

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN MATTHEW 12:15-32: AN INTERTEXTUAL
INVESTIGATION

ELIAS ASSEFA HASISO



This Assignment is presented as a Fulfilment of the requirements for Masters in Theology in
the Faculty of Theology at Stellenbosch University

Supervisor: PROFESSOR MARIUS NEL

March 2020

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this assignment is my own work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any University for attaining a degree.

Signature

E. A. HASISO

Abbreviations

A.D.	Anno Domini (Latin: “in the years of our Lord”)
BDAG	Bible Dictionary of Ancient Greek
DRC	Dutch Reformed Church
EGST	Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology
EKHC	Ethiopian Kale Heywet Church
ETC	Evangelical Theological College
KJV	King James Version
LXX	Septuagint (Ancient Greek Translation of the Old Testament)
M. Th.	Masters in Theology
MT	Masoretic Text
NT	New Testament
PGD	Postgraduate Diploma in Theology
Q	quell “a source believed shared by Matthew and Luke”
OT	Old Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version

Abstract

Former studies of Matthew's Gospel in general, and 12:15-32 in particular, have emphasised on Christology to the detriment of Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit. Previous research further limited its consideration of the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' miraculous ministry to 12:15-32, in the light of preceding and succeeding chapters. No study has investigated the integral role that the Holy Spirit played in Jesus' entire miraculous ministry and the reasons behinds Jesus' provocativeness towards the Jewish religious leaders. This thesis aims to fill this gap in Matthean studies.

This study investigates Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' miraculous ministry in a specific pericope of his Gospel in order to ascertain whether Jesus, Matthew and his faith communities' – and even the Jewish religious leaders were aware of the Holy Spirit. The study endeavours to address a specific research question: How does Matthew present the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32 in terms of the Old Testament?

This study used an intertextual method and specifically Richard Hays' “_backward reading_” or “_figurative reading_” of Scriptures to study the relevant passages. Particular attention is given to Matthew's direct and indirect quotations and allusions to the Holy Spirit and the Spirit's relationship with Jesus the Messiah. This intertextual study examined how Matthew's rereading of the OT Scriptures shapes not only his understanding of Jesus the Messiah, but also the dynamic role of the Holy Spirit in the life and ministry of the Messiah.

The research on Matthew 12:15-32 with its preceding and succeeding texts shows that Matthew presents the Holy Spirit as known to Jesus, his followers and Matthew's faith community, and as being actively involved in Jesus' conception, baptism, temptation and miraculous ministries. Matthew 12:15-32 also indicates that Jesus, who himself empowered by the Holy Spirit in performing his miracles. Jesus further encouraged his disciples by promising that the Holy Spirit would accompany them on their mission among their fellow Jews and Gentiles. Thus, to disregard what the Holy Spirit is doing in Jesus means to reject the visitation of God which will incur judgment, whether the perpetrators are the Pharisees or Matthew's faith community.

Opsomming

Vorige studies van die evangelie van Mattheus oor die algemeen en spesifiek met betrekking tot 12:15-32, het op die christologie gefokus, tot nadeel van Mattheus se uitbeelding van die Heilige Gees. Voorafgaande navorsing het die onderwerp van die rol van die Heilige Gees in Jesus se wonderbediening beperk tot 12:15:32, in die lig van die voorafgaande en daaropvolgende hoofstukke. Geen studie het al die integrale rol wat die Heilige Gees in Jesus se algehele wonderbediening en die redes vir Jesus se uitdagende houding teenoor die Joodse godsdienstige leiers ondersoek nie. Hierdie verhandeling beoog om dié gaping in Mattheïse studies te vul.

Hierdie studie ondersoek Mattheus se aanbieding van die Heilige Gees in verhouding tot Jesus se wonderbediening in ‘n spesifieke perikoop van sy evangelie, met die oog daarop om vas te stel of Jesus, Mattheus en sy geloofsgemeenskappe – en selfs die Joodse godsdienstige leiers – bewus was van die Heilige Gees. Die studie onderneem om ‘n bepaalde navorsingsvraag te beantwoord: Hoe beeld Mattheus die Heilige Gees in verband tot Jesus se wonderbediening uit in Mattheus 12:15-32, teen die agtergrond van die Ou Testament?

Hierdie studie maak gebruik van ‘n intertekstuele metode en naamlik Richard Hays se “backward reading” of “figurative reading” van die Skrif om die betrokke gedeeltes te lees. Besondere aandag word aan Mattheus se direkte en indirekte aanhalings en sy verwysings na die Heilige Gees geskenk, asook aan die Gees se verhouding met Jesus die Messias. Hierdie intertekstuele studie ondersoek hoedat Mattheus se herinterpretasie van die Ou Testamentiese skrifte nie alleen sy begrip van Jesus die Messias vorm nie, maar ook die dinamiese rol van die Heilige Gees in die lewe en bediening van die Messias.

Die navorsing oor Mattheus 12:15-32 saam met sy voorafgaande en daaropvolgende tekste toon aan hoe Mattheus die Heilige Gees uitbeeld as bekend aan Jesus, sy volgelinge en Mattheus se geloofsgemeenskap; en as sulks ook aktief betrokke was in Jesus se konsepsie, doop, versoeking en wonderbediening. Mattheus 12:15-32 dui ook aan dat Jesus self deur die Heilige Gees bemagtig is om sy wonders te doen. Jesus het vervolgens sy dissipels aangemoedig deur sy beloftes dat die Heilige Gees hulle op hul sending onder hulle mede-Jode en nie-Jode sal begelei. Om dus te verontagsaam wat die Heilige Gees in Jesus doen, beteken ook dat die verskyning van God wat oordeel sal bring, verwerp word; of die oortreders Fariseërs is of die lede van Mattheus se geloofsgemeenskap.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to persons, individually and collectively, without whom this assignment would never have reached accomplishment. First, I would like to convey gratitude to my Postgraduate Diploma in Theology (PGD) and Master in Theology (M.Th) supervisor, Prof. Marius Nel for his courteous assistance, inspiration and irreplaceable comments and productive criticism. Under his gracious guidance, I have really learnt insights that are reflected in the way I have argued in the present proposal.

I am also thankful to Prof. Jeremy Punt and Dr Peter Nagel. In the early stages of this proposal I consulted Prof. Punt; his advice and the materials I received from him helped a lot. Meantime, I cannot deny how much I have benefited from Dr Peter Nagel's critical questions and analytical argumentation in the Greek class. Therefore I extend my thanks to all, particularly the Greek reading class and seminar presenters, who triggered many thoughts which shaped the flow of my proposal. Likewise, I also appreciate Prof. Louis Jonker for offering me a clear and courageous guidance regarding the OT Scripture. I thank Dr Nagel and Dr Philip La G. Du Toit (from North West University) for their critical and constructive comments as internal and external examiners respectively.

I am further thankful for the assistance which I received from the Stellenbosch University Theological Faculty and librarians. Especially, the bursaries I received from the Dutch Reformed Church (DRC) and others played a vital role in my situations. I would also like to thank all the _ staff of the theological Faculty Dean's Office and Postgraduate Office, particularly, in Administration, Finance, Registration, Health and Immigration and others_ for their responsible and friendly work.

Moreover, different people have supported and influenced my work in various ways. I cannot mention each and every one, but some deserve to be addressed personally or collectively. The first thanks should go to Hosanna Kale Heywet Local Church (HKLC) and Ethiopian Kale Heywet Church (EKHC) head office. In addition to their prayers and provision, HKLC and EKHC wrote a supporting letter to the South African Embassy in Ethiopia which at the time played a decisive role in my being granted a visa. Dr Desta Heliso, the former president of Ethiopian Graduate School of Theology (EGST), Dr Bekele Deboch, PhD graduate from Stellenbosch University, and George Whitefield College in Muizenberg also played a significant role in taking the initiative and implementation. I appreciate their efforts.

Secondly, I am indebted to gratitude toward some of the Ethiopian Community Churches in South Africa from whom I received support occasionally. Such institutions include: Rehobot Evangelical Church in Cape Town. They played a meaningful role, especially, in the 2019 academic year, and its members showed really exceptional love and support both individually and collectively. Particularly, my brother Mr. Ermiays Lefamo, Mr. Wondimu Abbayine and others have worked tirelessly in coordinating some volunteers' to collect part of my registration fees of 2018 and 2019. I also received occasional support from other churches in and around Cape Town. These include: Randfontein Wongele Ewunet Church, Wongele Amagnoch Churches (Bizana, Ladysmith, and Johannesburg and others), Wongele Abisariwoch Churches (in Oliven, Johannesburg and Durban) and Godina Church (in White River), and KHC and Abenezer Church in Cape Town. I received much encouragement and support from friends, relatives and family. With all these, I remember and thank my younger brother Yosef Assefa. He has done a wonderful job with other relatives who live in different parts of South Africa. As I said before, many other people, including Abraham Delo and Sintayehu (Mime) Tesfaye, supported this study in various ways. May God bless them forever.

I am also most thankful to my lovely wife Ferehiwot Girma and my two little angelice kids Selele and Waeya. They have missed me for the last almost four consecutive years but stayed firm and faithful. Especially my sweet's persistent prayers and encouragement have been a secrete source of success. Thus it is with great joy with which I dedicate this thesis to my wife and children, my parents and to all who stood beside me during my study. I honestly admit that without their consistent and life-saving provision and love, this proposal would not have become true.

Lastly and most deservedly, I am so thankful to God (the Father, the Son), the Holy Spirit, who initiates the idea, like he did in the birth of Jesus Christ, and accompany me until its accomplishment. Now I can claim with the angel who declared to Mary, the Mother of Jesus, "For with God nothing will be impossible" (Luke 1:37).

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	ii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Opsomming.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Table(s).....	x
Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology.....	1
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Background to the Study.....	1
1.2. Literature Review.....	2
1.3. Research Aim.....	8
1.4. Delimitation	9
1.5. Research Question	10
1.6. Research Method	10
1.7. Summary Note	15
Chapter 2: Background and Overview Issues of Matthew’s Gospel	16
2.1. Background issues	16
2.1.1. Author: an apostle or non-apostle?	16
2.1.2. Date of Writing: Before or after A.D. 70?	20
2.1.3. Place of Writing: Palestine or Antioch in Syria?	21
2.1.4. Summary and Reflection.....	21
2.1.5. Historical Context: Occasion and Purpose.....	23
2.1.6. Literary Context: Matthew’s Structure	26
2.1.7. Theological Motive.....	33
2.2. Overview of Pneumatic References before and after Matthew 12:15-32	35
2.2.1. Pneumatological Passages in Matthew’s Gospel	38
2.2.2. Summary Note	48
Chapter 3: The Messiah and the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32	50
3.1. Introduction: The immediate context of Matthew 12:1-14.....	50
3.1.1. The Pharisees Criticism of Jesus Matthew 12:2, 9-10	51
3.1.2. Jesus’s Response to the Pharisees	52

3.1.3.	Summary note	54
3.2.	The Messiah Imbued with the Holy Spirit Matthew 12:15-21.....	54
3.2.1.	Matthew 12:17-21 in light of Isaiah’s 42:1-4	55
3.2.2.	Isaiah 42:1-4 in light of Matthew 12:17-21	58
3.2.3.	Summary Note	64
3.3.	The Messiah Empowered by the Holy Spirit Matthew 12:22-28.....	64
3.3.1.	The Crowd's Response Matthew 12:22-23	65
3.3.2.	The Pharisees' Reaction Matthew 12:24	67
3.3.3.	The Messiah’s Response Matthew 12:25-30	68
3.3.4.	Summary Note	74
3.4.	The Messiah Defends the Holy Spirit	74
3.4.1.	The Term Blasphemy.....	74
3.4.2.	The Consequence of Blasphemy.....	75
3.4.3.	Summary Note	79
Chapter 4:	Conclusion and Contribution to contemporary Matthean Studies	80
4.1.	Conclusion	80
4.2.	Contribution to contemporary Matthean Study.....	82
5.	References.....	85

List of Table(s)

Table 1: Comparative frequency of Spirit.....6

Chapter 1: Introduction and Methodology

1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Study

In 2008 I was preparing to enrol at the Evangelical Theological College (ETC) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. ETC requires applicants to supply reasons for preferring this particular college. In response, I derived one of my reasons from Matthew 22:29, where Jesus told Jewish religious leaders, “You are wrong because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God” (RSV), because I was convinced that Jesus intentionally connects understanding or knowledge of Scriptures with power. Since then studying this Gospel remains my primary choice, and led me to complete my Postgraduate Diploma in Theology on Matthew

Graham Stanton (1995:1) states that the Gospel of Matthew was the most widely used and influential until the rise of modern historical studies. Ian Boxall (2014:1) also notes Matthew’s profound dominance on Christian history and human culture. Boxall (2014:2-4) claims that Matthew’s popularity resides in three basic elements: 1) the Gospel is superbly and memorably ordered; 2) the widespread usage of Matthew in liturgy and catechesis; and, 3) the centuries-old belief that Matthew is the earliest of our Canonical Gospels¹. Nevertheless, the arrivals of modern historical studies, which favour Mark, have challenged this dominance (Stanton 1995:3; Boxall 2014:4). In the latter case, Matthew is considered dependent on Mark and other independent sources. In either way, Matthew’s presentation of the Holy Spirit has received little scholastic recognition.

This study will examine how Matthew presents the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus’ miraculous ministry in a specific pericope of his Gospel. As will become evident from the literary review, this research arises from the conviction that the Holy Spirit, despite playing a significant role in Jesus’ life and ministry in Matthew’s Gospel, particularly in 12:15-32, has not received much scholastic attention. A conviction among New Testament scholars, with which the researcher agrees, is that the Holy Spirit is the least acknowledged member of the

¹ It is believed that Matthew, one of Jesus’ disciples, wrote the First Gospel in the canonical order. This traditional view has been sustained for a long period of times and there are still some scholars who debate the issuer (See Boxall 2014:2-4).

Trinity in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. Charette 2000:11; Badcock 1997:1). It appears as if the “scholastic appetite” is often “quenched” due to a focus on Christology (Studebaker 2006:7) which leaves little room to appreciate the person and work of the Holy Spirit in Matthew (Charette 2000:11). This study has no problem with Christology but intends to ask whether justice has been done to Matthew’s presentation of the Holy Spirit (pneumatology). In order to determine whether this is the case a literature review of important studies of Matthew’s theology will be undertaken.

1.2. Literature Review

Several studies have been done on what Graham Stanton (1995:1) and Ian Boxall (2014:1) call the most influential and popular Gospel in the Synoptic tradition. The first part of the literature review reveals that studies of Matthew are preoccupied with Christology (cf. Hagner 1993:62; Luz 2005:vii; Allison 2005:50; France 1989:279, and Gundry 1994:53 to mention just a few). Luz’s and France’s work on Matthew’s Christological orientation are presented below as examples.

According to Luz (2005:97-112), the crux of Matthew’s Christology is wrapped up in three Messianic titles. The first is “The Son of David” (υἱὸς Δαβίδ). Luz (2005:85-88) believes that Jesus’s Davidic sonship linkage relates to the miraculous acts performed by Jesus as the fulfilment of Jewish Messianic expectation. The second Messianic title in Matthew is “Son of Man” (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). Luz (2005:88) writes, “Matthew unfolds the meaning of the expression of the Son of Man ... from homeless to persecution to passion, death, resurrection, and exaltation culminating in his parousia as an eschatological judge.” The last Christological title is “Son of God” (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ). According to Luz, the first two Christological titles, υἱὸς Δαβίδ, and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου depicts Jesus’ horizontal relationship with Jews in general and his disciples in particular. But the last title, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, displays Jesus’ vertical relationship with God the Father. Luz (2005:93) claims, therefore, that the term ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ implies “Jesus’ special and unique relation to God and his unique God-given status.” In short, these are the most important Christological titles in Matthew (cf. Luz 2005:96) and their study the most feasible signals of the dominance of Christology in Matthean studies.

France (1989:279) also makes it clear in his study of the Gospel of Matthew that it is a book about Jesus. Therefore, Matthew wants his reader to comprehend Jesus’ identity and its salvific implication. France (1989:281-296) also mentions five Christological titles in

Matthew, namely, Christ, Son of David, Lord, Son of Man, and Son of God. The first title, “Christ,” is Messianic and it points towards Israel’s Great King David. However, he is also the “Lord,” as David himself called him “_my Lord_” (Psalms 109: 1; cf. Matthew 22:43-44). The third title, “The Son of Man,” grandly indicates the earthly condition of Jesus (France 1989:289). It entails mainly Jesus’ suffering and death, his future vindication and glory. The fifth Christological title is “The Son of God”. For France (1989:293), like Luz, this title is central to Matthew’s Christological enterprise because it connotes his divine relationship with God the Father. Understanding these titles enables the reader to grasp what Matthew is about (France 1989:279).

Like Luz, France underscores the significance of the Christological titles in Matthew. Unlike Luz, France claims that these titles constitute only part of Matthew’s Christology (France 1989:281), because the titles and narratives about Jesus in Matthew are both aspects of his portrait of Jesus. Luz and France, however, make almost no mention of the work of the Holy Spirit in Matthew at least in these present works². Both Luz’s and France’s work thus share what Steven Studebaker (2006:7) calls a “...pneumatological deficit.” And this confirms what Graham Stanton (1995:10) has said: “...Christology is all-pervasive” in most Matthean studies.

This apparent theological deficit raises two related questions. The first question concerns the relationship between the Messiah and the Spirit: What role did the Holy Spirit play in Christological theme development in Matthew? I agree with Badcock’s (1997:23) statement, “If Jesus had not possessed the Spirit from the beginning of his ministry, then his ministry itself could not properly have been conceived as messianic.” The second question is practical or to some extent salvific, namely, how did the Jews’ resistance to acknowledgement of the Holy Spirit hinder their proper understanding of the Messiah and their relationship with God in the light of Matthew 12:31-32? The literature review below would, fully or partially, imply Jesus’ incorporation with the Holy Spirit, particularly, in Matthew.

Two recent works attempting to address this deficit are “Light of Truth & Fire of Love: A Theology of the Holy Spirit,” (1997) by Gary D. Badcock and “Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew’s Gospel” (2000) by Blaine Charette.

² In his later work, “The Gospel of Matthew,” France argues that what Jesus has said in Matthew 12:27 can be seen as a representation of the role of the Holy Spirit in Matthew’s Gospel (France 2007:476-479).

The noticeable pneumatological scarcity in Christian theology over against vast elaborations of Christology is also the reason for Badcock's (1997:1) study. In most theological studies issues regarding the “Spirit” or the “Holy Spirit” are either bypassed or sidelined. Badcock (1997:2) further argues that the shortage of references to the Spirit is not only limited within the vast body of Christology studies, but also manifests the Church’s historical continuous attempt to resist radical spiritual movements (Badcock 1997:2). According to Badcock, striving to keep a sound doctrine, as positive as it is, cannot be an excuse for being insensitive “to spiritual experience” or matters related to the “Spirit”.

As a result, Badcock (1997:3-7) believes that pneumatology is an organic link between Christology and ecclesiology, which means that the Holy Spirit as a person and power should be considered seriously. Next, Badcock (1997:11-34) establishes a biblical foundation for studying the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He first surveys what both the Old Testament and New Testament have to say about the Spirit. Regarding the OT, he argues that in the OT the concept of the Holy Spirit should begin with religious experiences rather than the creation story (Badcock 1997:11-17). After undertaking a stimulating investigation of the Old Testament’s depiction of the “Spirit”, Badcock (1997:17-18) draws the following four theological conclusions.

