>The speechless and deaf spirit | <sup>25</sup> ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὄχλος, ἐπέτιμησεν <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ</u> λέγων αὐτῷ· <u>τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα</u> , ἐγὼ ἐπιτάσσω σοι, ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν. |
| 12:36 | The Holy Spirit                                      | <sup>36</sup> αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u> ·<br>εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου·<br>κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,<br>ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου.  |
| 13:11 | The Holy Spirit                                      | <sup>11</sup> καὶ ὅταν ἄγωσιν ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες ἀλλὰ <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> .                |
| 14:38 | The spirit   | <sup>38</sup> γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν· <u>τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα</u> πρόθυμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.   |

Luke – 36 occurrences in 35 verses (from a total of 19,428 words)

|      |                    |   |
|------|--------------------|---|
| 1:15 | Holy Spirit        | <sup>15</sup> ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον [τοῦ] κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίῃ, καὶ <u>Πνεύματος ἁγίου</u> πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ,   |
| 1:17 | Elijah's spirit    | <sup>17</sup> καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν <u>πνεύματι</u> καὶ δυνάμει Ἑλισίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον. |
| 1:35 | Holy Spirit        | <sup>35</sup> καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ· <u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</u> ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ.                         |
| 1:41 | Holy Spirit        | <sup>41</sup> καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμόν τῆς Μαρίας ἢ Ἑλισάβετ, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη <u>πνεύματος ἁγίου</u> ἢ Ἑλισάβετ,  |
| 1:47 | My (Mary's) spirit | <sup>47</sup> καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</u> ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρι μου,   |
| 1:67 | Holy Spirit        | <sup>67</sup> Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη <u>πνεύματος ἁγίου</u> καὶ ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων·   |
| 1:80 | Spirit/spirit      | <sup>80</sup> Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠύξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο <u>πνεύματι</u> , καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις ἕως ἡμέρας ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ.   |
| 2:25 | Holy Spirit        | <sup>25</sup> Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ᾧ ὄνομα Συμεὼν καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ Εὐλαβὴς προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ <u>πνεῦμα</u> ἦν <u>ἅγιον</u> ἐπ' αὐτόν·              |
| 2:26 | The Holy Spirit    | <sup>26</sup> καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου</u> μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν [ἦ] ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου.   |

|      |                           |   |
|------|---------------------------|---|
| 2:27 | The Spirit                | <sup>27</sup> καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ   |
| 3:16 | Holy Spirit               | <sup>16</sup> ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερος μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν <u>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ</u> καὶ πυρί·                     |
| 3:22 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>22</sup> καὶ καταβῆναι <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι· σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.  |
| 4:1  | Holy Spirit<br>The Spirit | <sup>1</sup> Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης <u>πνεύματος ἁγίου</u> ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἦγετο ἐν <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ  |
| 4:14 | The Spirit                | <sup>14</sup> Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.  |
| 4:18 | Spirit                    | <sup>18</sup> <u>πνεῦμα</u> κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ<br>οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισεν με<br>εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς,<br>ἀπέσταλκεν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν<br>καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν,<br>ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,                                  |
| 4:33 | Unclean spirit of a demon | <sup>33</sup> Καὶ Ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων <u>πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου</u> καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ·  |
| 4:36 | The unclean spirits       | <sup>36</sup> καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες· τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει <u>τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν</u> καὶ ἐξέρχονται;  |
| 6:18 | Unclean spirits           | <sup>18</sup> οἱ ἦλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι ἀπὸ <u>πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων</u> ἐθεραπεύοντο,  |
| 7:21 | Evil spirits              | <sup>21</sup> ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ <u>πνευμάτων πονηρῶν</u> καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν.   |
| 8:2  | Evil spirits              | <sup>2</sup> καὶ γυναῖκες τινες αἱ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ <u>πνευμάτων πονηρῶν</u> καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, <b>Μαρία</b> ἡ καλουμένη <b>Μαγδαληνή</b> , ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἐπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει,   |
| 8:29 | The unclean spirit        | <sup>29</sup> παρήγγειλεν γὰρ <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ</u> ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηπάκει αὐτόν καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἀλύσειν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος καὶ διαρρήσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους. |
| 8:55 | Her (girl's) spirit       | <sup>55</sup> καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς</u> καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν.  |
| 9:39 | A spirit                  | <sup>39</sup> καὶ ἰδοὺ <u>πνεῦμα</u> λαμβάνει αὐτόν καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτόν μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντρίβον αὐτόν·  |