1. “Ruach” as theological type in the OT cannot be defined simply in impersonal terms as wind or breath. The term “ruach” or “Spirit” in the OT thus carries the impression of life in general and the idea of personal life in its emotional, voluntary, and intellectual aspects (Badcock 1997:17).
2. There is a clear and close connectedness between Spirit and Word in the OT. This link could be stated directly or indirectly, but the ruach or Spirit raises and empowers judges, prophets, priests, and on some occasions, kings (Badcock 1997:17).
3. The experience of the Spirit has from the beginning been viewed as being theologically ambiguous. The OT refrained from legitimating all exercise of the spirit as genuine. The shift in so many of the biblical texts from the Ruach Elohim to the Ruach Yahweh is almost certainly related to this internal debate in the OT theology (Badcock 1997:17)
4. Finally, the connection between Spirit and religious experience in the OT remains clear. Badcock indicates how often theologians of the past and present work either to simplify or dash the Ruach's active involvement in religious experience. To the contrary, Badcock (1997:18) argues, “...the Old Testament presents us with

something different which serves as a barrier against over-rationalization and over-systemization of the realities of faith and the content of theology.”

Badcock (1997:18-34) begins his NT survey with Paul and Luke-Acts followed by John's Gospel. According to Badcock (1997:19), the experience of the Spirit is clear in the NT too. Paul's understanding of the Holy Spirit is mainly related to spiritual gifts, baptism with the Spirit, and the like. In the NT, power and wisdom constitute part of the central themes of the Holy Spirit and both are found in Luke-Acts (Badcock 1997:20). Lastly, John connects the person and power of the Holy Spirit "...as the initial installment of the church's ecclesiological hope" (Badcock 1997:27). Badcock (1997:257) further admits, "Christian theology...itself exists only for the sake of religious life, the doctrine of the Spirit is absolutely central." In sum, Paul, Luke-Acts, the Evangelist John, and church history were all aware of the Holy Spirit. Based on his investigations and findings, Badcock in due course makes a case for a balanced doctrine of the Word and the Spirit in which neither is subordinate to the other.

Charette (2000:11) begins his study by stating "When it comes to the theology of the Spirit presented in the Gospels, Matthew and Mark are generally relegated to a secondary position in favor of Luke and John." This is also true of Badcock's study in which he did not even allocate a paragraph to them (see, Badcock 1997:22). Without exaggeration, therefore, only a few scholars address the dynamic role that the Holy Spirit has played in Jesus' narrative development in Matthew and Mark. Nolland (2005), Turner (2008), and Uytanlet and Kwa (2017) agree in this regard with Charette.

For Nolland (2005:498-506), Matthew interlocks the Holy Spirit with Jesus' miraculous ministry to testify to God's presence in the midst of those following Jesus. The role of the Spirit is linked with the bestowing of the Spirit and the empowering of Jesus' ministry (2005:500). Though God's moving in power in their midst was a call for cooperation, the religious leaders stubbornly allocated the act to Beelzebul. This is why Nolland (2005:505-506) and Uytanlet (2017:133) equate blasphemy with an intentional refusal to acknowledge what God is doing in Jesus through the Holy Spirit. Finally, for Turner (2008:316-317) one of the reasons for Jesus' withdrawal from conflict with the Pharisees is to be found in his being guided and empowered by the Holy Spirit.

Charette's (2000:11-142) book has three chapters which conclude by providing a number of implications for Pentecostal thought and praxis. In each chapter, Charette defines the activity

of the Spirit in Matthew in relation to Christ. He begins by stating his purpose: "...to demonstrate that there is in Matthew a thoughtful and carefully nuanced description of the activity of the Spirit" (Charette 2000:11). The first chapter describes the Spirit and Messiah in Matthew (Charette 2000:21-57). Charette (2000:56) concludes that Matthew presents Jesus as an anointed figure and relates the Spirit to every aspect of Jesus' life and work. The second chapter connects the issue of Spirit and redemption in Matthew (Charette 2000:58-97). Here again, the Spirit of God plays a significant role in the accomplishment of the Messianic task (Charette 2000:97). The last chapter corroborates the role of the Spirit and community in Matthew (Charette 2000:98-139). Matthew not only assures his readers that Jesus has accomplished the long-awaited redemptive work, but also that the work continues in the Church through the Spirit. He says, "It is evident from Matthew's narrative that the Spirit of God motivates and impels the messianic mission of the church" (Charette 2000:139). Thus from Charette's point of view, one can easily imagine the significant role the Holy Spirit has played in Jesus' accomplishment of his redemptive work.

Finally, in light of Badcock's and Charettee's claim, it is important to address one more reason to be found behind the meager Matthean pneumatology. This is that Matthew seemingly has little interest in pneumatology since he uses the term "Holy Spirit/πνεῦμα ἅγιον" or "Spirit/πνεῦμα" only on a few occasions. According to Felix Just (2007), Matthew mentions πνεῦμα less frequently than the other Synoptic Gospel writers. He tabulates references to the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels, John and Acts as follows.

Greek	English	Matthew	Mark	Luke	John	Acts
πνεῦμα	Spirit, breath, wind	19	23	36	24	70
πνεῦμα ἅγιον	Holy Spirit	5	4	13	3	41
πνεῦμα κυρίου	Spirit of the Lord	0	0	1	0	2
πνεῦμα [τοῦ] θεοῦ	Spirit of God	2	0	0	0	0
πνεῦμα χριστοῦ	Spirit of Christ	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1: Comparative Frequency of "Spirit" Allusions in Respective Gospels and Acts (Just 2017:xxx).

The impression might be created that this numerical deficit is one of the factors behind scholars' preference for the Gospels of Luke or John when it comes to pneumatology, as Badcock and Charette argue. In contrast, however, this study will investigate: firstly, whether this numerical limitation really matters in studying Matthew or other biblical texts; secondly, if it does, the extent to which such constraint could have any theological implications.

In short, Just's respective comparison of the Gospels and Acts shows that firstly, Matthew uses the term "Holy Spirit" more than Mark, nevertheless Luke put more emphases on the Holy Spirit as is evident in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:1 and Acts 1:1). Arguably, Matthew's five-time use of "Holy Spirit" may, however, be enough to achieve his theological purpose. This suggests that an attempt to deal with the Spirit in Matthew is merited even if the first Gospel refers directly to the Holy Spirit only on few occasions. It is also possible to argue other way around³. Secondly, only Matthew relates (twice) the Holy Spirit with the Spirit of God. Finally and most importantly, Matthew mentions evil spirits or unclean spirits only four times (8:16; 10:1; 12:43, 45), whereas Mark and Luke mention them fourteen and twelve times respectively. For the researcher, these observations are clues toward understanding Matthew's and his community's view of the Holy Spirit. According to France (1989:118), the Matthean communities were open to charismatic gifts and were committed to simple obedience to the teaching of Jesus. Thus it seems unlikely that a Christian would be able to exercise the charismatic gifts and obey Jesus' teaching without awareness of the Holy Spirit in Matthew.

Additionally, it is important to note the milieu and implications of Matthew's term "The Holy Spirit" in his Gospel's narrative development. How often Matthew uses the term "Spirit" is less significant than the effect the Holy Spirit has in the entire narrative. This study will argue, therefore, that despite a lack of many references to the Holy Spirit, Matthew takes an interest in the Holy Spirit. It can be argued therefore that Matthew's acquaintance with the Holy Spirit intended to avoid incongruity among the faith community regarding the person and power of the Holy Spirit. The theme of the Holy Spirit in Matthew should therefore not depend on other customary dominant themes, such as Christology, nor artificially separated from them.

³ It is also possible to argue other way around, since Matthew incorporates Jesus' miracle deeds with the Holy Spirit's engagement (see "The Gospel of Matthew" France 2007:476-479).

Levison (2009:xxiii) has stated, "Early Christianity was unified in its recognition that everyone, from Jesus to early believers to Paul himself, was Spirit-bearers..." This implies the active part which the Holy Spirit had played in the Early Christian life and ministry. Thus, if Matthew was concerned about the faith community called the Church, it would be difficult to understand it theologically without a proper understanding of the active involvement of the Holy Spirit.

In sum, on the one hand, this study will critique Matthean scholarship's silence regarding the Holy Spirit and build on the work of Badcock and Charette because it is difficult to express Christology meaningfully without addressing the role of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, the study will question Badcock's skeptical approach towards Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit and Charette's emphasis on the functional aspect of the Holy Spirit.

The researcher believes that the narrative account in Matthew 12:15-32 enables the reader to appreciate the Holy Spirit as both person and power. This chapter is important since in terms of Matthew's narrative development it is located almost in the middle of the entire Gospel; secondly, of Matthew's five references to the Holy Spirit, three are in Chapter 12; lastly, it provides further clues to understanding the religious leaders' (Pharisees and Sadducees) continuous resistance and refusal to acknowledge God's work in their midst, which evoked Jesus' provocative speech.

1.3. Research Aim

The researcher in this study intends to address the depiction of the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32 since the literature review in 1.2 has revealed it to be a research gap in Matthean studies. Thus this study specifically aims to study Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32 using an intertextual approach in order to gain a deeper understanding of Matthew's view of the Holy Spirit. It thus seeks:

- To assess the importance of Matthew's associating of the Holy Spirit with Jesus' miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32 which opens the question regarding most Matthean scholars' silence regarding the Holy Spirit in Matthew's gospel.
- To establish Matthew's understanding of the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32 which evinces the dynamic role of the Holy Spirit in Jesus' life and ministry.

1.4. Delimitation

In terms of delimitation, the study firstly focuses on Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in 12:15-32 which in turn interacts with some OT texts.

Secondly, Matthew's relationship with and exhibition of the Holy Spirit, nonetheless, are not confined to this passage alone. Rather Matthew inserts, at least occasionally, the term "the Holy Spirit" ("the Spirit of God," "Spirit" and the like) as his narrative develops. Specifically, his mentioning the term outside of the chosen passage, in relation to Jesus' and his disciples' God-given mission will also get some supplementary treatment in this study. From this particular study perspective, Matthew's use of the term Holy Spirit elsewhere has three connotations. First, it enables Matthew's reader to understand why Jesus actively corroborated with the Holy Spirit and what it means to be his disciples (i.e. they must aspire to know, have, and experience him). Secondly, Matthew's mentioning the Holy Spirit elsewhere also enables us to broaden our understanding in line with his narrative development. It provides us with clues as to the reason why Jesus' responded provocatively to the Jewish leaders' insults, indicating the Holy Spirit was working through him (12:22-32).

Thirdly, the Evangelist's Jewish background and the OT Scriptures influencing his reading and understanding of the Messiah's story will be studied. From the very beginning of the narrative, Matthew goes back and forth tirelessly to the OT Scriptures' promises/prophecy and comments on their fulfilment in the life and ministry of Jesus. In this fulfilment, the Holy Spirit plays a key role. In this regard, Charette (2000:14) is right when he says, "Matthew would know that the Spirit was to play an essential role in the final outworking of God's purpose".

The following areas will be taken into consideration in terms of Matthew's use of the OT. First, the study deals with Matthew's direct quotations, references, and allusions from the OT Scripture. Second, it suggests a later date (at least after 70 A.D) for Matthew's Gospel being written with a mixed community (Jews and Gentiles) in view. As Stefan Alkier (2005:8) says, "...it makes more sense to read Matthew with the thesis that the Immanuel-relation is still valid for the Jewish people, but it is no longer an exclusive relation". Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in his Gospel narrative, therefore, would serve as a source of encouragement to his readers by anticipating the arrival of the Messiah, replacing the Temple, and enabling them to resist painful persecution plus identity confusion.

1.5. Research Question

The research question this study attempts to investigate can be formulated as: How does Matthew present the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32 in terms of the Old Testament?

1.6. Research Method

As Craig S. Keener (1997:19) observes, "Scholars over the past century have developed various methods of approaching the Gospel." Nonetheless, France argues (1985:59) that it seems hard to find two commentators who interpret Matthew's Gospel in like manner. Kingsbury (1975:1) has held an analogous opinion, and Hans W. Frei (1974:11) further comments how difficult it is even to make a neat or complete distinction between the history of theory of biblical interpretation and historical criticism.

In my view, a multiplicity of methods presents an opportunity and a challenge. On the one hand, the opportunity lies in there not being one single and therefore absolute method to study Matthew. On the other hand, the challenge aspect also alerts Matthean scholars not to overplay or underplay any specific approach. Selecting a method and wrestling with the challenge, therefore, remains an inescapable scholarly task. Thus before focusing on this study's particular method, it seems appropriate to consider some of the various approaches that scholars have developed over the past century.

Mark Allan Powell (1990:2; 2009:5) considers the Historical-Critical method to have dominated the scholastic scene from the mid-nineteenth century to the 1980s. The fundamental substance of Historical-Critical studies is to be found in its endeavour to determine what actually happened or to discern the intent of the author (Powell 2009:5). One of the leading premises is that a proper interpretation of a text relies on a proper understanding of its context or its source and formation (Herzog 2000:72).

In a nutshell, according to the Historical Critical method, the interpreter of the Gospel can discern the intention of the author via source criticism, form criticism and redaction criticisms. (1) Source criticism looks for a reliable source on which Matthew drew while establishing the Gospel. Most modern scholars agree that Matthew used Mark, Q (a source shared by Matthew and Luke) and other material identical to Matthew (Keener 1997:19; Powell 1990:2). (2) Form criticism strives to classify the materials according to the form, to recover the original form and identify the life situation in which the material was created

(Powell 2009:24; Howell 1990:20; Powell 1990:2). However, the premises of the form critics could differ (Keener 1997:20). (3) In redaction criticism the reader or interpreter of the Gospel attempts to observe a distinctive emphasis of each Gospel writer as editor or author in the final formation of the Gospels (Keener 1997:21; Howell 1990:21; Powell 1990:2; 2009:27). Furthermore, all Historical critical methods, given their various nuances, strive to establish the world behind the text prior to interpretation and understanding of a text.

Narrative criticism is another favourite approach in Matthean scholarship in recent decades. Powell (2009:59; 1990:2-4) considers narrative criticism as a reference point for every literary method. Some of the distinguishing features of narrative criticism are the following.

1. First, narrative criticism places a high emphasis on the complete form of the text (Stock 1994:1; Bauer and Powell 1996:131). The Gospel as a story should be comprehended as it is, and should offer an aid to attempting to interpret the text in its finished form (Stock 1994:1-2).
2. Second, narrative criticism regards a self-conscious reading of the Bible in a way that it has not usually been read (Powell 1990:1).
3. Third, the advocates of narrative criticism view the story as a basis instead of a resource to establish meaning from the text (Bauer and Powell 1996:131).
4. Fourth, narrative criticism interprets a manuscript with the theoretical plan of the creator and reader of the text. Powell (Powell 2009:60, 63) calls them “an implied author and reader”.
5. Lastly, narrative criticism recognizes understanding as a progression that involves the thoughts and accesses a text from the viewpoint of the reader.

The scope and purpose of this study does not allow the use of other approaches, e.g. “Historical Jesus studies,” “Social-Scientific approaches” and others.

Different scholars like Powell (2009:1, 29) and others advise that restraining oneself to one specific way is challenging in contemporary New Testament studies, and Howell (1990:13) boldly acknowledges that the Gospel can be read and used in a variety of ways⁴. Furthermore, Howell (1990:19) indicates how a single approach might prove insufficient to

⁴Readers can use Matthew as a source for historical information about either Jesus or the faith community... as a basis for theological propositions or ethical guidance. But Howell writes that Matthew is not a historical account, a theological tract, a rule of discipline, nor a liturgical account, because the text type is narrative (Howell1990:11).

appropriate the whole counsel of the biblical texts⁵. Thus incorporation rather than restriction makes more sense in current Matthean scholarship. Powell (1990:10) compares Historical Criticism and Literary Criticism, concluding: “Still, these insights will not necessarily be contradictory and so potential exists for two models to be used in ways that are distinctive but complementary.” Moeys (2009:32) adds to that “...But used together-historical criticism and theories of intertextuality- complement one another.”

Taking the above discussion into consideration, this study understands a method as a scholar’s choice for his/her thought guide or conceptual framework. Thus methodologically this study is an intertextual or figurative study in line with what Richard Hays (2014:x, 1-16) calls “Reading Backwards” in his “Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels.”

According to Moyise (2002:1, 418-419), the importance of intertextuality in biblical studies became apparent with the works of Vorster and Hays. Though there is no consensus among scholars, most agree that intertextuality concerns the complex relationships that exist between texts (Moyise 2002:1; Alkier 2005:2 Decock 1999: 404). Alkier (2005:1) distinguishes three types of intertextuality, namely, production-oriented, reception-oriented and experimental intertextuality.

Moyise (2002:419-28) further surveys five different ways scholars apply intertextuality. These are: (1) Narrative intertextuality by for example, Sylvia Keesmaat who believes that the Exodus narrative influenced Paul’s exegesis in Galatian; (2) Exegetical intertextuality, e.g. by Timothy Barkley who exegetes a particular passage; and (3) Dialogical intertextuality by Moyise himself. According to Moyise (2005:424), the source text is not always as malleable as traditional categories and therefore cannot be easily silenced; (4) postmodern intertextuality by Ellen van Wolde suggests the subjective aspect of any reading; (5) the study of intertextual echoes by Hays (2005:419) which suggest that echoes can be quite loud if they reverberate in an echo chamber. Both Alkier (2005:2) and Moyise (2002:419-429) question, however, whether making a clear-cut demarcation is possible between different approaches to intertextuality, since one may experience unintentional or intentional overlaps between methods.

⁵ Quoting from Bernard C. Latagan, ‘Some Unresolved Methodological Issues in New Testament Studies’, in *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in biblical Texts*, Howell explicates that the biblical texts exhibit three closely-related and interdependent features: a historical, a structural, and a theological dimension. (Bernard C. Latagan and William S. Vorster, *SBL Semeia Studies*; Philadelphia, Fortress, 1985), p. 5).

As mentioned above, this study will largely follow Hays' "Reading Backwards" or "Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels" as a conceptual framework while using other methods and insights where appropriate. Hays (2014:x) defines backward readings in short as "...an exercise in intertextual close reading". When the backward or figurative readings premise is applied to Matthew's Gospel, it appears that Matthew's understanding and reinterpretation of Israel's Scripture resulted in his production of Jesus' story called the Gospel of Matthew. For Hays (2014:xi) the Evangelist's testimony is the product of a catalytic fusion of Israel's Scripture and the story of Jesus. He believes that Matthew's backward reading and reflecting forward are evident in his understanding of Jesus' identity. According to Hays (2014:xxii), the Gospel reader is therefore advised to read "...closely and imaginatively, and to read backward along with the Evangelists."

The following factors are essential for Hays to pursue "reading backward" or "a figurative reading"⁶. First, reading backward counts the value of the OT Scriptures and resists any attempt to disregard it (Hays 2014:1). Secondly, for Hays (2014:12-16) figurative reading is biblical by its very nature. For instance, the Old Testament teaches us first, to take seriously God's Word of judgment (Hays 2014:12); second, it encourages our faith commitments to be guided by Isaiah's vision of a restored and healed new creation (Hays 2014:13); and, finally, the Old Testament prefigures the salvific death of Jesus (Hays 2014:13). Likewise, in fact though it is more difficult than the Old Testament, the Gospel of Matthew suggests to us to read the Old Testament in the following ways: first, to look for configuration which enables us to have a live interaction between the two Testaments (Hays 2014:15); second, to put Jesus's narrative in the centre as a climax in God's dealing with the world (Hays 2014:15); and finally, it values a community of discipleship and table fellowship (Hays 2014:16). In sum, Hays observes that in the lens of figurative reading, "All four canonical Gospels declare that the Torah and the Prophets and the Psalms mysteriously prefigure Jesus" (Hays 2016:3).

This study chooses Hays' reading backward or figurative reading for the following reasons. Firstly, the researcher has found it to be a fruitful method for reading Matthew's Gospel. Admittedly, identifying echoes for Matthew 12:15-32 is daunting but it is not impossible. In

⁶ Hays notes that the hermeneutical key to this intertextual dialectic is the practice of figurative reading: i.e. the discernment of unexpected patterns of correspondence between earlier and later events or persons within a continuous temporal stream (see Hays 2014:93). In figural interpretation, the intertextual semantic effects can flow in both directions: an earlier text can illuminate a later one, and vice versa.

line with Hays's suggestion to read the Gospel creatively, the researcher will look at Isaiah 42:1-4; Psalms 51 and other possible echoes.

Secondly, reading backward or figurative reading not only counts the Scriptures (OT and NT) as the word of God and a unified canon, but also puts Christ in the centre of the narrative (Frei 1974:18-35)⁷. Figurative reading thus aspires to encompass the core dynamisms (the temporal sequence and its depiction; and the theological conviction that God the Holy Trinity is the central reality to whom we have to aspire) which shape the interpretation of the Bible (Frei 1974:31; Walters 2008:5).

Thirdly, it is often acknowledged that the Evangelist Matthew delivers a more composed exegesis of the OT Scripture and Jewish customs than any other Synoptic writers. Charette (2000:18) writes, "That Matthew was profoundly influenced by the Old Testament, particularly the prophetic corpus when composing his Gospel requires little defense". In other words, Matthew's reading of the OT Scripture and Jewish influence played a decisive role in his selection and interpretation of his Gospel. This means that intertextual reading plays a decisive role in one's understanding of Matthew's Gospel, particularly Matthew's interest in the Holy Spirit. Lastly, but not the least, reading backward values the interconnectedness of the OT and NT and appreciates the engagement and interaction of the faith community. According to Frei's (1974:22) demonstration, Calvin views the religious aspect an unifying dynamic web that should be involved in a proper interpretive stance.

Finally, Hays uses reading backward to disclose how reading the OT Scriptures enables the Evangelists and the early Christians to understand the identity of Christ. As a point of departure, however, the researcher uses intertextuality or figurative reading to examine the significance of Matthew's use of the OT echoes, quotations and allusions in attempting to understand the person and work of the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32. For Christopher Beetham (2011) echoes refer to a conscious or unconscious act performed by the author, whereas allusion is a conscious attempt by an author to point a reader back to a prior text. However, they describe the role of an echoed, alluded or quoted event, person or text in elaborating and integrating the meaning of the text in the new context (Hays 2014:13-14). In

⁷ Hans W. Frei has shown that Luther and Calvin, despite traditionally disagreeing on a wide range of issues, had held some similar positions: 1) both ascribe the Bible as being the word of God (Frei 1974:19, 22); 2) on the primacy of the grammatical sense... Luther and Calvin supplemented a close grammatical reading of the text with figurative and or typological exegesis (19); 3) both Luther and Calvin saw Christ as the subject matter of the whole Bible... and two Testaments constituted the very Word of God...and; 4) both also agreed more or less on the religious and historical use of the reading (23).

dialogue with the OT echoes, therefore, special attention will be given to those which enhance our knowledge of the person and work of the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32. If necessary, other themes (like Christology), will be used in a way that shed more light on our discussion.

1.7. Summary Note

In summary, this introductory chapter has raised, among other things, two focal discussions. The first is the literary review, where the dominance of the Christological theme was identified and an appeal for a comprehensive investigation on Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit was made. And the second is methodological – defining a method as a conceptual framework, this study uses Richard Hay's "Scriptural echoes" or "Reading Backwards" (Hays 2014:x, 1-16).

In Chapter Two the study will focus on background and overview matters. Even though the researcher usually uses intertextuality as the main study method, addressing some background and overview issues remains important for the following reasons: Firstly, figurative or intertextual reading is not completely closed off from the historical and literary dimensions of the Bible. Stanley D. Walters (2008:4) rightly says, "It is certainly possible to engage in the analysis of the Bible that gives priority to literary associations. But a figurative reading is concerned with time, every bit as much as... historical reading." Secondly, background study, either on a lower or higher level, has the potential to put Matthew's reader in a better position. Graham Stanton (1995:16) writes that "...interpretation of a text cannot be carried out in isolation from consideration of the social setting of its reader." Thirdly, we also consider how Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit is depicted elsewhere in his Gospel. This not only enables us to assess the preceding and succeeding texts in relation to the Holy Spirit, but it also functions as a springboard and makes a link with other relevant texts and Matthew 12:15-32.

Chapter three presents the core task of this study: it specifically, investigates how the interconnectedness of the Holy Spirit and the Messiah is depicted in Matthew 12:15-32 along an intertextual investigation. Here the researcher focuses on investigating how the evangelist's OT reading shapes his understanding of the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32. The final chapter, Chapter Four, endeavors to recapitulate the entire discussion and points out potential implications concerning the Holy Spirit for contemporary NT studies, of particularly Matthew.

Chapter 2: Background and Overview Issues of Matthew's Gospel

The background information below, though not exhaustive, is meant to inform readers of three aspects which often exist in tension in Matthean scholarship. The first is that some Matthean scholars view the understanding of the socio-political and religious situations in which a text, in this case the Gospel of Matthew, was created, as background which can shed more light. Thus intertextual approaches are not completely closed off from the historical and literary dimensions of the Bible. Second, other Matthean scholars not only disagree on the details of background information but they also either doubt the evidence or totally deny its significance (Senior 1983:5). Others, like Frei (1974:11), admit the limitation in sticking with a single approach to attend the whole course of Matthew's Gospel and call instead, for integrated or inclusive approaches. Thus the researcher's aim in discussing background issues is, therefore, also dual: namely, assuming to shed more light on the text and to show that there is no single way of reading Matthew's Gospel.

2.1. Background issues

Matthean scholarship engages in continuous debate regarding certain textual and contextual issues. This includes investigations concerning Matthew's Gospel authorship, the date of its writing, the place where it was first compiled and even the language the author had used. This calls for briefly assessing the different proposals emanating from previous studies.

2.1.1. Author: an apostle or non-apostle?

Traditionally Matthew, the Apostle, is considered to be the author of the first Gospel (Filson (1977:16), an assumption made unanimously by the Early Church tradition. Similarly Wallace (2004) argues that three main sources support the traditional belief. The first one takes the title, "The Gospel According to Matthew", itself as a source of information. An opposing argument is that the title might have been a later addition or not even decisive to understanding the narrative. Nevertheless, from the traditional point of view, the given title serves as an initial clue for who wrote the Gospel. Nearly all documents abide this heading since 125 A.D., to which Filson (1977:16) further comments that "The Gospel According to Matthew" directly means "...the Apostle Matthew wrote the Gospel".

Hengel (2000:11) indicates that defending the apostolic authorship is not a recent contention, but arose in agreement with what Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria had testified. The former, who was known for defending the tradition as one Gospel, states boldly that there are only four apostolic Gospels. Without doubt, Hengel argues, the early Church tradition acknowledged the apostleship of Matthew and John. The latter, Clement, also suggested that the Gospels with Jesus' genealogy – meaning Matthew and Luke – came first. Clement often quotes all four Gospels with their fixed titles and Origen confirms that the first Gospel was written by Matthew (Hengel 2000:16; Hill 1982:22).

Secondly, according to the traditional interpretation, most external evidence which favours Matthew's authorship cannot easily be dismissed. Filson (1977), Wallace (2004) and Hanger (1993) argue that the Early Church Fathers' claim is still substantial. Tradition believes that the first church father who regarded Matthew, the Apostle, as the author of the First Gospel is Papias, whose reference to this effect was popularized by Eusebius, the fourth-century church historian (Hagner 1993:xiv). Irenaeus, whose argument is still rooted in the earlier documents recognizes the apostolic authorship of Matthew and also hints about its recipients and the date on which the Gospel was written (Hagner 1993:Xiv). In sum, the testimony of Papias and Irenaeus had become a standard view for these scholars and the Early Church Fathers including Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine. Wallace (2004) also determines that the phrase “the Gospel according to Matthew” itself eventually serves as a potential mark for Matthew's authorship.

The third argument for the apostle Matthew brings the internal indication into consideration. According to Wallace, such authorial indication can be deduced from the literary features of the Gospel itself:

1. The author of this Gospel seems to be a Jew. For instance, he knows the Jewish customs, Palestine's geography and others, particularly, the affinity between the Messiah and his attitude towards the Jews (Matthew 2:23; cf. Matthew 1:18-19; 5:17-20; 10:1ff).
2. In fact, the author occasionally reflects a negative view toward the Jewish religious leaders, namely, Pharisees and Sadducees (Matthew 3:7 16:6, 11, 12; 23:1ff); the temple, Sabbath, prophet(s) and king(s)-driven religious system on the one hand. On the other hand (Matthew 11:11; 12:1-2, 6, 42) he also shows great concern toward them (Matthew 3:1-12; 4).

3. Wallace further argues that the author's fashionable practice of using statistics and his association with currency precisely matches a decision of Jesus' disciple most probably Matthew the tax collector (Matthew 9:9).
4. Finally, Wallace (2004) concludes, since the outside and inside witnesses arguably attribute the First Gospel's authorship to Mathew the apostle, there needs be no doubt.

Hagner (1993), Gundry (1994) and France (1989/2007) are among well-known advocates of the traditional position. In the first place, France (1989:50-53) considers what is conventionally called anonymity. Obviously, Matthew's author, like other Gospels, does not identify himself by name in the course of the document. Nevertheless, France is convinced that such anonymity is customary in the vast majority of literary works found out and inside the OT and NT⁸. In those days, France argues, the authorial information was usually attached in the heading rather than in the body of a document and this is true with most OT and NT writings (France 1989:50; also Hengel 1985:64-84). In fact, most biblical scholarship considers the headings of the Gospels, Matthew in particular, as later additions but using them to determine the author is a general custom. Furthermore, Papias' 125 A.D. dating is a scholarly guess and an earlier date is also possible (France 1989:51, 54). Secondly, since the Gospels were circulating with headings, for a long period, Papias cannot be viewed as the only source to refer to the Apostle Matthew as the probable author of the First Gospel. Rather he is the heir to a tradition already several generations old (France 1989:53). Finally, in line with Hengel, France (1989:53) argues that the phrase "...according to..." by itself may not solely imply authorship but the personal name attached to it –like Matthew, Mark and so on.

Other scholars are also sympathetic towards the apostolic authorship of the First Gospel or at least Matthew's contribution. Gundry (1994:xxii) argues that Matthew could have written his own gospel without emending the tradition and his engagement with other sources; Mark and Q does not necessarily affect his apostolic status⁹. According to Gundry (1994: xxiii), Matthew's comparative dependence on other sources is less problematic when compared to the modern western lack of respect for tradition.

⁸ See France (1989:50-53) where he initially argues that titles might not imply the author, excepting in the case of autobiographies or other works concerned with events in which the author was himself involved... The same is true of the Gospels.

⁹ In Gundry's (1994: xxii) view, we do not have good reason to think that Matthew did in fact call on his memory, even though apostolic authorship implies that he might have done so.

Hagner (1993: lxxvi) puts it this way: (1) Matthew is an anonymous document but this is true of all the Gospels; (2) in light of the tradition which has ascribed the production of Matthew's Gospel to Matthew the disciple, it is also possible to relate this with textual references (Matthew 9:9; 10:3); (3) the original language in which this Gospel was written remains a matter of scholarly dispute. Hagner states that no one precisely knows in which language it was written and it remains hard to decide; (4) like Gundry, Hagner sees no problem in Matthew's using Mark and Q as source material because tradition believes that behind Mark's production of his Gospel is found Peter the apostle; (5) Hagner (1993:lxxvi-lxx) rejects a Gentile authorship and claims that Matthew had played a significant role in the collection of the document but this cannot automatically make him responsible for its final form. However, unlike Gundry, France, and Wallace, Hagner supposes at least a Hellenized Jew who became Christian wrote it.

In contrast to the previous scholars, several modern Matthean scholars like Kilpatrick (1966), Kingsbury (1998), Carter (2000) and others question apostolic authorship for Matthew. For Kilpatrick putting such heavy weight on the phrase "the Gospel according to Matthew" is far from convincing. Furthermore Kilpatrick (1966:3-5) notes four points of ambivalence attached to the term "...according to..." First, "the word" for Papias may mean our Gospel rather than the Gospel according to Matthew; second, the first Gospel does not have the appearance of a translation; rather it seems to have been written in Greek; third, this Gospel is not by Matthew; and fourth, Papias by "the word" probably means the document may be Q.

Kingsbury (1998:20-26) has attempted to determine whether the author of the First Gospel is the Apostle Matthew (Matthew 9:9; 10:3) or not. His straightforward suggestion is: "the evidence does not seem to indicate that Matthew the apostle is the author of the Gospel."¹⁰ For Kingsbury (1998:96-97; 98-105): (1) the Matthean community spoke Greek; (2) their city was probably Antioch in Syria; (3) its members included both Jews and Gentiles; (4) the Matthean Jesus is likewise Jewish in hue; and (5) he mentions other related characteristics of the Matthean community and Jesus' ministry. Finally, based on these background elements, Kingsbury (1998:105-107) argues against the apostolic authorship for Matthew's Gospel. The first reason comes forth from what we noted earlier, namely, the apostle's reliance on the work of a non-apostolic Gospel writer, namely Mark, seems implausible. Second, the First

¹⁰ For one thing, Matthew the author appears to have set Mark's Gospel at the basis of his work; further, he follows the outline of the Second Gospel. What is at stake is that if Matthew is an apostle, the apostle cannot depend so heavily on someone who is neither an apostle nor an eyewitness of Jesus.

Gospel writer seems to be that of the second generation rather than the first generation follower of Jesus; and finally, the author remains unknown. But the most probable guess is that he could be a Greek-speaking Jewish Christian of the second generation who lived within this community (Kingsbury 1998:106-107).

Carter (2000:14-15) is another scholar who has argued against the apostolic authorship. For him too, Matthew the apostle is not a good candidate for the Gospel by his name. Carter's argument relies first on the anonymity of the author of the First Gospel considering "...the apostle Matthew [as]... most unlikely". Second, Carter, like his forerunners, is suspicious about Matthew's dependence on other sources, especially Mark. Nolland (2005:4) holds a similar view. Third, both Carter (2000:15) and Nolland (2005:2-3) see the term "the Gospel according..." as a later addition. Carter (2000:15) thus argues that the title was assigned to Matthew either because of the meaning associated with his name or his impact in the faith society.

In light of this study, the Matthean authorship with the later date view makes more sense though none of the background arguments can be apprehended with inexorableness. Mainly because it underscores the fulfilment of the OT promises with the inclusion of Gentiles which is now realized through the working power the Holy Spirit in Jesus and his disciples.

2.1.2. Date of Writing: Before or after A.D. 70?

It seems problematic to propose the writing date for Matthew's Gospel, without referring either to the author or its place of writing. Matthean scholars claim various dates of writing according to their interpretation of sources, often with comparatively common conventions.

On the one hand, those who advocate the apostolic authorship usually assert an early date, especially prior to the Jerusalem temple devastation and its aftermath. Gundry (1994:xii) believes that the early date argument makes more sense than the counter argument for latter date which viewed it to be after A. D. 70. Wallace's view does not seem far from Gundry's and Hagner's (1993) convictions. Wallace (2004) writes that the early 60s would be the most probable date for Matthew.

On the other hand, the adherents of non-apostolic writing for Matthew's Gospel refuse the above proposal. Kingsbury (1998:96) simply claims that scholars generally link Matthew's Gospel with the city of Antioch in Syria and date it around A.D. 80 to 90. Meier (1991:13) takes a similar stance and argues for Markan priority which pushes Matthew's date of writing

towards the A.D. 80s. Meier substantiates his argument with internal evidence. First, Meier considers Matthew 22:1-14 and 22:7 as textual signals which refer to Matthew's reflection on the fortune of A.D. 70; second, Meier takes as evidence (in Matthew 28:16-20) the Gentile Christians' dominance as can be inferred from the fact that it has no reference to circumcision; Christians' freedom from Jewish food law (Matthew 15:11); emphasis on the continuing presence of Jesus for all days (Matthew 28:20) and so on. In sum, the later date advocacy takes heed of it being non-apostleship writing, Markan priority, the effect of discourses on Matthew 24:1ff and other related matters. As a result, the advocates of the later date assume as Matthew was written in between A.D. 80 and A.D. 90 (Meier 1991:13).

2.1.3. Place of Writing: Palestine or Antioch in Syria?

It is hardly feasible to pursue a distinct place of writing irrespective of a generally acknowledged writer and date of writing. Since these three components, author, date and place, are logically interrelated, the issue of the place of writing offers no obvious solution. Generally speaking, those who argue in favour of apostolic authorship and an early date prefer a Palestinian origin for Matthew. On the contrary, most Matthean scholars (Davies 1966; Bornkamm 1956; Kingsbury 1996; Seinor 1983) who favour non-apostolic authorship and a later date for its composition argue for the place outside Palestine, most probably Antioch in Syria (Rome).

2.1.4. Summary and Reflection

From the above, Matthew's Gospel authorship, date and place of readings, the following points need further reflection before reaching a working conclusion. First, until the rise of modern historical studies, the authorship of the Gospel was attributed to Matthew the Apostle (Stanton 1995:1). Despite arguing against its apostolic authorship, Nolland (2005:3) himself notes that no one in the early centuries attributes the First Gospel to anybody other than Matthew. Second, it is not certain whether the Gospel was titled under his name because of production or popularity. Third, scholars differ in their conclusion because they interpret similar sources differently. For instance, Boxall (2014:2-4) mentions three reasons for the popularity of Matthew's Gospel in history: (1) the Gospel is superbly and memorably ordered; (2) the Gospel's liturgical and catechesis attachment within the churches; and (3) "the century-old belief that Matthew is the earliest of our four canonical Gospels, and one of only two...attributed to an apostle and eyewitness of Jesus." Thus Boxall's argument leans towards popularity rather than production. For France (1989:18-20), however, the opposite

makes more sense. France argues that the impact of Matthew's Gospel basically depends on: (1) apostolic authorship; (2) the character of the Gospel itself; and (3) on its sustained concern to present Jesus in the context of Judaism. Fourth, the manuscripts at hand are either fragments or second-hand translations. Without a doubt, Papias's document has played a very decisive role in the debate, but Matthean studies have been using the surviving documents of Papias to argue for or against the apostolic authorship for Matthew's Gospel. For instance, Eusebius, from whom we get the very information about Papias, not only reflects a negative view of the document but also denies Papias's connection with the apostolic source (France 1989:55). The modern or contemporary Matthean scholars also have not yet reached consensus on how to view and interpret the document by Papias (France 1989:55; Filson 1971:16; Nolland 2005:2-3).

In sum, the following points are worth noting: first, it looks inappropriate to restrain all of what tradition has said about the role of Matthew, the disciple, in the production of the Gospel that bears his name. Secondly, the author's occasional negative reflection on Jewish religious leaders and their religious system cannot be considered as an elimination of his identity, since most OT prophets were provocative towards their fellow Israelites, especially kings. In this regard, Jesus, whom the multitude acknowledges as a long-awaited Messiah and great prophet, does, in fact, do three major things in parallel to the OT prophets. First, Jesus regularly calls people to repent and bear fruit, teaches about the Kingdom of God and does miracles (Matthew 4:17, 23; 9:35). Second, Jesus calls disciples, as the representatives of Jews, and evokes them to mission so that their righteousness will surpass that of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matthew 4:18-22; 5:20; 10:1-21; 28:18-20). Third, Jesus confronts the hypocrites, namely, Pharisees and Sadducees and warns them about their destiny if they should refuse to repent. What Matthew does, therefore, is not something of the otherworld; rather he reinterprets the OT Scriptures and reflects Jesus' teaching (cf. Matthew 3:7; 16:6, 11, 12; 23:1ff).

Thirdly, the author's familiarity with the OT Scriptures, his vocation and his attitudes to Jews could attest to his Jewishness and Matthew the disciple shorts none of these criterions. Fourthly, as Carter argues the preference to Matthew could be differ but it was not attached without purpose and according to the traditional interpretation this includes his authorship. Lastly, even if Matthew had used Mark's document as his primary source, this does not automatically set-aside Matthew's role.