|       |                           |   |
|-------|---------------------------|---|
| 9:42  | The unclean spirit        | <sup>42</sup> ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάραξεν· ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ</u> καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ.   |
| 10:20 | The spirits               | <sup>20</sup> πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίrete ὅτι <u>τὰ πνεύματα</u> ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, χαίrete δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.  |
| 10:21 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>21</sup> Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u> καὶ εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνेतῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθεν σου. |
| 11:13 | Holy Spirit               | <sup>13</sup> εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει <u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</u> τοῖς αἰτούσιν αὐτόν.  |
| 11:24 | The unclean spirit        | <sup>24</sup> Ὅταν <u>τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα</u> ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον· [τότε] λέγει· ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον·  |
| 11:26 | Evil spirits              | <sup>26</sup> τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἕτερα <u>πνεύματα πονηρότερα</u> ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων.   |
| 12:10 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>10</sup> Καὶ Πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς <u>τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα</u> βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.  |
| 12:12 | The Holy Spirit           | <sup>12</sup> τὸ γὰρ <u>ἅγιον πνεῦμα</u> διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν.  |
| 13:11 | Spirit of infirmity       | <sup>11</sup> καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ <u>πνεῦμα</u> ἔχουσα <u>ἀσθενείας</u> ἔτη δεκαοκτὼ καὶ ἦν συγκύπτουσα καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές.   |
| 23:46 | My (Jesus') Spirit/spirit | <sup>46</sup> καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· πάτερ, εἰς χεῖρας σου παρατίθεμαι <u>τὸ πνεῦμα μου</u> . τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.   |
| 24:37 | Ghost/spirit              | <sup>37</sup> πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν <u>πνεῦμα</u> θεωρεῖν.  |
| 24:39 | Ghost/spirit              | <sup>39</sup> ἴδετε τὰς χεῖρας μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτός· ψηλαφήσατε με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι <u>πνεῦμα</u> σὰρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.  |

John – 24 Occurrences in 18 verses (from a total of 16,150 words)

|      |                        |   |
|------|------------------------|---|
| 1:32 | The Spirit             | <sup>32</sup> Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων ὅτι τεθέαμαι <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> καταβαῖνον ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν.  |
| 1:33 | The Spirit Holy Spirit | <sup>33</sup> καγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι ἐκεῖνος μοι εἶπεν· ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτος ἐστίν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν <u>πνεύματι ἁγίῳ</u> . |

|       |                                |   |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|
| 3:5   | Spirit                         | <sup>5</sup> ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῆ ἔξ ὕδατος καὶ <u>πνεύματος</u> , οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.                                      |
| 3:6   | The Spirit<br>Spirit/spirit    | <sup>6</sup> τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> <u>πνεῦμα</u> ἐστίν.   |
| 3:8   | The Spirit/wind<br>The Spirit  | <sup>8</sup> <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> .            |
| 3:34  | The Spirit                     | <sup>34</sup> ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> .  |
| 4:23  | Spirit/spirit                  | <sup>23</sup> ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν <u>πνεύματι</u> καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτόν. |
| 4:24  | Spirit of God<br>Spirit/spirit | <sup>24</sup> <u>πνεῦμα ὁ θεός</u> , καὶ τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτόν ἐν <u>πνεύματι</u> καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.  |
| 6:63  | The Spirit/spirit<br>spirit    | <sup>63</sup> <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> ἐστίν τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν· τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν <u>πνεῦμα</u> ἐστίν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστίν.  |
| 7:39  | The Spirit<br>Spirit           | <sup>39</sup> τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ <u>τοῦ πνεύματος</u> ὃ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὐπω γὰρ ἦν <u>πνεῦμα</u> , ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἔδοξάσθη.                               |
| 11:33 | The Spirit/spirit              | <sup>33</sup> Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας, ἐνεβριμήσατο <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν  |
| 13:21 | The Spirit/spirit              | <sup>21</sup> Ταῦτα εἰπὼν [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη <u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν καὶ εἶπεν· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰς ἔξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με.   |
| 14:17 | The Spirit of Truth            | <sup>17</sup> <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας</u> , ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει· ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.                  |
| 14:26 | The Holy Spirit                | <sup>26</sup> ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον</u> , ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ].                      |
| 15:26 | The Spirit of Truth            | <sup>26</sup> Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας</u> ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ·                          |
| 16:13 | The Spirit of Truth            | <sup>13</sup> ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, <u>τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας</u> , ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.   |
| 19:30 | The Spirit                     | <sup>30</sup> ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβεν τὸ ὄξος [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τετέλεσται, καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν παρέδωκεν <u>τὸ πνεῦμα</u> .  |
| 20:22 | Holy Spirit                    | <sup>22</sup> καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐνεφύσησεν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· λάβετε <u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</u> ·   |