To the contrary, the position held by tradition is solely dependent on later information gained from the early Church fathers like Papias and Irenaeus and was propagated by Eusebius not earlier than 4th A.D. Senior (1983:5) likewise says, "...we cannot be sure that Papias himself had solid historical information about the author of the Gospel." Second, the writer's association with the OT and other incentives, for instance, his negative or positive reflections concerning Jews cannot directly stamp the authorship right on Matthew. Third, in view of Mathew's Gospel the disciples call is mainly associated with evangelism and making disciples rather than producing their own story concerning Jesus. Finally, since no one knows precisely the author of Matthew's Gospel, time and place of writing, neither side of the argument can be seen to be definitive.

This means, studying the Holy Spirit is neither necessarily dependent on ascertaining the specific place of writing, date nor author since it cannot be established.

2.1.5. Historical Context: Occasion and Purpose

Reconstructing the historical context of Matthew's Gospel is both overwhelming and stimulating. On the one hand, the attempt is daunting because: first, the First Gospel writer, time of writing and its geographical location are uncertain. Likewise, Matthean scholars are far short to agree on the occasion and purpose of Matthew's Gospel. Furthermore the original recipients of the Gospel and whether the author principally anticipated meeting a particular problem remains an on-going discussion. This causes studies in Matthew to take different cues in establishing an circumstance and aim of this Gospel.

On the other hand, establishing the setting for Matthew's Gospel is also important because, as Stanton (1995:16) notes, "...interpretation of a text cannot be carried out in isolation from consideration of the social setting of its reader." In other words, whatever the script, understanding its content demands taking cognizance of the textual or socio-historical context of its origin. It is therefore important to evaluate how different scholars have attempted to establish a historical context for Matthew's Gospel.

For Gundry (1994:5-9) the historical context, and henceforth its occasion and purpose stem from Matthew's theology. Matthew shows great interest in the problem of a mixed church (Gundry 1994:5). At the heart of the problem is false teaching arising from false prophecy. Thus, according to Gundry, Matthew's faith community is warned not to be trapped by false disciples' false prophecies and using it as a means to escape life-threatening persecution by

Jewish religious leaders. In short, Matthew's Gospel arose from a scenario in which Jesus' disciples were encouraged to keep demonstrating their faith in spite of persecution. Gundry (1994:9) thus writes, "All in all, Matthew write his Gospel to keep persecution of the Church from stymieing evangelism." Thus Gundry's conclusion implies that Matthew wrote his Gospel in response to the circumstances of his community.

Senior (1983:5-8) outlines the settings that various scholars propose for Matthew's Gospel. Delineating the core source of information to the Gospel itself, Senior reflects on Davies' and Hummel's view of Matthew's setting and church. According to Senior, for Davies the milieu of Matthew, especially the Sermon on the Mount, is a reflection of Christians' reaction towards the radical Pharisaic Judaism. Davies observes that Christian identity confusion occurred following the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 and Johanan ben Zakkai's and his followers' rigid political and religious reaction towards the events in Jamnia (Senior 1983:6-7). From David's vantage point, Matthew's Gospel writer has intended to delineate this new faith community's distinctiveness over against the Jamnia's reformation backdrop.

Another German scholar on whose view Senior reflects is Reinhart Hummel (Senior 1983:8-9; cf. Hummel 1963:26-28). From Hummel's perspective the focus of Matthew's Gospel resides in the conflict which had taken place between the believing Jews and Pharisees. Hummel claims that the evangelist has struggled both from the inside and outside. As the result, Hummel resists the argument that Matthew was advocating a complete breach from Judaism and synagogue attendance and suggests that the evangelist has attempted to evade the Pharisaic rigidity and Christian lawlessness.

Filson (1977:20-21) reconstructs Matthew's historical setting quite differently than Davies and Hummel, finding the purpose of the writer, neither in overcoming the identity crisis as Davies proposed, nor in mediating conflict between Jewish Christians and Pharisees, as Hummel (1963:26-28) argues. The primary aim of the author is not encouraging the true disciples to uphold their evangelism despite the looming persecution and warning the false disciples as Gundry has proposed, but rather, the writer of Matthew's Gospel aims to provide the church teachers with a basic tool for work (Filson 1977:20). What Stendahl calls the "Matthew's School" as "Sitz im Leben" or "setting" for Matthew's Gospel has a close affinity with Filson's church teachers' basic guide. Stendahl (1968:35) writes "Thus the Matthean School must be understood as a school for teachers and church leaders... a manual for teaching and administration within the church."

To conclude the matter at hand, here once again Matthew's Gospel reader does not get easy answers regarding its context, purpose, and occasion. From Davies and Hummel's perspective, Matthew wrote his Gospel either to define the identity of the newly-organized institution in light of the Jesus narrative (Davies), or to regulate the prevalent conflict between Jewish Christians and Pharisees (Hummel). As a result, the former finds the aim of Matthew's Gospel in the total separation of Church and Synagogue, which necessitated developing a fresh Christian identity demonstration. The latter views the matter differently, and thus questions the complete separation of the Church from the Synagogue; instead he focuses on overcoming the problem of lawlessness and legalism. Neither Davies nor Hummel's discussion specifies whether the Matthean community consisted wholly of Jews or wholly of Gentiles or was a mixed congregation.

Gundry and Filson have taken another scholastic track. For Gundry true discipleship and evangelism are what elicited the First Gospel. Matthew's faith community dominated by Jewish Christians, are told to resist persecution, do evangelism and show their faithfulness to Jesus' teaching. Other scholars like Marshall (1992) see the Jewish colour in Matthew's congregation. According to Marshall, the Jewishness of the author is reflected in certain ways in the Gospel itself. For instance, the author knows well the OT promise and its accomplishment and makes a decisive linkage between Jesus Christ as their Messiah and Jewish historical symbols like Abraham and David. Filson (1977:21) in turn rejects Gundry's primary evangelistic notion and defines the prime aim of Matthew's Gospel composition as providing a guide book for leading worship and teaching.

Other scholars including Kingsbury (1998:97-98) argue for a mixed community consisting of Jewish and Gentile followers. As Marshall claims above, Matthew contains some markers indicating Jews (for instance, promises and their fulfilment); nonetheless, such an insight should not devalue other perspectives or readings. The inclusion of Gentiles is implicitly reflected in the very beginning of the Gospel and demonstrated at the end of the Gospel where Jesus gave the Great Commission to disciples (Matthew 1:5, 6; 28:18-20; cf. 15:21-28). (P 31)

In this study the researcher adopts the latter position because attempting to read the First Gospel in exclusion of Gentiles seems unconvincing. First, Matthew views Jesus as the one through whom the nations will be blessed as the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham and his descendants (Matthew 1:2; Genesis 12:2). Second, Matthew's Gospel does not completely

rule out the inclusion of Gentiles in the narrative (Matthew 1:5.6; 2; 10; 28). Third, what happened inside the temple at the time of Jesus' death – "...the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom" (Matthew 27:51) – symbolizes something great. On the one hand, the temple represents God's people, namely, Israel and its properties, the city and the land. On the other hand, it exists for remote others, particularly the Gentiles, to be accessed individually or collectively. Therefore, the event on the cross and Jesus' commissioning his disciples to evangelize the Gentiles refutes such religious and ethnic division-based values (Matthew 28:18-20). Finally, as discussed under the place of writing, in modern Matthean scholarship most scholars consider Roman (Syria) a probable place of writing for Matthew's Gospel. In light of this claim, therefore, it seems difficult to view the faith community in Matthew's Gospel to be either wholly Jews or wholly Gentiles.

Therefore, this Jewish and Gentle oriented Christian community would need a new understanding of Scripture (the OT) in the way that matched their interests and situation. The evangelist does this in two different ways. Regarding the Jews, he depicts Christ Jesus as their anticipated Messiah who accomplishes the OT prophecy and completes the law. Matthew regards the disciples and other Jews who responded positively to the Messiah's call as the representatives of the nation Israel in the kingdom of God. Nevertheless, the evangelist does not do that at the expense or exclusion of the Gentiles. Rather Matthew signals the inclusion of Gentiles on different occasions (1:5, 6; 28:18-20; cf. Genesis 12:2).

2.1.6. Literary Context: Matthew's Structure

As mentioned earlier, we cannot be sure who wrote this Gospel, or when and where it was written. Despite such ambivalence, however, the evangelist raises various theological and practical themes, which could be Christological, ecclesiological, eschatological or pneumatological. This study concerns the last one, pneumatology.

Matthew mentions the 'Holy Spirit' (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) or '...Spirit' (...πνεῦμα) on different occasions (for instance in Matthew 1:18-20; 3:11; 3:16; 4:1; 10:20; 12:15-32; 26:41 and 28:19-20). Matthew's interaction with the subject matter – his presentation of the Holy Spirit – can be viewed differently and the scholars' perspectives vary. It is therefore important to look at: (1) The literary structure of Matthew and (2) the location of the references to the Holy Spirit in light of Matthew's structure which in turn provides clues to the evangelist's understandings of the Holy Spirit.

2.1.6.1. *The Structure of Matthew*

Scholars structure Matthew's Gospel differently. Bauer (1988:1, 54) notes that structural analysis of Matthew's Gospel has been a center of controversy and debate. Different factors have caused this confusion about Mathew's structure, but in light of this study, two of them are worth mentioning: One reason is that the meaning(s) of any text resides, fully or partially, in its structure and therefore comprehensive structural congruity is necessary. In this particular context, knowing where Matthew in his narrative uses the term Holy Spirit is important to appreciate its theological and practical implications. Another reason is that Matthean scholars have not reached consensus regarding the structure of the First Gospel.

In his book titled "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design", Bauer (1988) identifies four major categories which often vie for dominance, in the history of Matthean structural studies. These include a geographical, topical outline, conceptual structures, and literary criticism (Bauer 1988:11-54; 73-108). It is important to sketch what constitutes these classifications. The purpose of annotating the issue is: (a) to note where the key passages for this study (Matthew 1:18; 3:11; 3:16; 4:1; 10:20; and 28:19-20) are located in Matthew's Gospel structure; and (b) to substantiate their literary and theological relationships within the narrative development, particularly, Jesus' miraculous ministry, the disciples' mission, the Jewish religious leaders and Matthew's faith community.

1. Some scholars structure Matthew geographically-chronologically. This was the main approach of Matthew's Gospel construction until 1930 in particular (Bauer 1988:21-22). As Bauer's reference to Allan and Grensted's (1929:23; Bauer 1988:23) structure of Matthew shows, the geographical-chronological approach outlines six subdivisions, namely: (I) Matthew 1-2 Birth and Infancy of the Messiah; (II) Matthew 3:1-4:11 Preparation for his ministry; (III) Matthew 4:12-15:20 Work and Teaching in Galilee; (IV) Matthew 15:21-18:35 Work outside Galilee; (V) Matthew 19:1-20:34 Journey to Jerusalem; and (VI) Matthew 21:1-28 Last days of the Messiah's life.

The following elements characterize Matthean scholars in this camp (Bauer 1988:23-26). First, they agree about the general division of the Gospel, but they disagree on specific terms. Second, they acknowledge the apostolic authorship and view the Gospels primarily as a means rather than a source to determine the historical Jesus. Third, most are fervent advocates of Marcan priority. Fourth, others prefer to adjust Matthew's structure geographically because of the theological significance given to

geography (Bauer 1988:24). Finally, Christology – they understand Jesus in terms of the title ‘Christ’ – rather than ecclesiology or eschatology, the fulfilment of prophecy and salvation history have got a prominent place in their theological discussion (Bauer 1988:24-25).

2. Other scholars structure Matthew’s Gospel topically. This approach was first introduced into Matthean study by Bacon in 1930. Basically, Bacon's (1930:82, 265-335) structural assessment focuses on the role of discourses in Matthew (see also, Bauer 1988:11, 26). While addressing the whole course of topical structure discussion is neither possible nor the intent of this study, the following points represent the majority of scholars in this camp.

Firstly, as Bauer (1988:26) notes, the majority of adherents to this approach are convinced that Matthew’s structural adjustment well fit in his formation of narrative and discourse materials. Second, as Bacon himself did, most of his advocates have divided the Gospel into five books which correspond to the OT Pentateuch books (Bauer 1988:11). Third, some prefer a chiasmic organization, whereas others, like Kingsbury, favour arranging the Gospel into threefold division (Bauer 1988:26, 40-44). Finally, Matthew is often considered a converted Jewish rabbi, not the apostle, and Jesus is a teacher, particularly, the new Moses (Bauer 1988:11, 29).

On the one hand, in view of the five-fold division, Matthew 1-2 and 26:3-28:20 are viewed as preamble and epilogue respectively. Thus Book One consists of Matthew 3:1-7:29 whereas Book Two takes from Matthew 8:1-11:1. Book Three comprises Matthew 11:2-13:53 while Book Four covers Matthew 13:54-19:1a; and Book Five contains 19: b-26:2 (Enslin 1931:84; Bauer 1988:29).

On the other hand, the threefold division represents most of Kingsbury’s contribution toward Matthean studies. In his book ‘Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom’ Kingsbury (1975) argues against Bacon’s fivefold division and introduces the advantage of the threefold classification. Taking Matthew 1:1 as superscription, the threefold structure is based on Matthew 4:17 and 16:21 the formulaic statement which says, “From that time Jesus began.” Thus Kingsbury (1975:13-23; 1975: 2-6, 8; 1977:24; 1998:30; 1986:38-40; cf. Bauer 1988:41; 1988:42) breaks Matthew’s Gospel between Matthew 1:1-4:16; 4:17-16:20 and 16:21-28:20.

3. Still others structure Matthew's Gospel conceptually. Scholars in this camp attempt to classify the Gospel of Matthew according to 'a theme or central idea' on which the evangelist composed the whole material (Bauer 1988:45). According to Bauer's (1988:45-54) critical analysis, the majority of scholars consent that: first, the salvation history is viewed as central idea of Matthew's Gospel; second, this history is generally divided into three epochs, namely, Israel, Jesus, and church; but third, they differ on the detailed manner of this historical-salvation and the way it is reflected in Matthew's structure. For instance, for Wolfgang Trilling (1988:48) Matthew 28:18-20 is key in understanding the entire message of the Gospel, whereas John P. Meier (1975:204-207) focuses on the passages like Matthew 10:5, 6; 15:24 and 28:16-20 and fourth, they emphasize ecclesiology over eschatology.
4. In the recent decades, the majority of scholars structure Matthew's Gospel from a literary criticism point of view. Advocates in this camp basically view the final text as complete in itself and use its literary features as a clue for its structural relationship (Bauer 1988:12). Bauer (1988:13) thus writes that the final literary entity, in this case, is the Gospel of Matthew itself. In this regard, the examination of literary structure endeavours first, to decide the major and subunits within the Gospel; and second, to classify the structural dealings within and between these units (Bauer 1988:13).

Bauer (1988:57-134) deals in depth with four structural elements which essentially serve the thought of literary criticism. Addressing the whole genus of Bauer's structural discussion is not possible in this limited work nor does it serve the purpose of this study. Therefore, we just sketch the main dialogues which could determine the identification of the literary features on which the main hinges of Matthew's Gospel structures are allocated.

According to Bauer (1988:57-63), the first structural element is the repetition of comparison. The mission of Jesus and the disciples, the ethics of Jesus and the ethics of the disciples and the filial relationship of Jesus with his Father and the disciples with their Father are compared. The second structural element goes with the repetition of contrast, particularly, between the political leaders, like Herod, and the Jewish religious leaders like the Pharisees and Sadducees (Bauer 1988:64-71). The third major structural composition operative within the Gospel is called "the repetition of particularization and climax with repetition and causation" (Bauer 1988:73-108). Matthew's Gospel structure reads Matthew 1:1-4:16: The Preparation of Jesus

Messiah, the Son of God; Matthew 4:17-16:20: The Proclamation of Jesus to Israel; and Matthew 16:17-28:20: The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus the Messiah, Son of God. And the final structural element in this camp is “Climax with Inclusion” (Bauer 1988:109-128).

5. In his book titled “The Gospel of Matthew”, Donald Senior (1997:24-32) addresses the issue of Matthew’s structure in current studies. As Bauer and others scholars have done, Senior also assesses three noticeable ways of structuring Matthew’s Gospel. These include, first, that most Matthean scholars consider the five discourses as their structural clue (Senior 1997:24-26; Spencer 1980:199; Combrink 1982:61-62). Second, some scholars argue that chiasmic patterns are decisive in determining Matthew’s Gospel composition (Senior 1997:26-27). Finally, others prefer to follow the storyline of the Gospel (Senior 1997:27-31; Combrink 1982:61).
6. Finally, it should be noted that this study adapts Kingsbury’s and Bauer’s three-fold division.

2.1.6.2. *The Position of the References to the Holy Spirit*

Almost all of the above structural constructions consist more or less of references to the Holy Spirit, though this does not mean the theme of the Holy Spirit is persistently developed throughout the Gospel. Rather, it firstly indicates that both the evangelist and the faith communities were aware of and acquainted with the Holy Spirit. France (1989:118) writes that the Matthean communities were open to charismatic gifts and were committed to simple obedience to the teaching of Jesus. Secondly, any reader of Matthew’s Gospel (in the past or present) hardly misses Matthew’s presentation of the Holy Spirit. As Levison (2009:xxiii) has noted, the Early Christianity recognizes that everyone in Christ was a Spirit-bearer. Thus Matthew’s depiction of the Holy Spirit, though it often seems infrequent, is significant regardless of whatever structural organization one favours.

For instance, if one follows the line of a five-fold and geographical-chronological divisions, the role of the Holy Spirit is vivid in both prologue (Matthew 1-2) and epilogue (Matthew 26:2-28:20). Furthermore, in the former division, only two parts of the books – Book IV (Matthew 13:54-19:1a) and Book V (Matthew 19:2b-26:2) – are without any reference to the Holy Spirit. In a like manner, the geographical-chronological approach resembles the five-fold division, especially in the prologue. Surprisingly, the geographical-chronological

structure contains no reference to the Holy Spirit in parts IV (Matthew 15:21-18:35) and V (Matthew 19:1-20:34).

On the other hand, the three-fold division and the literary-criticism-oriented structure, shares substantial elements together and they generally structure Matthew into 1:1-4:16; 4:17-16:20 and 16:21-28:20. Again in light of the three-fold structural construction, readers can easily identify how references to the Holy Spirit are comparably integrated. Nevertheless, the pioneer(s) of three-fold division first designed it to deal with Christology and not with Pneumatology. This could suggest that adapting an existing structural approaches, like I did, or inventing a new approach cannot be viewed as an excuse not to appreciate Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in his Gospel. In either case, this study favours emulating the three-fold structure as a general structural framework.

Since this study mainly follows Hays methodologically, it is also important to establish Hays' position concerning Matthew's structure. In the first place, in his book called "Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness", Hays (2014) does not explicitly identify himself with any particular structural approach. In my view, this happens at least partially, due to it being an unfinished work. As he mentions, Hays' primary task seems to revitalize the role of figurative reading without bothering with exhaustive fixed structural issues. Therefore, Hays (2014:ix) advises his reader to view this work "as a sort of progress report that looks in hope toward the ultimate promise of more wide-ranging study." He adds: "These are questions that I must leave for another day" (Hays 2014:x). Here the 'questions' left for another day may refer to the broader work even though it does not automatically suggest an interest about structure. On the other hand, if we read Hays' work closely, we can probably deduce the following implications for Matthew's Gospel composition.

Firstly, Hays is cognizant of certain negative aspects that historical study prompted and often applied (Powell 2009:5; Hays 2014:3). In particular, Enlightenment-based historical study had stood against the Church authority and spiritual or allegorical interpretation of the biblical texts. Frei (1974:1) notes prior to the Enlightenment "...reading portions of the Bible ... in an allegorical or spiritual sense, were permissible"¹¹. Hays proposes an intertextual or reading backward approach against such Enlightenment-born backdrops. Nevertheless, Hays

¹¹ Frei's (1974:1) findings show that Western reading of them in the days before the rise of historical criticism ...were strongly realistic, i.e. at once literal and historical.

also believes in Markan priority and the significance of contexts (OT and NT) as historical studies in general and redaction critics, in particular, do (Hays 2014:xi; 35-36). This would leave little doubt that Hays shares elements from redaction-critics.

Secondly, in his discussion of Matthew's Gospel, Hays emphasizes the "Emmanuel theme" which is intended to rejuvenate Christology. Another way of putting this point is to say that the Gospel of Matthew is Christological by its very nature, for one reason: "All four canonical Gospels declare that the Torah and the Prophets and the Psalms mysteriously prefigure Jesus" (Hays 2014:3). Hays (Hays 2014:36-38) also depicts Christ in Matthew's Gospel as: (1) the one who fulfills Israel's Scripture; (2) the embodiment of God; and (3) Matthew's allusions, citations and other references are all destined to this end.

Thirdly, as noted earlier in this study, Christology is one of the most vibrant signals which scholars use to classify the Gospel under discussion. Kingsbury's three-fold division can be cited as one of the examples. This, at least partially, shows that Hays' work does not seem distant in structuring Matthew's Gospel in view of Christology.

Lastly, but also most specifically, Hays (Hays 2014:37) writes that Matthew has introduced four of the ten formula questions in the birth and infancy narratives and includes other fulfilment citations in 2:5-6, 3:3 and 4:14-16. In other words, according to Hays, Matthew has placed half of the fulfilment texts in the first part of his Gospel. This suggests that Hays most likely structures Matthew's Gospel either thematically or within the parameter of the three-fold division. Certainly Hays does not work without a structural framework.

The following conclusion can be drawn regarding Matthew's structure analysis: First of all, Howell' (1990:13) and Bauer (1988:11) make it clear that Matthew's Gospel has been read and structured in several ways. This is reminiscent of scholars' religious, educational or other convictions. In other words, there is no value-free or unbiased structure as such. Second, the majority of modern and postmodern structural studies fall into the division of three. For instance, Kingsbury from redaction-criticism and Bauer from literary-criticism have classified Matthew's Gospel as mainly divisible into three. Third, except partially for literary-criticism, other structural approaches are driven by either Christology –a high or low –or ecclesiology and eschatology. Fourth, maybe as the result of Christology or ecclesiology-oriented structure, Matthew's depiction of the Holy Spirit has received little recognition. Fifth, scholars in no camp ever denounce the theological significance of either geographical-chronological or topical foci, the fivefold and threefold divisions. Lastly, Matthean scholars

seem convinced that any exclusive and closed structural approach falls far short from comprehending the Gospel's message in its entirety, let alone the person and power of the Holy Spirit in Matthew.

2.1.7. Theological Motive

It can be accepted that Matthew's occasion and purpose have something to do with Matthew's Gospel theological motive. In fact, the aim of the structure is to strengthen this motive. The difficulty is that we do not have a unanimous proposal that fits all scholars' rationale about the historical context and structural composition of Matthew's Gospel. For instance, Davies' theological motivation rests on overcoming an identity crisis, whereas Hummel's theological motivation depends on resolving conflicts in a sustainable manner. It is, therefore, important to sketch some of the representative proposals as theological motives for Matthew and adjoin them with Matthew's theological view of the Holy Spirit.

In Gundry's view, Matthew's theology is shaped mostly by ecclesiological motives. The evangelist unveils his awareness of the problems of a mixed church (Gundry 1994:5), and draws a clear distinction between the true disciples and false disciples. According to Gundry (1994:6), true disciples are enduring suffering (Matthew 10:23, 40-42; 25:31-36) and are determined to preach the Gospel regardless of persecution. The false disciples, to the contrary, are making a public disclaimer in order to escape persecution (Matthew 10:32-33; 26:70). Furthermore, the evangelist urges his little faith community to do good work which surpasses that of the Pharisees, to avoid lawlessness and persevere in preaching the Gospel. All in all Gundry (1994:9) claims, "Matthew writes his gospel to keep persecution of the church from stymieing evangelism." So according to Gundry, one of the most important Matthean theological motives is to be found in urging his community to practise evangelism by overcoming any historical or cultural barriers, specifically, persecution from their religious leaders.

Kingsbury (1998:26-32) frames Matthew's theological motive in light of a redaction-critical approach. The evangelist engages with the phrase "the gospel of the Kingdom" (4:23; 9:35; 24:14; 26:13) which in turn defines the nature and purpose of the Gospel attributed to his name (Kingsbury 1998:26-27). The 'Gospel' here refers to the specific message that Jesus Messiah, the Son of God, proclaimed...whereas the 'Kingdom' of God or heaven notion implies the 'rule' or 'reign' of God (Kingsbury 1998:28). Accordingly, two structural approaches, namely, topical and the view of the history of salvation serve this purpose well

(Kingsbury 1998:29-32). Topically, Matthew's Gospel naturally resembles a kerygmatic story: it indicates the way God reveals himself in and through his Son, Jesus the Messiah. Hence the task of proclaiming the Gospel would result in either salvation or condemnation. The other aspect of the structure, history of salvation, Kingsbury (1998:31) argues, "makes a basic distinction between 'the time of Israel (OT)' as the time of prophecy and 'the time of Jesus' as the time of fulfilment". Furthermore Kingsbury understands other epochs like the ministry of the church are incorporated into these two main historical epochs.

Therefore for Kingsbury the Christological theme encapsulates Matthew's central theological motive. Other themes in Matthew could only be delineated from the vantage point of Christology. He writes: "...Matthew's Gospel is essentially Christological in orientation: it is only by attending to Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God, that one comes to know who God is and what the church is" (Kingsbury 1998:32). In Kingsbury's interpretation of the term "Emmanuel," God's presence among the church, is available only in and through Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God. Thus Kingsbury pinpoints the Holy Spirit's role in Jesus' miraculous ministry and in the on-going church ministry. In fact, this study originated from such an observation and will argue to determine whether such a general conclusion can be accepted.

In any case, some of Matthew's other theological motives need to be mentioned ahead of outlining his references to the Holy Spirit. Generally speaking, the First Gospel writer portrays the God who has been working in history (1:1ff). The genealogy theme presses forward the idea of ceaseless divine intervention which now assumes another level in history through Jesus the Messiah, the Son God, by the powerful work of the Holy Spirit. Secondly, the Messiah, who was born of and endowed and guided by the Holy Spirit, fulfils the OT prophecy and perfects the law (Matthew 1:23; 4:4, 7, 10; 5-7; 19:4-10). Thirdly, the Messiah, who was born of the Holy Spirit, predicted to be baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire, himself endowed and guided by the same Spirit, performs miracles and commissions his disciples in Matthew's Gospel is really the Son of God, the Saviour of the world and the King of the Jews (Matthew 1:21; 3:11, 16-17; 4:1, 12:15-31; 28:18-19; 27:11, 29). Therefore, the storyteller reveals that Jews' believing and refusing the Messiah has not only defined the fulfilment of the OT prophecy but also it opened the door Gentiles' to enter into the kingdom of God. Lastly, Holladay (2017:201) comments that incorporation with Messiah and living in "the identity of the church is identified by her accepting the Messiah and living a life in according to his call mark the identity of the Church. Thus, the question that needs further

investigation is: what enables the church to accept Jesus and live according to his words and deeds?

2.2. Overview of Pneumatic References before and after Matthew 12:15-32

Matthew scholars rarely view the First Gospel as a potential contender for matters regarding the Holy Spirit, mainly because of the evangelist's paucity of references to the Holy Spirit. Some, like Kingsbury (1998:32) and Luz (1998:172) even argue that God's presence in Matthew is defined or available only in and through the person of Jesus Christ, and others prefer to turn to Luke or John when it comes to the matter of the Holy Spirit (Badcock 1997:1; Charette 2000:11). They concede to argue, Pneumatology is less evident in Matthew. It is thus an open question if Matthew has any interest in the role of the Holy Spirit.

This study will therefore investigate Matthew's references to determine whether the evangelist has referred to the Holy Spirit a sufficient number. Besides Matthew 12:15-32, the evangelist mentions the Holy Spirit in the preceding and succeeding chapters (Matthew 1:18-20; 3:11; 3:16; 4:1; 10:20; (26:41) and 28:19-20).

The evangelist first mentions the Holy Spirit in a proper place – Matthew 1:18-20 in reflection to the new era that will begin with Jesus. Davies and Allison (1988:149-150) consider Matthew's opening sentences with the phrase, "the book of the generation of..." Matthew 1:1 as particularly significant. The Greek equivalent terms "Scroll or Bible" and "genesis" can mean, the book of "genesis," "generation," "origin," and even "history". Davies and Allison (1988:150) opt for either "history" or "genesis" (new generation). Moreover, their interaction with another Matthew scholar, Fenton's work shows that the Greek term "genesis" is "telescopic". According to Fenton, it first can cover the genealogy that follows; second, genesis can refer to the account of Jesus; third, it can also mean history or life story; and finally, genesis can denote to the entire new creation that initiates and completes with Jesus' First and Second Advent. In the end, however, Davies and Allison (1988:154) admit that nothing prohibits one from using Matthew 1 for more than one function. Despite such and other technical or methodologically oriented preferences, the first chapter of the First canonical Gospel is relevant to this study for the following reasons.

Firstly, it emphasises what God had promised in the OT, particularly to Abraham and David. The former is the bearer of the Hebrew people's origin and the latter is the stamp bearer of

Israel's anointed King Messiah. Hence the evangelist links the genealogical narrative with Jesus Christ's birth (Hill 1972:75). In Genesis, God called Abraham and made a covenant to bless the world through him and his descendants (Genesis 12:1-3; 22:18). Likewise, God had made the royal covenant with David to bring the anointed King, the Messiah, regardless of David's and his descendants' failure to live up to God's expectations (2 Samuel 7:12ff; 1 Chronicle 17:11ff). The First Gospel, which has been thought to be informed by the author's Jewish Scriptures (Hays 2014:xi) reading and reinterpretation, thus gives a blueprint both as a mark of fulfilment (OT promises/prophecies) and point of departure (God's working in advance). In my view, therefore, the evangelist makes his point pervasively – even by inclusion and omission of some OT characters – of the very beginning of his writing; i.e., the God of Abraham and David is now coming into the world dramatically, to keep his promises. But how could such dramatic works have been noticed before and how have these promises become true now?

Secondly, the insertion of four Gentile (and ethnically mixed) women challenge the customary ready-made Jewish genealogy which was expected to include only men (Harrington 1991:32; Keener 2009:79; Toussaint 1980:40). However, the evangelist introduces four particular women (Matthew 1:3, 5, 6) in the place of OT matriarchs like Sarah, Rebekah, and Rachel (Gundry 1994:15). Bruner (1987:5-6) notes that "usually the name of men suffice in biblical genealogies, and women's names are added only if they will ensure the purity of the line or enhance its dignity." Here unsurprisingly the naming of the women might be seen to deviate from the Jewish norm, in that manner for genealogies they shamed the Jewish honour. Moreover, Matthew considering them as part of the Messiah's ancestors implies something unacceptable to traditional Jews. Despite their humble social backgrounds, they are material to the Messianic line. But why does the evangelist, quite selectively, retell this story immediately after Israel's covenantal patriarchs and royal pillars – Abraham and David?

Hill (1972:74), Luz (1989:109-110), Gundry (1994:15) and Carson (1984:66) identify three common arguments for the inclusion of the four women. Some Matthean scholars, like Hill (1972:74) see in it what they call "divine irregularity": God not only transforms but can transcend something beyond its sphere. Other scholars view their inclusion as a representation for Gentiles' inclusion in God's salvific history (John 1988:154). Other scholars read in their inclusion God's willingness to reach and save all sinners (John 1988:154). Neither Jews nor Gentiles remain sinless, so both desperately need God's favour.

Finally, as Carson (1984:66) suggests, "There is no need to rule out any of the above interpretations." Thus while the irregularity of God and the inclusion of sinner women may shock the Jews and their governing bodies, Matthew does not hesitate to make the point (Wright 2002:3). By doing so, the evangelist boldly claims that part of Jesus' ancestors were Gentiles, women, and sinners because God often works in unusual ways¹². The good news is that neither sexism nor racialism hinders God to achieve his purpose: there and then and here and now.

Thirdly, the genealogy presents the overview of Israel's exile and its aftermath. Exile conveys God's judgement and Israel's desolation. Bruner (1987:8) says, "...Israel declines until it falls into the pit of exile, losing its land, temple, King, and so, seemingly almost all of God's promise." Exile, as it is stated in their covenant stipulation, is, therefore, an epic curse (Deuteronomy 28:1ff). Notwithstanding, the deportation of the people, the destruction of their temple, and death of their kings never hinder God from reaching his people with abundant mercy and everlasting love (cf. Matthew 1:6b-11; cf. 9:13; 23:23). Soon God will promise his presence among his people again (Matthew 1:23). I agree with Bruner's conclusion: "In Matthew God's mighty claim in Jesus is almost as important ... as God's massive mercy in Jesus" (Bruner 1987:9). Once again Matthew identifies Jesus with the aftermath of exile, the sinners' sense of hopelessness and loneliness even prior to his baptismal configuration (Matthew 3:1ff).

Fourthly, in this genealogy Matthew places the birth of Jesus after Israel's return from Babylonian deportation which proves God's unprecedented faithfulness (Matthew 1:17, 18-20). As mentioned above, theologically the Jews', or Israel's, stay in Babylon was viewed as epic divine curse. Moreover, even after their return to the Promised Land their life was not easy. Bruner (1987:11-12) writes, "But the 500s of the first millennium before Christ was years of hell for Israel... When Israel thought everything had fallen apart... He brought Jesus Christ." From Matthew's presentation of the OT history – full of ups downs – God shows his faithfulness to keep the promises and his ability to bring something that humanity cannot imagine in its totality. There would have been little doubt that the genesis of Jesus Christ, in which the Holy Spirit had played an exceptional role, cements this truth.

¹² Johnson suggests that some scholars see in the inclusion of women that God can use even the humble and despised to accomplish his purpose...whereas others view in it that "...unexpected and sudden intrusion of the four women" suggests expectation of something even more amazing...the virgin birth...Johnson 1988:153-157, which leads him to his own conclusion (see p.176).

Thus Matthew joins the genesis of Jesus Christ not only with history (Matthew 1:2-17) but also with the divine agent, the Holy Spirit (1:18-20). Through the agent, the deity assumes humanity and enters into human culture through 'Incarnation'. Levison (2009: xxiii) writes, "Early Christianity was unified in its recognition that everyone, from Jesus to early believers to Paul himself, was Spirit-bearers..." Matthew thus mentions the Holy Spirit in a very crucial episode – the birth of Jesus Christ – which grandly fulfils the past promises (OT) and inaugurates the beginning of a new era (NT) through Jesus Christ (Matthew 1:18-23). Hill (1972:75) writes, "...the advent of Jesus inaugurates a 'new' creation or ... a new era for humanity and the world." According to Hill, both in the OT and in rabbinic thought, the notion of Spirit includes creating, recreating, renewing, and revivifying. Hill (1972:78) summarizes, therefore, Matthew implies that the creative power and activity of God was inaugurating the New Creation through the conception of the Messianic Redeemer.

2.2.1. Pneumatological Passages in Matthew's Gospel

As it has been mentioned elsewhere in this study, the lack of pneumatological interest in Matthew's Gospel can be explained by how few times he refers to the Holy Spirit. But Matthew does refer to the Holy Spirit at some key moments in Jesus' life and ministry. Despite being few in numbers, this study indicates that pneumatological references would potentially affect one's understanding of Jesus' relationship with the Holy Spirit.

(1) The first Matthean pneumatological reference appears in Matthew 1:18-19 where the evangelist mentions the Holy Spirit twice. Firstly he uses it in reference to what the Holy Spirit has done regarding Mary. Bruner (1987:21; see also Filson 1971:55) writes, "The genesis of Jesus inside human life is the exclusive work of the Holy Spirit." It was through this Spirit that the birth of Jesus Christ becomes possible.

Secondly, Matthew mentions the Holy Spirit in relation to Joseph, the betrothed of Mary (Matthew 1:19). At the first glance, Joseph intended to abandon Mary, justifiably, not wanting to shame his betrothed and in line with the law (Deuteronomy 22:13). But after noting the appearance and message given to him that the situation came from God, particularly from the Holy Spirit, he was prepared to face any potential shame. In a society where women, even the purest ones, earned little regard or acknowledgment, Mary who became pregnant without her husband could expect the worst treatment, but God's direct divine intervention reverses Joseph's decision and transforms his understanding of the law. Joseph did not follow his plan since he had been convinced by God's angel that God's

righteous act through Mary from the Holy Spirit was far greater than traditional versions of righteousness.

Finally, the virgin birth prophecy deserves further note. The genesis of Jesus Christ is sealed by the Holy Spirit in the conception of Jesus. Now the angel of God takes a further step and tells Mary and Joseph the name(s) – Jesus and Emmanuel, and the mission, which will save people from death from their sins (Matthew 1:1-23). The angel joins the event with the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy.

Matthean scholars define the term "virgin" variously; for some, it means a maiden ready for marriage, whereas for others it refers to a woman who has never had intercourse with a man (Filson 1971:55; Hill 1972:79). The historical context of Isaiah's prophetic utterance seems clearer than the particular meaning attached to the 'virginity' of the young woman. At the time Israel in general and Judah, in particular, had encountered political upheaval and religious crisis (Isaiah 7:6-14). Isaiah's prophetic utterance heralds a miraculous divine intervention which guarantees the salvation or restoration of the people. Thus Isaiah's prophetic message underlines that the child will be born miraculously and save the nation(s) and so reaffirms the very presence of God – Emmanuel, God-with-us. It appears that Isaiah and Matthew both have God's miraculous intervention or visitation to save or restore his people in mind. For Matthew, the intervention was initiated in Mary by the Holy Spirit. Bruner (1987:22) summarizes that one of the greatest works of the Holy Spirit in Matthew's context is bringing Jesus Christ into human life. Therefore, without the work of the Holy Spirit there would have been no incarnation.

(2) Matthew's second pneumatic reference comes in Chapter Three where again the evangelist uses the words twice in Matthew 3:11b "...the Holy Spirit" (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) and 3:16 "...the Spirit of God" (πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ). God's angel persuades Jesus' parents, Joseph and Mary, that his birth will have occurred through the Holy Spirit (Matthew 1:18-20). As a result, Jesus is born in Bethlehem and the event is reported to King Herod by Gentile magi who came from the east following the leading star (Matthew 2:1ff). Matthew 3:1-15 constitutes John the Baptist's prior ministry, namely, announcing the arrival of the kingdom of God and the need for repentance. In the midst of doing his mission, John the Baptist boldly announces the arrival of the Messiah and his mission – baptizing with the Holy Spirit and with fire – in a historically crucial scenario – between the OT promises and their fulfilment. Wright (2002:21) says, "...he (Jesus) is coming to fulfil God's plan, the promises God made

long ago and had never forgotten." Additionally, John understood where the Messiah's greatness resides; that is, he will not only challenge (baptizing by fire) but also provide the changing agent, the Holy Spirit. Bruner (1971:79) writes that John believed Christ would bring a new willing Spirit. John baptizes as preparation for repentance whereas Jesus baptizes for fulfilment with the Holy Spirit and fire (Carson 1984:104).

Matthew further relates an unexpected divine drama which accompanied Jesus' baptism (Matthew 3:16-17). In it the one about whom John the Baptist testifies to baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire, himself endowed by God's Spirit and heard a heavenly voice. Wright (2002:22) claims that Jesus' coming out of the water and receiving God's Spirit and other related occurrences are well confirmations of him to be God's son, Israel-in-person. Matthew's OT reading and interpretation, or in Hays' term, Backward Reading, is reflected here in his use of two allusions. The first is the exodus episode – Israel's coming through the Red Sea and receiving the law as the configuration of being God's people. As a new text and context shed more light on the previous text, however, Jesus is endowed with life-giving and the transforming Spirit, instead of the law. In other words, the OT law and prophecy have been perfected and fulfilled in him. Later Jesus would say, "Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish but to fulfil" (Matthew 5:17).