## APPENDIX II

### Overview of Syntax & Translation of Matthean Usage of Πνεῦμα for the Divine Spirit

|    | TEXT  | CONTEXT                      | PERICOPE   | CASE SYNTAX                             | LITERAL TRANSLATION                    |
|----|-------|------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 1  | 1:18  | ἐκ πνευματος ἁγίου           | Holy Spirit in the Birth Narratives                  | Genitive with preposition ἐκ            | from (through) the Holy Spirit         |
| 2  | 1:20  | ἐκ πνευματος ἔστιν ἁγίου     | Holy Spirit in the Birth Narratives                  | Genitive with preposition ἐκ            | from (through) the Spirit that is holy |
| 3  | 3:11  | ἐν πνευματι ἁγίῳ και πυρι    | Holy Spirit in the Baptist's Prophecy                | Locative-dative                         | in the Holy Spirit and fire            |
| 4  | 3:16  | (το) πνευμα (του) θεου       | Spirit of God in the Baptism of Jesus                | Nominative Subject                      | the Spirit of God                      |
| 5  | 4:1   | ὑπο του πνευματος            | Holy Spirit in the Temptation of Jesus               | Genitive of Agency with preposition ὑπο | by the Holy Spirit                     |
| 6  | 10:20 | το πνευμα του πατρος ὑμων    | Promise of help from the "Spirit of your Father"     | Nominative Subject                      | the Spirit of your Father              |
| 7  | 12:18 | το πνευμα μου                | Spirit on Jesus Is a Messianic Fulfillment           | Accusative Direct Object                | my (YHWH's) Spirit                     |
| 8  | 12:28 | ἐν πνευματι θεου             | Driving out Demons by the Spirit of God              | Instrumental                            | with the Spirit of God                 |
| 9  | 12:31 | του πνευματος                | Blasphemy of the Holy Spirit                         | Objective Genitive                      | of the spirit                          |
| 10 | 12:32 | κατα του πνευματος του ἁγίου | Blasphemy Against the Holy Spirit                    | Genitive with the preposition κατα      | against the Holy Spirit                |
| 11 | 22:43 | ἐν πνευματι                  | David in the prophetic Spirit                        | Locative dative                         | in the Spirit                          |
| 12 | 27:50 | το πνευμα                    | The Spirit at the death of Jesus                     | Accusative Direct Object                | the Spirit                             |
| 13 | 28:19 | του ἁγίου πνευματος          | The Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian Baptismal Formula | Genitive of possession                  | (of) the Holy Spirit                   |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, W. F. and C. S. Mann. *Matthew: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. The Anchor Bible, gen. eds. William Fox Albright and David Noel Freedman. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971.
- Anderson, A. A. "The Use of 'Ruach' in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 17 (1962): 293-303.
- Anderson, Janice Capel. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 91. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Aker, Ben C. "Matthew, Gospel of" in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements*. Eds. Stanley M. Burgess, Gary B. McGee and Patrick H. Alexander. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1988: 588-598.
- Allen, Willoughby C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- Aune David E. *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Bacon, B. W. "The 'Five Books' of Matthew against the Jews," *Expositor* 15, 8<sup>th</sup> series (1918): 56-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Matthew*. London, UK: Constable, 1930.
- Balch, David L., ed. *Social History of the Matthean Community: Cross-Disciplinary Approaches*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.
- Bauer, David R. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Sheffield, UK: Almond Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Mark Allan Powell, eds. *Treasures New and Old: Contributions to Matthean Studies*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996.

- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Christian Literature*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Trans. and adapted by William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick Danker. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Beare, F. W. *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1981.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The New American Commentary: Matthew*. Gen. ed. David S. Dockery. Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1992.
- Boice, James Montgomery. *The Gospel of Matthew, Vol. 1: The King and His Kingdom, Matthew 1-17*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Matthew, Vol. 2: The Triumph of the King, Matthew 18-28*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001.
- Bornkamm, Günther; Gerhard Barth, and Joachim Heinz Held. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. Trans. Percy Scott. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Bratcher, Robert G. *A Translator's Guide to the Gospel of Matthew*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1981.
- Brooks, Stephenson H. *Matthew's Community: The Evidence of His Special Sayings* *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 16*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Brown, Colin, gen. ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978 & 1986.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *Matthew: A Commentary, The Christbook: 1-12*. Vol. 1. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew: A Commentary, The Churchbook: 13-28*. Vol. 2. Dallas, TX: Word Publishing, 1990.
- Carson, D. A. "Matthew" in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Gen. ed. Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984, vol. 8:3-599.
- Charette, Blaine. "'Never Has Anything Like This Been Seen in Israel': The Spirit as Eschatological Sign in Matthew" *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 8 (1996):31-51.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 18. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Charles, J. Daryl. "The 'Coming One'/'Stronger One' and His Baptism: Matt 3:11-12, Mark 1:8, Luke 3:16-17." *Pneuma* 11:11 (Fall 1989): 37-50.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 5. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976.
- Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 3 vols. The International Critical Commentary. Gen. Eds. J. A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield, and G. N. Stanton. Edinburgh, UK: T. & T. Clark, 1988.
- Di Gangi, Mariano. *The Spirit of Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1975.
- Donaldson, Terrence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*. Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplemented Series No. 8. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Fee, Gordon. "Baptism in the Holy Spirit: The Issue of Separability and Subsequence." *Pneuma*, 7:2 (Fall, 1985): 87-99.
- Fenton, J.C. *Saint Matthew*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, gen. ed. Leon Morris. Leicester, UK: IVP, 1985.
- Garland, David E. *Reading Matthew: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the First Gospel*. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1993.
- Glasscock, Ed. *Matthew*. Moody Gospel Commentary. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1997.
- Green, Michael. *The Message of Matthew: The Kingdom of Heaven The Bible Speaks Today*, ed. John Stott. Leicester, UK: IVP, 1988 & 2000.

- Gundry, Robert. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1-13, vol. 33A & Matthew 14-28, vol. 33B* Word Biblical Commentary, gen. Ed. Bruce M. Metzger. Dallas, TX: Word, 1993.
- Hanna, Robert. *A Grammatical Aid to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1983.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina, ed. Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Trans. James Greig. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1981.
- Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. The New Century Bible Commentary, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Holman, Charles L. "A Lesson from Matthew's Gospel for Charismatic Renewal" in *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley M. Horton*, ed. Paul Elbert. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988: 4-63.
- Howell, David B. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 42. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Johnston, George. "'Spirit' and 'Holy Spirit' in the Qumran Literature," in *New Testament Sidelights*, ed. H. E. McArthur. Hartford: Hartford Sem. Found., 1960: 27-42.
- Keck, Leander E. "Matthew and the Spirit" in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne H. Meeks*, eds. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995: 145-155.
- Keener, Craig S. *Matthew*. The IVP New Testament Commentary Series, ed. Grant R. Osborne. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts: Divine Purity and Power*. Peabody, MA: 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew*, Proclamation Series: The New Testament Witnesses for Preaching, ed. Gerhard Krodel. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1977.

Kittel, Gerhard and Gerhard Friedrich. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.

Kuyper, Abraham. *The Work of the Holy Spirit*. Trans. Henri Devries. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1941.

Land, Steven J. *Pentecostal Spirituality: A Passion for the Kingdom*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 1. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Lenski, R. C. *The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1943.

Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew in History: Interpretation, Influence, and Effects*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1994

\_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Translated by Wilhelm C. Linss. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, ed. Helmut Koester. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew*. Trans. J. Bradford Robinson. New Testament Theology, gen. ed. James D. G. Dunn. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Ma, Wonsuk. "Biblical Studies in the Pentecostal Tradition." In *Globalization of Pentecostalism: A Religion Made to Travel* Eds. Murray W. Dempster, Byron D. Klaus and Douglas Petersen. Oxford, UK: Regnum, 1999: 52-67

Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1957.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London & New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