Second, Matthew's backward reading of the OT is further reflected in his allusion to Isaiah 11:1-2. Isaiah, an OT prophet, and John, the forerunner of Jesus, share quite similar socio-religious circumstances (cf. Isaiah 11:1-2 and Matthew 3:11). Isaiah gives a glimpse of hope in the midst of his judgement oracles. The prophet identified the coming Messiah as the one on whom the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding would rest. To put this in another way, God's judgement, whatever type it would be, is not the last word on God's people. Rather, there will be hope for their restoration, renewal and identity reformation because of the Messiah imbued with the Lord's Spirit. In turn John the Baptist demonstrates the status of the Messiah in their midst while calling on the Jews to repent and bear the fruit of repentance (3:1-12). For John too, the Messiah, unlike himself who was baptizing with water, will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire. But, what do the Holy Spirit and fire have in common? Or why does John the Baptist liken the Messiah's ministry to baptizing the people with the Holy Spirit and fire?

Again Matthew's OT reading seems to reshape his Gospel reading and interpretation as well. First of all in the OT both water and fire often symbolized misfortune or calamity (Gundry

1994:49); (cf. 1 Samuel 22:5; Psalms 18:6; 69:1-2; Isaiah 8:7 cf. Matthew 3:10). Such destructive or disciplinary judgemental flood or fire or both come either from human enemies or a Divine agent. According to Davies and Allison (1988:316), who also observed similar passages in the Jewish rabbinic tradition, "...John almost certainly had in view this fiery stream." Second, Matthew seems well-advised by the implication of *ruah* and fire in prophetic books (Isaiah 32:15; 44:3; Ezekiel 36:25-26; Joel 2:28-29). Spirit is "ruah", which was associated with judgement (Davies and Allison 1988:317; Gundry 1994:49). According to Allison and Davies the Spirit-fire association performs both purification and destruction. It cleanses the righteous, who repent their sin but destroys the unrighteous, those who refuse to repent. Third, John's testimony of Jesus' act implies that Jesus himself was the bearer of the Spirit (Luz 1989:172). The evangelist attests to this truth on certain occasions (Matthew 3:10; 12:18, 28:18-20). In general, the Holy Spirit, of whom Jesus himself was aware with which he was empowered, was understood by John the Baptist and Matthew the evangelist as the agent of purification and judgement.

Meanwhile, the description of "God's Spirit" like a dove could metaphorically represent meekness, wisdom, knowledge, and understanding with which the Son of God is now endowed (cf. Hill 1972:78). Thus the disclosure of the divine drama reaffirms not only the inauguration of the long-awaited Messianic era but the returning of the Holy Spirit or God's Spirit. Carson (1984:105) notes John's announcement – Spirit plus fire – and the events around the Jordan River – like a dove, the voice from heaven – could only have been greeted with excited anticipation. Filson (1971:68) further adds, "That the heavens opened and the Spirit descended gently ... means that the Spirit is sent from God to Jesus." Further the informed reader would understand the tie between the phrases "behold, the heaven ... opened" (in Matthew 3:16); and "behold, the curtain of the temple was torn...the tombs were also opened" (in Matthew 27:51-52). These are revelatory actions and voices which accompanied Jesus both in his mission identification (around the Jordan River) and later in his mission accomplishment (in Golgotha around Jerusalem). Carson (1984:109) equates the Spirit descending and the voice from heaven as a signal that God himself breaks the silence and again reveals himself to men.

(3) Matthew Chapter Four is where we find another reference to the Holy Spirit or Spirit (Matthew 4:1). Since Matthew has already identified the Holy Spirit in his previous discussions, the reader is aware that the Holy Spirit has played an extraordinary role in Jesus' birth (Matthew 1:18-20), allowing corroboration of the prophetic utterance and showing God

has proved his faithfulness. John the Baptist's conviction and the events in and outside the Jordan River confirm that the Messiah himself is not isolated from the Holy Spirit (Matthew 3:11-17).

The same Spirit who initiated Jesus' birth and descended on his baptism led him into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil according to Matthew 4:1 (Davies and Allison 1988:354; Carson 1984:111; Hare 1993:23). The manifestation of the Holy Spirit like a dove and God's attestation as to his beloved son in Jesus' baptism (Matthew 3:16-17) underline the demonic temptation motive. Jesus' divine sonship was not dependent on his success or failure in this particular scenario; but if he had failed to overcome the temptations that would have affected his mission and purpose (Evans 2012:80).

The imagery of leading into the wilderness recalls some of the OT prefigures, for instance the Israelites' departure from Egypt (Evans 2012:80). Hill (1972:99) identifies traces of three OT prefigurations. (1) It corresponds to Israel's temptation in their wilderness wandering (Deuteronomy 8:13; 6:16; 6:13); (2) the parallelism between Jesus and Moses (Deuteronomy 9:9-18); and (3) the protection of God given to the protagonist in Psalms 91. The purpose and significance of Jesus' temptation have been viewed differently by the scholars. Some interpret the temptation narrative through the lens of historical representation (Blomberg: 2002:83; Davies 1993:44). Others prefer to link it with real Christian life situations (Fitzgerald 1972:152-153; Garrett 1998:20). Even though the aim of this study is not to present the whole discussion here, it need not necessarily be one or the other way. Regardless of such on-going debate, however, one point of reference is unambiguous: the Holy Spirit's guidance precedes Jesus' temptation and his subsequent victory.

As mentioned above, the narrative of Jesus' temptation in Matthew corresponds to that of Israel in the wilderness. Unlike Jesus, Israel however failed in the wilderness temptation, not because of the lack of the Spirit, but rather because of their lack of obedience (Carson 1984:111; Hare 1993:23); (cf. Number 11:17, 25, 29; Psalms 106). The prophet Isaiah integrates Israel's failure in the wilderness with their stubbornness to follow and obey the Holy Spirit's voice and guidance rather than the agent's incapability (Evans 2012:80); cf. Isaiah 63:10-14). This may suggest that the evangelist did not narrate the story of Jesus' temptation from scratch; nor that it is a later addition by an editor. Rather, it happens in accord with the author's reinterpretation of the OT reading. In any case, the evangelist emphasises the agent, the one who led Jesus into the wilderness, instead of prescribing or

predicting the outcome. Any OT reader in general and those who knew the Messiah's tradition in the OT would hardly miss the success. Davies and Allison (1988:354) comment that God's Spirit has led Jesus into the wilderness and it resulted in his overcoming the temptation and performing God's will.

In summary, in line with Kingsbury's structural scheme Matthew 1:1-4:16 presents one phase of Matthew's Gospel structure. In this part of the Gospel the evangelist has integrated the Holy Spirit with some crucial aspects of Jesus' story. Generally speaking, the Messiah's birth, his escape of death, his baptism and his temptation and overcoming of temptation are all exhibited in this part of the Gospel.

Most importantly for the purpose of this study, is that Matthew 1:1-4:16 presents a sensitive portrayal of the Holy Spirit in almost the entire encounter: (1) some inclusions and exclusions in Matthew's genealogy narrative challenges the Jewish customary genealogical system; Jesus' genealogy narrative happened because of the Holy Spirit; (2) Jesus was told to baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire on the one hand; but also he himself was endowed with the Holy Spirit following his baptism, on the other hand; and (3), unlike Israel, the same Holy Spirit leads Jesus into the temptation and enables him to overcome the temptation in the wilderness. At least in this part of his Gospel, Matthew never intends to portray Jesus the Messiah in the absence or apart from the active involvement of the Holy Spirit. The Messiah's birth, his baptism and overcoming temptations all require his encounters with the Holy Spirit. In other words, if we consider Matthew 1:1-4:16 as the Messiah's preparation for his ministry, he is prepared through the initiation, endowment and guidance of the Holy Spirit.

(4) Matthew Chapter 10:20 is the fourth passage where the evangelist refers to the Holy Spirit or "your Father's Spirit." Again in Kingsbury's three-fold division and the literary-criticism-oriented structure Matthew 4:17-16:20 forms the second structural unit of the First Gospel. Jesus' overcoming temptation, followed by his calling the twelve disciples and ministering around Galilee (Matthew 4:12-25). The three subsequent chapters (Matthew 5-7) cover what is usually called "the Sermon on the Mount" where Jesus taught his disciples exhaustively. These Kingdom-infused moral/ethical and theological sermons are succeeded by Jesus' discourse and miraculous ministry (Matthew 8-9). Strikingly, the evangelist refrains from references to the Holy Spirit in these four or five chapters. This could lead one to conclude that the paucity of references to the Holy Spirit means that the Gospel is not about the Holy Spirit. This is however not the case, for the following reasons. First, if the Sermon on the

Mount is about the Kingdom of heaven or God then it seems unlikely to consider it to be Spiritless. Dunn (1998:136) rightly claims that “Although references to the Spirit are few in the Synoptics, they are sufficient to show that Spirit and Kingdom are closely associated.” Second, the evangelist has referred to the Holy Spirit five-times (Matthew. 10:20; 12:18, 28, 31, 32) in this part of the Gospel. Third, though incorporating the pneumatological references in Matthew’s Gospel with other discourses and miraculous narratives is disputed, it is not completely impossible.

Within the structural construction of Matthew 4:17-16:20, Matthew 10 addresses Jesus' missionary concern for Israel. First, Jesus calls the twelve disciples (Matthew 10:1-4); second, Jesus sends them to the mission field to evangelize Israel (Matthew 10:5-15); third, Jesus predicts the cost of mission: they will suffer for the Kingdom's sake (Matthew 10:16-25); and lastly, Jesus instructs the disciples about other related issues (Matthew 10:26-42).

In the beginning of the Gospel, the angel of God predicts Jesus' mission – saving the nation (Matthew 1:23). John the Baptist reiterates that the One who comes after him will baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire (Matthew 3:11); his testimony is soon confirmed by the Spirit descending upon Jesus and the voice heard from heaven (Matthew 3:16-17). After overcoming the temptation, Jesus perseveres with his mission – preaching the Kingdom's Gospel, teaching and doing miracles (Wright 2002:115). Jesus now himself construes his mission as a task that will be done with the aid of Holy Spirit. The disciples are destined to face certain critical opposition but Jesus assures them that they will certainly not be alone, because the Father’s Spirit or by implication the Holy Spirit will be with them. In fact, Jesus will also do the same thing when he gives the Great Commission to them at the end of this Gospel (Matthew 28:18-20; Gundry 1994:193). They would be persecuted by their fellow Jews and family members as well (Harrington 1991:146; Filson 1971:131). Nevertheless, the disciples need have no fear because the "Spirit" of their "Father" will assist and guide them. Bruner (1987:383) comments, Whenever Jesus’ disciples proclaim the good news in any hostile circumstances, the Spirit speaks. Either the message itself comes from the Holy Spirit or he provides what they need at the moment of persecution (Gundry 1994:192; Davies and Allison 1988:185; Hare 1993:114). Filson’s concluding statement deserves mention: “...the apostles need not worry how to defend themselves in hostile situations [or]... unpredictable crises; the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of their Father, will speak in and through them” (Filson 1971:131). All of this suggests that the disciples' effectiveness and perseverance in their God-given mission – to Israel and Gentiles alike – come from the divine provision, particularly, of

the Holy Spirit (Matthew 10:20; 28:18-19). Therefore, as it is mentioned above, they did not have to fear the difficult situation which would surround them in their mission because the Holy Spirit would be with them.

(5) The third division of Matthew's Gospel, according to Kingsbury's structure, is from Matthew 16:21 to 28:20. Some of the main themes in this part of the Gospel are Jesus' suffering, death and resurrection (Kingsbury 1998:30). Here Matthew rarely dealt with the subject of the Holy Spirit, until the fifth somewhat ambivalent reference, in Matthew 26:41. In most of this chapter, Matthew narrates what Jesus had done ahead of the impending arrest and death (Matthew 26:1-56). Some of the core themes include Jesus' prediction of his death, Judas' betrayal of Jesus, the Jewish leaders' plot to arrest Jesus, Jesus' sharing the Passover meal with his disciples, his prayer at Gethsemane and more. Thus Matthew's reference to "Spirit" occurs following Jesus' demanding his disciples, particularly Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, to keep watch and pray (Matthew 26:36-38), while he was praying (Matthew 26:36-46). Nonetheless, Matthean scholars interpret the term "spirit" differently in Matthew 26:41.

Most scholars view of "spirit" as a human personality component which has no bearing on the Holy Spirit or God's Spirit and is different to Matthew's meaning: "Human spirit" (Gundry 1976:110-111); "a man's noble desire..." as opposed to physical weakness (Hill 1972:342; Davies and Allison 1998:545); "their (disciples') spirit," not God's Spirit (Filson 1971:279); and part of the human that is attuned to God (Hell 1991:47).

Other scholars think that "spirit" represents here a divine act of assistance, or enablement as the response of Jesus followers' fervent prayers. It refers to the strength that God can bestow on us (Evans 2012:436). Hare (1993:302) also argues against the interpretation of "human Spirit" because in Hebrew, unlike in Greek, the flesh represents the whole person: body and mind/spirit. The word "spirit" in Matthew 26:41b, by no means suggests that the human spirit is always eager to serve God's will (Hare 1993:303). It rather suggests a relationship with God that has been placed within each of us. Nevertheless, Hare does not make plain how this spirit has been put in each of us and which spirit, in fact, it is: human or divine. In any case, the spirit here mostly leans to imply God's act of encouragement or strengthening at the time of trial.

Still, some scholars, such as Bruner (1990:986), sympathetically interpret "spirit" here as divine or the Holy Spirit. In the first place, Bruner admits that the main body of interpreters

understands "spirit" in Matthew 26:41b as a human spirit. However he provides two reasons for this to be the divine Spirit: first, the "spirit" in Gethsemane in most translations seems capitalized which is an indication for the divine spirit; and second, even the best human spirit is always also flesh and falls short to do God's will. Therefore, the term "spirit" in Matthew 26:41b refers to the Holy Spirit who was present with the disciples (and with Jesus) to give victory over temptation.

Without denying its ambiguity, this study goes along with Bruner.

1. Bruner's lower or upper case argument may not be convincing and this counts for nothing, but the Holy Spirit's accompaniment with Jesus and his disciples is hardly debatable (Matthew 1:18-20; 3:11; 16-17; 4:1; 10:20; 12:18, 28, 31-32).
2. In the context, it is unlikely to define Jesus' calling the disciples to watch and pray which could be entrapped by physical weariness on the one hand; and Jesus' remaining persistent in his prayer on the other hand. In the first case, if "spirit" in Matthew 26:41b refers to the human spirit which naturally wills to do God's will there seems little need to pray to strive to keep the body strong. Second, prayer is a call for help (from somewhere else) in order to overcome a difficult situation, which may prove not only invincible even for a strong physique but with good human intentions. Further even if one argues that the disciples could not pray because their spirit was weakened by physical weariness, this too encounters other interpretive difficulties. For one reason, Jesus did not persist in his prayer because he was physically strong but rather, I argue, because God or the Spirit was enabling him to do so (cf. Matthew 4:1). Otherwise, Jesus' humanity comes under suspicion.
3. I agree with Evans and Hare's suggestion that God provides help or strength at the time of trial and need for those who pray. Nonetheless in the narrative of Jesus' and his disciples' prayers in Gethsemane (Matthew 26:41b), Jesus' advises the disciples to persevere in prayer and remain courageous, as he was doing despite his imminent death, only because of the agent "Spirit" or the "Holy Spirit". Bruner (1990:986) writes, "...God's Holy Spirit, at work in the disciples' lives in the presence of Jesus, is an encouraging Spirit, eager to give disciples victory over temptation..."
4. Finally, since Matthew is well-acquainted with the Holy Spirit's role in the previous incidents – in Jesus' birth, baptism, temptation, the disciples' mission to Israel and Jesus' miraculous ministry; he experiences little difficulty to attune the same Spirit's role at the time of trial such as that of the disciples and Jesus.

(6) The last pneumatological passage in Matthew's Gospel is found in Matthew 28:19. Again the evangelist's mentioning the Holy Spirit seems intentional and strategic. Matthew Chapter 28 in general and 28:16-20, in particular, are pivotal for various reasons. First, Hare (1993:331) believes that Matthew 28:16-28 plays a significant role in understanding the whole Gospel. Second, according to Gundry (1994:593), Matthew 28:16-20 offers a compendium of important Matthean themes¹³. Lastly, Matthew's Gospel ends with the risen Jesus charging his disciples for the Gentile mission (Evans 2012:482).

Moreover, (1) The angel of God and Jesus himself encounter a couple of women – Mary of Magdala and the other Mary – and confirm to them that he has arisen (Matthew 28:1-10). Despite the guards' and Jewish religious leaders' attempt to bribe people who report on Jesus' resurrection, Matthew testifies that these women go to Galilee to report what they have seen (Matthew 28:9-15). (2) Matthew further tells us of the disciples' response – they worshipped him though some doubted – and Jesus was crowned with authority in heaven and on earth (Matthew 28:16-18 cf. 2:11). John the Baptist had already confirmed that the one who comes after him would be mightier than him (Matthew 3:11). (3) Finally and most importantly, Jesus commissioned his disciples to evangelize Gentiles via baptizing in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit and to make them disciples by teaching what they had learnt (Matthew 28:19-20). (4) In contrast to Hare, Gundry, and Evans, in my opinion, the points in numbers one and three are most the significant.

In Matthew 28 women were the first to become involved in God's historic work. Mary of Magdala and the other Mary encountered both the angel and the risen Jesus (28:5-10). Further, the angel and Jesus addressed the women with the same terminology: "Do not be afraid" (Matthew 28:5, 10). For OT readers this commands resonates with covenantal language (Genesis 15:1; Exodus 3:12-16; Joshua 1:9; 2:14; Ruth 2:8-13; 2 Samuel 7:13-15; Isaiah 43:1; Jeremiah 1:8 cf. Matthew 1:20; Luke 1:13, 30; 2:10-11; 1 Corinthians 18:9-10). In fact, these are not the only OT and NT passages in which God ordered individuals or groups of people not to be afraid; they are mentioned here to hint how women were incorporated into God's salvific activities in both Testaments. Filson (1977:302) writes, "For their [women's] loyalty and persistent love they hear first the news of the resurrection." Interestingly, already the women we saw in Matthew's genealogical narrative had disclosed

¹³ For Gundry Matthew 28:16-20 is very important because it confirms Jesus as the greater Moses, the deity of Jesus, the authority of his commission, the danger of doubt among disciples, the teaching ministry. But most importantly, it presents the mission to all nations.

that God could intervene and transform limitations to achieve his purpose. Such divine interaction and transformation further achieve their climax in what God had done in Mary through the Holy Spirit (1:18-20). Thus the two women's encounter with the angel of God and the risen Jesus unambiguously recalls the very message of the angel's first communication with Mary (Matthew 1:18-23; 28:5-10).

For another reason, Jesus explicitly commands his disciples to baptize Gentiles “in the name of the Father, of the Son and the Holy Spirit.” Matthean scholars interpret the phrase “in the name of...” differently. For instance, for Filson (1977:306) the term implies clearly articulating the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; confesses the full right of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to worship and loyalty; and gratefully acknowledges the gracious blessing given by the Father through the Son by the working of the Holy Spirit; and pledges obedience to Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Others like Evans and Gundry understand that the phrase “in the name of” endorses the pre-Ester Trinitarian understanding (Evans 2012:186; Gundry 1994:596). For Keener (2009:716) at the time the biblical and Jewish tradition regarded the two names, the Father and the Holy Spirit, as divine thus baptizing in the name of the Son means regarding Jesus himself as divine.

In the OT to speak or act "in the name of" God or Lord does not seem strange. Among other things, speaking or acting in the name of God refers or implies: (1) God's call, especially in case of the priests and prophets, to minister in his name (Deuteronomy 18:5); (2) it is a sign of sheer trust in God and his mighty power which overturns difficult situations or gives victory (1 Samuel 17:45); (3) it is often seen as a means to conveying blessing (2 Samuel 6:18; Psalms 118:10-12); and (4) it stands as the source of authority under whose power the prophet (s) speak against or for the people (Deuteronomy 18:22; Isaiah 50:10; Ezra 5:1). If Matthew is believed to be influenced by his OT reading, "in the name of..." may refer to the divine call for ministry (Jesus' disciples in mind), the need to trust in God's (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) authority, the blessing now to be channelled into the world, and the message of salvation. On this point, in the context of our discussion, the Holy Spirit is thus one of the three Persons through whom calling people through evangelism, blessing and empowering them would materialized.