- McKnight, Scot. *Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels*. Guides to the New Testament Exegesis, ed. Scot McKnight. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.
- McDonnell, Killian, and Montague, George T. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indices*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1915.
- Meier, John P. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Menzies, Robert P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 6, eds. John Christopher Thomas, Rickie D. Moore and Steven J. Land. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Menzies, William W. and Robert P. Menzies. *Spirit and Power: Foundations of Pentecostal Experience*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.
- Montague, George T., S.M. *Companion God: A Cross-Cultural Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*. New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Montague, George T., S.M. *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. Peabody, MA: Hendricksen, 1976.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Mounce, Robert H. *Matthew*. New International Biblical Commentary, ed. W. Ward Gasque. Peabody, MA: Hendricksen, 1991.
- Oden, Thomas C. *Life in the Spirit: Systematic Theology Vol. 3*. New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1992.
- O'Shea, William J. *Sacraments of Initiation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
- Penney, John Michael. *The Missionary of Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 12, eds. John Christopher Thomas, Rickie D. Moore and Steven J. Land. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Plummer, Alfred. *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew*. London, UK: Robert Scott, 1909.

- Powell, Ivor. *Matthew's Majestic Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1986.
- Powery, Emerson B. "Ulrich Luz's *Matthew in History: A Contribution to Pentecostal Hermeneutics?*," in *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* Issue no. 1, April 1999: 3-17.
- Reiling, J. and J. L. Swellengrebel. *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Riches, John. *Matthew*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Schaberg, Jane. *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*. SBL Dissertation Series 61. Ed. William Baird. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Schwarz, Christian A. *Paradigm Shift in the Church: How Natural Church Development Can Transform Theological Thinking*. Ohio, IL: Churchsmart Resources, 1999.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Matthew*. Trans. David E. Green. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Shelton, James B. "Matthew" in *Full Life Bible Commentary to the New Testament: An International Commentary for Spirit-Filled Christians*. Eds. French L. Arrington & Roger Stronstad. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999:119-253.
- Sims, John A. *Our Pentecostal Heritage*. Cleveland, TN: Pathway Press, 1995.
- Stagg, Frank. "The Holy Spirit in the New Testament." *Review and Expositor*, 63 (1966):135-147.
- Stanton, Graham, ed. *The Interpretation of Matthew*. London, UK: SPCK, 1983.
- Stanton, Graham N. *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew*. Edinburgh, UK: T & T Clark, 1992.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels*. London, UK: Macmillan, 1924.
- Stronstad, Roger. *Spirit, Scripture and Theology: A Pentecostal Perspective*. Baguio, Philippines: APTS Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology" in *Pentecostalism in Context: Essays in Honor of William W. Menzies*, eds. Wonsuk

- Ma and Robert P. Menzies, 60-77. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 11*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter, ed. *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991,
- Thomas, John Christopher. "The Kingdom of God in the Gospel According to Matthew," *New Testament Studies* 39 (1993): 136-146.
- Thomas, John Christopher "Pentecostal Theology in the Twenty-First Century." *Pneuma* 20:1. (Spring 1998): 3-19.
- Toon, Peter. *Our Triune God: A Biblical Portrayal of the Trinity*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Act*. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Walvoord, John F. *Matthew, Thy Kingdom Come: A Commentary on the First Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1974.
- Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study*. *Journal of the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 62*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Welker, Michael. *God the Spirit*. Trans. John F. Hoffmeyer. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Wiersbe, Warren W. *Be Loyal: Following the King of Kings*. Colorado Springs, CO: Chariot Victor Publishing, 1980.
- Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. *Society for the New Testament Studies Monograph Series: 7*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Witherington III, Ben. *New Testament History: A Narrative Account*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2000.

### Internet/Electronic Sources

*B-Greek* [mailing list]; available from <http://metalab.unc.edu/bgreek>; Internet; accessed 4 October 2003

*BibleWorks for Windows*, ver. 5.0.020w [CD-ROM]. Big Fork, MT: BibleWorks, 2001.

Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Zondervan Reference Software ver. 2.7 [CD-ROM]. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989-1999.

Crawford, Alex. *The Spirit: A General Exposition on New Testament Usage* [book on-line]. Hallett Cove, South Australia, 1990. Accessed on 4 October 2003. Available from <http://www.christadelphia.org/books/spirit/index.html>; Internet.

Missler, Chuck. *Koinonia House Online* [Bible Study on-line]. Available from <http://www.khouse.org/articles/biblestudy/20000301-205.html>; Internet. Accessed March 2000.

*Scholar's Library*, 7th ed. [CD-ROM]. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1999.

*The Theological Journal Library 4.0* [CD-ROM]. Garland, TX: Galaxie Software, 1999.

*The Synoptic Problem Homepage*. <http://www.mindspring.com/~scarlson/synopt/index.html>; Internet. Accessed on 4 October 2003.