2.2.2. Summary Note

In Chapter Two the study has attempted to address the background and overview issues of Matthew's Gospel in light of, *inter alia*, Hays' intertextual interpretation. As far as the first

Gospel background matter is concerned, Matthean scholars have followed basically two lines of thought: accepting the apostolic authorship and an early date of writing, and the Palestinian origin (Hengel 2000:16; Hill 1982:22); or accepting non-apostolic authorship, a later date of writing and probable Rome (Syrian) origin (Kilpatrick 1966; Kingsbury 1998; Carter 2000). Interestingly, both lines of argument were maintained over long periods of time, particularly the traditional (first) position. It seems futile to hope for consensus or disregarding the alternatives or even some kind of combination of elements from both positions (Stanton 1995:16; Walter 2008:4). However, each reading and interpretation of the text of the Gospel would incline the scholar toward supporting those presumed background circumstances according to his/her personal conviction.

The structure of Matthew's Gospel is another area on which Matthean scholars hold diverse opinions. As discussed elsewhere, some scholars prefer a geographical-topical outline (Bauer 1988:21-22) whereas others favour a five-fold, or a three-fold division (Bacon 1930:82, 265-335; Bauer 1988:11, 26; Kingsbury 1975:13-23). Another option is the literary critical approach, and so on (Bauer 1988:57-134; 1988:45-54). This study adopts Kingsbury's three-fold structural approach for the single reason that Matthew's references to the Holy Spirit fit this approach conveniently (Kingsbury 1986:38-40; 1998:30; Bauer 1988:41, 42).

The Gospel of Matthew has, in my view, been disregarded unfairly, on grounds of its apparent limited treatment of the phenomenon of the Holy Spirit. From the standpoint of this study, the paucity of direct references to the Holy Spirit does not deter examination into the Gospel's recognition of it. On the contrary, the researcher has found that the specific passages and events in which the evangelist attaches reference or implication of the Holy Spirit or Spirit are crucial moments in the life of Jesus, in the narrative development of Matthew's Gospel. To be more explicit, some of these include Jesus's birth (Matthew 1); Jesus' baptism (Matthew 3); Jesus' temptation narrative (Matthew 4); prescribing the disciples' mission to Israel (10); Jesus' Passion narrative (Matthew 26); and the Great Commission (Matthew 28). Matthew plainly implicates the Holy Spirit's role with all of these episodes and, in most cases, reflects his OT readings.

Chapter 3: The Messiah and the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:15-32

3.1. Introduction: The immediate context of Matthew 12:1-14

As mentioned in the introductory part of this thesis, the narrative account in Matthew 12 is important for the following reasons: First, in terms of Matthew's narrative development_ at least regarding the number of chapters_ it is located almost in the middle of the entire Gospel. Second, not only does Matthew 12 constitute one of the five explicit references to the Holy Spirit, but the Evangelist also mentions the term “Holy Spirit” three times. Lastly, it provides further clues to understanding the religious leaders' (Pharisees and Sadducees) continued resistance and refusal to acknowledge God's work in their midst, which elicited Jesus' provocative speech.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus cautions his disciples that their righteousness must surpass that of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Matthew 5:20). The miracles and discourses in chapters 8 and 9 affirm Jesus' own righteous deeds and authority which he exercised over nature and humans. However, the Evangelist notes that the Scribes/Pharisees were suspicious and reacted jealously against Jesus's authority and regularly refused their co-operation (Matthew 9:3, 11, 14, 34; cf. 10:25; 11:16-19). Meantime, Jesus predicted that the disciples' mission to Israel would be tough because of, among other things, the religious leaders' rigidity (Matthew 11:1-9). In a similar manner to that of the Pharisees, Jesus also ascertains that his yoke will be lighter, which will result in providing rest to those who will follow him (Matthew 11:25-30). Whether this comparison signals Jesus' critique of some oral traditions or the inconsistent interpretation of written law is open to debate (see, Hare 1993:130; Davies and Allison 1991: 307). However, this stance is aimed directly at the Pharisaic arduous code of practice which they imposed upon the people.

Thus Matthew 12 clearly exhibits the Pharisees' negativity toward Jesus and their plan to entrap him on the one hand, and Jesus' response on the other. Matthew 12:1-14 in particular is composed of three parts. We find the context in Matthew 12:1 of the Pharisees' criticism and questions (Matthew 12:2, 10) and Jesus' response. As noted above, the Pharisees' antagonism toward Jesus had already surfaced (Matthew 9:3, 11, 14, 34; cf. 10:25; 11:16-19), whereas in previous cases it was covert. In Matthew 12:1, 9, 14, however, Jesus's opponents made their case plain and public.

3.1.1. The Pharisees Criticism of Jesus

First, the Pharisees accused Jesus' disciples for plucking "ears of grains" on the "Sabbath" (Matthew 12:1). Since the law permits the poor to glean from the corners of the field (Leviticus 19:9-10; Deuteronomy 23:25), the Pharisees' accusation pertains to the Sabbath day because from their perspective the disciples' life could not be at risk (Davies and Allison 1991:307, 310; cf. Green, Brown and Perrin 2013:821; Barker and Kohlenberger III 1994:59). In reality, though implicit in their statement, Jesus who allowed his followers to pluck the ears of the grain on the Sabbath is responsible for the breach of the law. But why was the Sabbath so important and how should it have been observed?

Regarding the first question, Sabbath observance is one of the most prominent commandments in the Bible, and is commanded explicitly in the OT (Davies and Allison 1991:307). The two biblical episodes in which the Sabbath law was established are creation and redemption (Exodus 20:8-11; cf. Genesis 2:2; and Deuteronomy 5:12-16). The former, the creation story, was meant to commemorate God's accomplishment of his creative work which climaxed in his own rest (Genesis 2:2; Exodus 20:8-11). Though the precise meaning of the term "Sabbath", either in Hebrew or Greek, remains unresolved, in most cases it implies: "seven," referring to the seventh day of the week, "cessation or rest," referring to God resting from his creative work (Silva 2015:220; Evans and Porter 2000:1031). The latter redemption story relates God's mighty deed of delivering Israel from Egyptian captivity. The Sabbath was thus assigned to reflect on the deliverance reported in Exodus as the commemoration of their loyalty to the covenantal relationship with God (Farmer 1998:1293; Silva 2015:222). Taken together in a broad sense, the Sabbath observance calls all humanity in general and Israel in particular to acknowledge God, who creates, cares and sustains life (Mare 2004:38). Therefore the commandment did not signify a burden, but was intended positively, as a day of joy, on which prayer, Scripture reading, edifying discourses and other religious ceremonies were meant to be held (Evans and Porter 2000:1032; Green 2013:821; Silva 2015:222). Negatively, it was meant to be observed by a cessation of work and any breach of this prohibition could incur a death penalty (Silva 2015:221; Green 2013:820; Evans and Porter 2000:1031).

Nevertheless, some ambiguity exists even in the Scripture itself and its observers are often seen encountering uncertainty, mainly due to different interpretations. According to Green's (2013:820) observations, the OT does little toward categorizing what constituted "not do (be

doing) ... work". We get a glimpse of the biblical backdrop in the Pharisaic opposition toward Jesus, though their intention was malicious. In a strict manner, Sabbath observance does in fact prohibit performing most actions in a general sense and its desecration was considered a capital transgression (Exodus 35:3; 16:22-26; Number 15:32-36). Yet, on the contrary, the Scripture also permits certain actions to be performed on the Sabbath: for instance, ritual services in the Tent and Temple. The priests were thus abiding by the law when changing the consecrated bread and offering the double burnt offering on the Sabbath (Leviticus 24:8; Number 28:9-10). Barker and Kohlenberger III (1994:59; see also, Dunn 2003:1028) and Farmer (1998:1293) say that the priests were innocent because the law that established the Sabbath also established the right of the ministers to 'desecrate' it.

The matter becomes more complicated when one realizes how the latter traditions, particularly of the scribes, approach Sabbath observance differently. Some NT scholars share a similar view, describing some of the Scribes' approaches regarding the Sabbath. For instance, Barker and Kohlenberger III (1994:59) write that the Jewish Sabbath regulation law identifies "thirty-nine kinds of works" forbidden on the Sabbath and picking grain could be one of them, whereas Silva (2015:22; cf. Green 2013:820) reveals that the Qumran Sectaries refused to save an animal's life from death on the Sabbath and even "sexual engagement with one's own wife was banned". Evans and Porter (2000:1031) further comment that following the Babylonian exile "the Scripture became the object of interpretation by legal experts, namely Scribes" and probably as the result of that, Green (2013:820) claims, by the time of Jesus people understood differently "what could and could not be done on the Sabbath." In any case, the Pharisees make their point and draw their conclusion: Jesus's allowing disciples' to pluck the ears of the grains on the Sabbath was wrong.

3.1.2. Jesus's Response to the Pharisees

In responding to the Pharisees' charge, Jesus would have had two options: he could either adopt a flexible scriptural tradition or dare to apply a rigid but inconsistent scribal interpretation (Green 2013:820). Unwaveringly, Jesus takes no time to comprise his argument with Scripture (cf. Matthew 12:3-4; and 1 Samuel 21:1-6). The reason is that Scripture itself is flexible in some circumstances, e.g. the temple service; another reason is that doing good things in order to achieve more valuable aims is permissible even given the Pharisees' attitude. As a result, Jesus' response is based on the same source as the Pharisaic charge.

Thus Jesus offers a defence against the Pharisees' charge and supports his disciples' action on the Sabbath, based on three OT Scriptural illustrations.

First, as a counter-question and appeal to Scripture, Jesus recalls what King David had done in the OT time (Matthew 12:3-4; cf. 1 Samuel 21:1-6). The Pharisees knew well that David (and his companions) ate forbidden food "but the Scriptures themselves do not condemn his actions" (Barker and Kohlenberger 1994:59). Instead, both Matthew's Gospel and 1 Samuel narrators, however, plead 'hunger' as the motivation. In fact, the appeasement of hunger, regardless of a specific day, was "a sign of the restoration of the kingdom" (Farmer 1998:1293). Jesus argues either logically or theologically that if hunger took precedence (with David's authority) over the law "then it should also [be justifiable] at this time when the kingdom was restored" (Farmer 1998:1293). Second, Jesus explains that the priests could work on the Sabbath but remained irreproachable because the law itself gave them such a right (Matthew 12:5). Again the implication seems clear: If the law had sealed the priests' authority to work on Sabbath; such a concession is more appropriate for the one who is greater than the Temple and Lord of the Sabbath (Matthew 12:6-8). Third, Scriptures further attest that God delights in mercy rather than rigid ritualism (cf. Charette 2000:73); hence those who have God's law in their hearts know how to act in compassion even on the Sabbath (Hosea 6:6 cf. Isaiah 51:7; 56:1-2). Farmer (1998:1294) says, Jesus' reference to Hosea 6:6 underscores his calling for "steadfast love rather than ritualism."

The second conflict between the Pharisees and Jesus happened in the synagogue (Matthew 12:9-14). The Pharisees questioned Jesus (Matthew adds the phrase "in their synagogue") on whether it is allowed to heal a person's withered hand on the Sabbath (Matthew 12:9). But as it was true with plucking the ears of the grains of corn (Matthew 12:1), they simply aimed to make a solid cause for his breaching the Sabbath law rather than looking for understanding (cf. Matthew 12:14). Farmer (1998:1294) finds two possible grounds on which the Pharisees thought Jesus could be wrong if he said yes: first, the man's life is not at immediate risk; second, his infirmity was considered to be the result of a divine curse (cf. Zechariah 11:17; 1 Kings 13:1-6; John 9:2). Regardless of their entrapping motive and inconsistent interpretation, Jesus expands further on what should or should not have been done on the Sabbath (Matthew 12:11-12).

Jesus asks the Pharisees whether they attempt to save their own sheep if it falls into pit on the Sabbath (Matthew 12:11). In my view, this question carries two implications: first it hints at

how the sects themselves were run with divergent views. It was true that in some latter Jewish traditions, particularly of the Qumran, lifting an animal from a pit was forbidden (Green 2013:820). Nonetheless, most of the Pharisees remained reluctant to espouse such an extremist view (Dunn 2003:1028). It seems that Jesus criticized them for opting to save an animal's life on the Sabbath but plotting to trap him for healing a human's life (Matthew 12:12). Framer (1998:94) writes, "They can concern [themselves] about their own property but not about another human being." Second, and more importantly, the seventh day was set-aside to do good things, not the opposite. Metaphorically, in Matthew's Gospel the "sheep" language represents the people of Israel (Matthew 9:36; 10:6, 16; 15:24). Comparatively, therefore, if the Pharisees were so sensitive about their literal sheep, animals or property, nothing should be worth more to Jesus than doing what he had come to do: saving the peoples' lives (Matthew 1:21; cf. 9:36) and exercising concern for their well-being.

3.1.3. Summary note

In sum, this introductory discussion does not aim to explore the matter of the Sabbath; neither does it attempt to overcome all unsettled disputes which surrounded the Pharisees and Jesus, over the Sabbath. In my view, the following three main points are however worth noting:

First, in the argumentative narratives in Matthew 12:1-14, Jesus does not only favour adhering to the Scripture but he also implicitly criticizes the Pharisees for their rigidity and inconsistency. Second, despite Jesus' corrective and courageous responses, the matter remains unresolved: no one declares victory over the other. Third, both parties – the Pharisees and Jesus – take different approaches. The Pharisees plot how to murder Jesus which in fact amounts to a manifesto of their malicious intention (Matthew 12:14, 35-36; cf. 7:17-20; 12:33-36; Luke 6:45). On the contrary, Jesus continues to minister to others, as he did before (Matthew 12:15; cf. 4:23-25; 9:35-38); probably because he has not only been imbued and empowered by the Holy Spirit but because he also defends the Holy Spirit.

3.2. The Messiah Imbued with the Holy Spirit Matthew 12:15-21

In Matthew, Jesus' contemporaries, particularly the Pharisees and Sadducees, are depicted as remaining unmoved, both regarding repenting their sins and welcoming God's gracious visitation. The earliest negative view of these religious leaders in Matthew's Gospel comes from John the Baptist (Matthew 3:7-10). John appears to be convinced that these parties come to participate in the ritual (water baptism) solely for the sake of formality instead of

seeking forgiveness of sins. As a result, the Baptist criticizes and warns them about failing to come with a humble spirit and productive mind (3:8-9). After John's imprisonment (Matthew 4:12; cf. 11:2-6), Jesus also notices how the Pharisees wilfully attempt to ensnare and tempt Jesus to discredit God working in him through the Holy Spirit (Matthew 5:20; 9:3, 11, 34; 10:25; cf. 11:16-19; 12:1-14, 24). Thus, as Matthew continues unfolding the story, the Pharisees' intention becomes obvious: they scheme to execute Jesus (Matthew 12:14; cf. 21:15).

By contrast, Jesus resists engaging in either public or private debate which would probably end in a win-lose situation. And he also regularly warns people, individually or collectively, to keep secret what he had done for them (Matthew 8:4; 9:30; 12:16; 16:8), to avoid drawing public attention. Similarly, he withdraws from their (the Pharisees') synagogue and continues his ministry in other areas (Matthew 12:14, 15-16). Following Jesus' removal from their synagogue and healing people outside the synagogue, Matthew uses a long citation from Isaiah 42:1-4.

It is therefore important to understand Matthew in light of Isaiah and Isaiah in the light of Matthew.

3.2.1. Matthew 12:17-21 in light of Isaiah's 42:1-4

Matthew 12:17-21 contains one of Matthew's fulfilment quotations from Isaiah 42:1-4. Some scholars, like Grogan (1984:18), believe that Isaiah 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9; and 52:13-53:12 can be considered to be the "Servant Songs". Matthew, who seems to have been well-read in the Jewish Scriptures, interprets Isaiah's "Servant" theme with Jesus's deeds and thoughts. In light of this study, quoting Isaiah 42:1-4 in 12:18-21 is significant, among other things, for the Messiah's/Servant's conjoining with the "Spirit." However, since Isaiah 42:1-4 and thereby Matthew 12:17-21 are exposed to different interpretations regarding the form of the texts and the identity of the Servant, some representative proposals deserve to be presented briefly.

In the first, the text form of Isaiah 42:1-4 and henceforth Matthew's quotation of this particular passage raises the question of its form. Hill (1972:214) argues persuasively that the text form of Isaiah 42:1-4 seems a collection from different sources. Previous to Hill, Lindars (1963:147-152) and Stendahl (1968:107; cf. Carson 1984:286) had viewed the change in Matthew's use of Isaiah to Matthew's school and to Christians' need for apologetic respectively. Gundry (1975:110-116) acknowledges that "there is mixed-text character" but

he also admits that it is not easy to discern the reason for the change. Morris (1992:309; cf. Beaton 2002:122-123, 129) further comments that “...either Matthew is making his own translation or ...citing some other Greek versions...”

Davies and Allison (1991:223) investigate different proposals regarding Matthew’s quotation from Isaiah and what it signifies concerning the text form. According to their assessment, some of the scholarly suggestions include: (1) The quotation contains several Matthean amalgamations (*hapax legomena*). (2) Isaiah’s 42:1-4 was probably a messianic text in first-century Judaism... (3) Jesus’s silence is one of the most convenient points of contact between Matthew and Isaiah and Others. However, Davies and Allison themselves are also pay attention to alternative interpretations¹⁴. In any case, Matthew might possibly have adjusted his OT reading in view of Jesus’s person and ministry (Beaton 2002:123). Alternatively in an intertextual reading, it is also acceptable that an old text might bear a new meaning in a new context¹⁵.

Second, the identity of the Servant calls forth different interpretations. Grogan (1986:18) proposes three main lines of thoughts. First, according to the Jewish interpreters, the “Servant” represents Israel as a nation, the faithful remnant, ideal Israel including prophets like Isaiah himself and Jeremiah. Watts (1987:119) and Boring (2001:361) share a similar view: the “servant” is identified with “Jacob/Israel Abraham.” The second is a Christian’s interpretation of Isaiah’s passage. According to Grogan, Christians’ guided by Matthew 8:17; 12:17-21 and other NT passages, claims it is “Jesus.” Lastly, modern scholars have shown the same variety of opinion. Therefore it is feasible first to examine both Isaiah and Matthew texts in their own contexts.

In Isaiah’s context, the prophet first connects the Servant with Israel. Or to follow Grogan, Watts and Boring’s terminologies, the Servant is identified with Jacob/Abraham and this signifies the covenant notion between God and Israel as a nation (Isaiah 41:8-9; 43: 1-8) (Boring 2001:361). This means, at least partially, the Jewish scholars’ interpretation of the “Servant” does not seem groundless. Second, in light of Isaiah 42:18-20 however, as Grogan (1986:18) rightly argues, the “Servant” appears to be empirical Israel. Another way to put this would be that the Servant’s characteristics – for instance, he never cries nor needs publicity –

¹⁴ See Davies and Allison’s (1991:223-224) counter-argument: first the term “beloved” shows analogy to Matthew 3:17 and 17:5; second, the incident links the main themes: Jesus and the Holy Spirit and others.

¹⁵ For instance, Beaton, who has made a thorough survey, even verse by verse (see 2002:122-141), concludes that “Matthew’s unique-text form... demonstrates his use of either the Hebrew, or more likely a Greek (or Aramaic) text conformed... then altered in the light of his own concerns ” (200:141).

could hardly correspond with Israel and must thus be distinct from the ideal Israel. Third, closely related with the second point, the prophet does not focus only on the singularity of the servant rather than the collective, but links him to a suffering servant¹⁶ (see also Isaiah 50:4-9-53:1-12).

One further note is that these scholars, including Grogan and Watts, probably reach their conclusion on the basis of their encounter with the Hebrew text; in such a case Matthew's use of Greek and/or Hebrew may raise the question with which he is engaging. Matthean scholars, like Nolland (2005), Gundry (1994) and Menken (2004) comment that it is not easy to ascertain Matthew totally left one- Hebrew or Greek- and used the other. Instead, these scholars suggest: (1) the textual form of Matthew's quotation in 12:18 is by itself problematic since it appears to deviate both from extant LXX and Hebrew versions (Menken 2004:52); (2) in some instances, like the OT quotations, Matthew diverges the LXX, whereas he follows it on other occasions (Gundry 2005:229). Likewise, Matthew appears to deviate both from LXX and Hebrew. For instance, Gundry (1982:229) notices that Matthew's "I will put" agrees with Targum against MT and LXX which says "I have given". Gundry mentions that (2) Matthew usually not only diverges the LXX, specifically in the quotations but also often follows it (Gundry 2005:229). This shows that Matthew had made a decision in choosing sources and making the adjustment (cf. France 2007:471)¹⁷; (3), as with other formula quotations, the text form is closer to MT than the LXX (Nolland 2005)¹⁸. Therefore, it is not clear that Matthew always follows the LXX or Greek line of thought.

Fourth, the prophet remarking, among other things, that the servant is installed by God's "Spirit" is significant. Morris (1992:310; cf. Blenkinsopp 2002:211) argues that Matthew's quotation from Isaiah 42:2 clearly envisages that the servant will have exceptional endowment. This could be one of the reasons why Christians claim that Isaiah's servant prophecy is fulfilled in Jesus the Messiah. Fifth, though the nation sets to reject or to oppose him (Isaiah 53:1-12), he remains determined to accomplish his mission – declaring God's righteousness and justice to the nations or Gentiles (Isaiah 42:4). As the result of the servant's

¹⁶ Grogan boldly claims that in the third and fourth Servant songs in Isaiah no single expression is made which depicts the servant as a group rather than an individual... his work is unique either within or outside Isaiah, since he dies as atoning sacrifice for human sins.

¹⁷ ...the echo of the opening words of Isaiah 42:1 in heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism, where the term "beloved (agapetos) reflects the non-LXX version Matthew here quotes" (see, France 2007:471).

¹⁸ ...In Mt. 12:18 the only agreements are where the Greek of the LXX is the obvious Greek equivalent to the MT (the wording agreements are: ὁ παῖς μου, μου, ἡ ψυχὴ μου, τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) (Nolland 2005).

mission achievement, “the wider earths are placed in a position that they might see and receive the “*mispat*,” the One God meant to be theirs...” (Boring 2001:362). Beuken (1972:1-30) further argues that the servant clearly has a task to the nations. Finally, the servant in Isaiah’s context is pictured as a loving and compassionate one who refuses to quarrel or to react furiously (Isaiah 42:2-3; cf. 53:1-12).

3.2.2. Isaiah 42:1-4 in light of Matthew 12:17-21

Matthew resumes the narrative, with Jesus’s withdrawing “...from their [Pharisees’] synagogue” (Matthew 12:15 cf. vs. 14; 22:15) because he knew that the Pharisees were plotting to kill him. Jesus customarily withdrew when confrontation became intense and the habit had become a model for his disciples, moving from place to place (Matthew 4:12; 14:13; 14:13; 15:21; 16:5; cf. 10:23). Yet Matthew adds a note: “many people followed him” (Matthew 12:15). In other words, Matthew perceives that Jesus’ departure was not unnoticed. This is important for two basic reasons: first, despite the religious leaders’ stern resistance, the masses acknowledge him as anointed Messiah and are therefore willing to follow (cf. Matthew 14:13; 21:8-12).

Second, it is known that Jesus intentionally embarks on any journey, at least in Matthew, which enables him to fulfil the prophecy and perfects the law (Matthew 4:13; 12:15-16). Thus he would be seen moving from place to place but consistently conducting his mission. He passionately served others – especially the weak, the needy and marginalized – and transformed their infirmity as the Messiah was expected to do (Matthew 12:15; cf. 1:21; 4:23-24; 9:35-36). It is interesting therefore, that neither warm hospitality nor a warning of hostility prevents him from accomplishing the commission for which he was set apart. For Gundry (1982:229) Jesus’ flight resulted in the continuation and extension of his ministry. In doing so, in Matthew 12:17 the evangelist underlines that the prophecy by Isaiah had become fulfilled (cf. Morris 1992:308). But how does Matthew reinterpret Isaiah’s servant prediction, to claim that the prophecy fits Jesus and not anyone else?

While there will not be one unanimous answer, in light of this study, the following reasons appear possible:

1. Matthew’s interpretation seems to be influenced by his encounters with the OT Scriptures (cf. Hays 2014:xi). The evangelist has already established himself as one who has a close affinity with Israel’s OT Scriptures. Some scholars, like Hill

(1972:214) and Gundry (1975:110-116), argue that Matthew's quotation contains mixed-text characters, which could be explained as Matthew's having used either various sources (like Mark and Q) or worked from a single source. Matthew's reinterpretation of those materials and his ability to match the findings with Jesus' life and ministry is, however, undeniable. His understanding of the OT Scriptures is affirmed by his using many quotations, including the so-called "fulfilment quotations" (Matthew 1:22-23; 2:16-17; 3:3; 4:6, 14-15; 8:16-17; 11:9; 12:18-21 and etc.)

2. Matthew presents Isaiah's "(suffering) Servant" as Jesus the Messiah. In verse 18 Matthew demonstrates that "Servant" can also mean "son" (Carson 1984:286), as one "... chosen... beloved..." in whom the sender is well pleased. This time Matthew not only echoes Isaiah's "Servant" but also his own previous reference. According to Matthew 3:17, a voice from heaven confirmed that Jesus was the Son of God in whom he [God] was well pleased. In my view, if we heed Matthew's presentation of the "Servant" we would be in a better position to understand who the servant is to whom both Isaiah and Matthew refer. But this does not mean everyone reads and interprets the term "Servant" in like manner. In any case, Matthew's repeating the similar issue twice in 3:17 and 12:18 have both positive and negative theological implications. Positively, first, the terms "beloved, chosen and ... pleased" demonstrate the intimacy between God the Father and the Son (Beaton 2000:142). Though like Moses and David in the OT (cf. Psalms 89:3; 105:26; 106:23), Jesus is the one marked by divine choice, his relationship cannot totally be governed by covenant promises – like between God and Israel; second, it provides another chance to those who want to repent and follow Jesus (Matthew 3:10-11; 12:15). Negatively however, it warns those who resist acknowledging that God is working in Jesus, who is imbued by the Holy Spirit (Matthew 3:10-11; 12:14).
3. Matthew explores the necessity of Jesus' being anointed by the "Spirit" and its purpose: "I will put my Spirit... and... proclaim justice to Gentiles" or "nations" (Matthew 12:19). Matthew uses the term "Spirit" interchangeably but consistently and consciously. Sometimes he does precede his reference to the Spirit with the adjective "Holy" – Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἅγιον) (Matthew 1:18, 20; 3:11; 12:32; 28:19). At other times he uses it with a possession marker "...of God" (πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ) – the Spirit of God or of your Father (Matthew 3:16; 10:20; 12:28). At other times he mentions it

together with the possessive pronoun “my” – my Spirit (Matthew 12:19). Otherwise he just writes it without any clear marker “Spirit” (Matthew 4:1; 26:4; 12:31).

The way Matthew demonstrates the “Holy” Spirit could be seen as part of his rhetorical persuasion. At the same time he does this in a way to infer that the meaning of the text relies not only on sentence construction but on the context too. This then, both in traditional and modern interpretations, seems the reason that context is assumed to be significant because arguably every text has a pretext or context. Moyise (2002:418) notes that “It [a text] can only be understood as part of a web or matrix of other texts, themselves only to be understood in the light of other texts.” Seen in Matthew’s context, maybe except for Matthew 26:41 which has remained disputable, the remaining references to the “Spirit” in the context convey his understanding of the Holy Spirit. In fact, Matthew has mentioned “spirit” on two other occasions (Matthew 5:3 and 22:43-44) and they refer to human spirit.

An important aspect of this study is to investigate Matthew’s presentation of the Holy Spirit in light of Jesus’ miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32. In this specific pericope (Matthew 12:18a) the evangelist maximizes the point, informing his readers about the Messiah’s endowment with the (Holy) Spirit. God puts his Spirit on him in whom he is well delighted. As Morris (1992:310) states, the Spirit is given to some extent to those who are called to serve God. In the case of Jesus the norm is taken a step further: Matthew envisages that the servant will have an especial endowment. In the baptismal episode the Messiah’s encounter with the Holy Spirit (Matthew 3:17) is followed by his temptation narrative (Matthew 4:1). Interestingly his overcoming the temptation in the wilderness was succeeded by teaching, preaching the Gospel of kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity (Matthew 4:23). In 12:18 Matthew follows a similar routine. Charette (2000:74) joins both Matthew 3:17 (see also 17:5) and 12:18: “The quotation thus indicates that the Messianic task which had been initiated at the baptism is now well under way.”

I am further convinced that the Messiah’s – the Servant in Isaiah 42:1-4 – endowment with the (Holy) Spirit is reflected both in his commission (purpose to accomplish) and his character. First, Matthew exhibits that Jesus was instilled with Spirit so that he would proclaim “justice” (Revised Standard Version (RSV) or “judgement” (King James Version (KJV) in fulfilling the commission toward the Gentiles (Matthew 12:19b). Second, the evangelist also discloses how the Messiah acts in the midst of hostile circumstances to reveal his character (Matthew 12:20-21).

Concerning the first, Morris (1992:310; see also, Goslinga 1986:279; Brown 1978:691)¹⁹, though he is a NT scholar, states that in the OT some people were endowed with the Spirit in order to achieve a certain purpose. For instance, the Spirit is said to have rushed on Judges like Gideon (Judges 6:34); Jephthah (Judges 11:29); Samson (Judges 14:6, 19; 15:14) and Kings Saul (1 Samuel 10:6; 11:6) and David at the time of their anointment (1 Samuel 16:13). The Spirit was endowed in and stirred judges to deliver Israel from oppression and thereby to give peace and security by enabling them to do mighty deeds²⁰. These individuals are believed to have experienced a sense of power and courage which would overturn the nightmare situation in which they and their people were.

Meantime, Matthew's references to *ruah* in the OT or *pneuma* in the NT senses reflect his engagement with different source materials, viz. Hebrew and LXX. This shows: (1), in most cases *pneuma* is the equivalent of *ruah* in Hebrew's MT text (Brown 1978:690); (2), both translations share one of the ideas behind *ruah* "the unusual fact that something as intangible as air should move that explicates "...the energy manifested by such movement" (Brown 1978:690; Louw and Nida (1988:141); (3), the power, invisibility and personality aspects constitute that the Holy Spirit is not simply an inanimate entity. Rather he is a living and life-giving power; (4) as a result, Matthew, though influenced by his OT Scripture reading, also shares aspects from Greek thinking²¹.

In the case of Saul and David, the Spirit was endowed to authorise their becoming kings of Israel (cf. Morris 1992:310). However, King Saul could not remain true to the Spirit and 1 Samuel's narrator remarks on the Spirit's departure from him and its replacement by an evil spirit (cf. Samuel 16:14, 15, 23; 18:10; 19:9). 1 Samuel relates the occurrence with Saul's failure to follow Samuel's instruction. Klein (1983:92) writes, "...the Spirit will induce Saul to prophecy with the band of prophets and he will be turned into a different sort of man" (1 Samuel 10:9 cf. Ezekiel 11:9; 18:31; 36:26). But he soon falls short of expectations. Cartledge (2001:203) adds, "Though the ruling king was unaware, the torch had been

¹⁹ ...It (Spirit) can come mightily up on a man...enabling him to perform some ecstatic, supernatural deeds... (Bower 1978:691)... he (Spirit) endowed him (Othniel) with gifts and ability that he would need to deliver Israel (see Goslinga 1986:279).

²⁰ Goslinga (1986:331) explains the way Gideon was approached or introduced by God's Spirit ahead of him into going the battlefield. The Hebrew, Goslinga says, literary means that the Spirit of the Lord "put Gideon on..."...The meaning is therefore, he claims, that the Spirit of the Lord entered into Gideon, filling him, and making him capable great deeds.

²¹ The Spirit of God, the Spirit of Lord (cf. Matthew 12:18 and Isaiah 42:1) (=God) (cf. LXX; TesSim 4:4; JosAs 8:11; ApcSed 14:6...see, Danker2000:834)

passed.” Cartledge’s “torch” here refers to Saul’s kingship right which had been given to David, following the departure of the Spirit (Samuel 18:10; 19:9).

David, one of the most prominent figures in the OT, had also experienced the encounter of the Spirit. The OT testifies that the Spirit of the Lord also came mightily upon him (1 Samuel 16:13). As Cartledge (2001:203) states, the Lord’s Spirit had come upon David and he would never be the same again. Approaching David from the Psalmist’s perspective reveals his sincere sensitivity and his plea to God not to remove the Spirit from him (Palms 51:11). Here the psalmist reflects on David’s transgression or equity and his deeper lamentation and confession of sin (traditionally believed to be adultery cf. 2 Samuel 12:1ff). Goldingay (2007:132-133) writes, “...The new plea presupposes that the person needs not only cleansing but also renewing.” According to the Psalmist’s description, David appeals to God first, to create or renew a right spirit (new consciousness) in him; and second, not to remove his Spirit (the Holy Spirit) from him which could result in his being cast out from the very presence of God²². David seems aware that the Spirit not only dwells temporarily but that the consequence of its departure, particularly because of any reproach, is simple and predictable. The psalmist probably knew this from Saul’s experience, how on the passing of God’s Spirit it was replaced by evil spirits (1 Samuel 18:10; 19:9).

The Hebrew writer admits that time would not let him tell of Gideon, Samuel and the prophets (Hebrew 11:32). The purpose and limit of this study does not allow exploring this theme further. Yet, what has been done as a sample has attempted to make the point that in the OT, the Spirit came upon someone to authorise her/his appointment, identify the role to be played and thereafter accompany the person toward a successful accomplishment of the task. Nonetheless, often the mission’s completion could hardly credit one for having an irreproachable personality. In other words, in the OT we do not find people, individually or collectively, who fulfil certain expectations without some failure in character. Whether judges or kings or prophets, none emerge completely blameless.

The Messiah alone had no problem in this regard; neither Isaiah the prophet nor Matthew the interpreter finds any reproach in him. Boring (2001:365) claims that “...the unusual character of the Spirit’s descent may well find its home in the mission of the servant in Isaiah, in which the Spirit’s endowment gives rise to behaviour not generally associated with kings or

²² See Goldingay (2007:134): the phrase “holy Spirit” occurs in the OT only here and in Isaiah 63:10-11... In this context, meaning in Psalms 51:11, however, it underlines the paradox of the fact that the Spirit of God or God’s awesome transcendent deity resides in a human being...

prophets.” In my view, one of the reasons is that the Holy Spirit accompanies almost all of the crucial events in Jesus’ life and ministry (see in Chapter Two of this study). Some may argue this is to read too much into the text, but as Thomas (1976:56) argues, “At each stage of His [Jesus's] earthly manifestation the Holy Spirit is associated with him...” For now, however, it suffices to see how the Messiah’s endowment with the (Holy) Spirit is displayed in his character.

The first characteristic note is that he, the Servant/Messiah, “...will not cry loud or wrangle...” (Matthew 12:19a; cf. Isaiah 42:2). Most Matthean scholars interpret the statement in a similar fashion, as can be seen in the following examples:

1. The picture is not a mere silence (because Jesus occasionally criticises the religious leaders: cf. Matthew 5:2; 23:1ff), but gentleness and humility (Carson 1984:286; Beale and Carson 2007:44; Morris 1992:311).
2. "He will not quarrel" means that his mission is one of peace (Morris 1992:311).
3. It refers to Jesus’ reluctance to engage in dispute with his Jewish adversaries “over his identity and authority” (Charette 2000:75).
4. Still, Jesus’ act replicates his refusal “to defend himself by political rhetoric” (Hare 1993:137; Keener 2014:77).
5. “Such a frenzied response to Jesus would clearly intensify Pharisaic opposition,” most importantly, ahead of the proper time (Turner 2008:315).

In sum, in certain circumstance the silence of Matthew’s Messiah or Isaiah’s Servant could reasonably represent all or most of these scholarly reflections. It also seems undeniable, in Matthew’s context however, that these characteristics potentially reflect not only the Messiah’s special identity and power but his mission, viz. salvation to all people, for which the Spirit endowed him (cf. Keener 2014:77).

Another aspect of the Messiah’s character is explicated in his attitude toward others – the downtrodden, wounded and broken (Matthew 12:20). In fact, Jesus often encountered intense and even potentially lethal opposition (Matthew 12:14; cf. 9:3, 34; 10:25; 22:15). Yet, as Matthew notes, he never ceases to speak and act compassionately for the welfare of those in need, whether material or spiritual (Matthew 4:13; 8:16, 17; 12:15-16; 11:5, 29). Both in his table fellowship with sinners (Matthew 9:11-13) and on the Sabbath controversy (Matthew 12:7), Jesus proves to the Pharisees how God values mercy more than sacrifice. Turner (2008:318) comments that “His ultimately victorious ministry will be characterized by

compassionate deeds rather than inflammatory words.” Therefore Matthew informs his reader that the Messiah, being imbued by the (Holy) Spirit, refuses to break a burnished reed or quench a smouldering wick (Matthew 12:20). By doing so, he assures that Jesus is the one in whom the Gentiles/nations will put their hope for justice and salvation (Matthew 12:18, 21). Despite Matthean scholars debate on whether Matthew means justice or judgement²³, the Messiah’s endowment with the Spirit and his refusal to condemn the weak (in whatever sense) are interconnected with the Gentiles’ mission in which the Holy Spirit participates (Matthew 12:18, 21; cf. 1:23; 28:18-19) .

3.2.3. Summary Note

In summary, Matthew’s citation of Isaiah 42:1-4 is important for this study in the following ways. First, as Davies and Allison (1991:324) state, Jesus is the unobtrusive servant of God upon whom God’s Spirit rests. Second, due to the Spirit’s enablement Jesus is shown to be gentle and compassionate in his ministry to the weak and marginalized (Turner 2008:316). Lastly, Jesus’ installation by God’s Spirit or the Holy Spirit is further manifested in the mission he accomplished and the character he displayed. Like the OT judges, kings and prophets through whom the Spirit had displayed mighty works, Jesus is seen to strive tirelessly to fulfil his mission. Unlike them, however, Jesus proves to be irreproachable in his person – he does what he says. Therefore, as most scholars agree, Matthew’s quotation was not selected accidentally; neither has he done it for a mere accumulation of prophecy fulfilment or for the sake of having a formula quotation. Rather Matthew, being highly influenced by his OT reading, applies Isaiah’s prophecy intelligently to Jesus the Messiah, who was baptized and is now imbued by the Holy Spirit (cf. Matthew 3:17; 12:18). In the assessment of Davies and Allison (1991:324) “Nothing is superfluous, everything fits (cf. Beale and Carson 2007:44).”

3.3. The Messiah Empowered by the Holy Spirit Matthew 12:22-28

Matthew proceeds without an explicit reference to the Holy Spirit in most of his narrative-discourses. To begin with, for example, in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7), where we observe collections of Kingdom-driven moral/ethical teachings, Matthew does not involve the Holy Spirit. And in Chapters 8-9 Matthew relates some of Jesus’s wondrous deeds with no reference to the Holy Spirit’s role. Matthew again goes without a single reference to the

²³ See Davies and Allison (1991:324).

Holy Spirit in Chapters 11: 1-30; 13:1-25ff: and 27:1-66 which may cover half of the Gospel materials.

Matthew 12:22-30 contains the third accusation which the Pharisees raised. As I stated earlier, the first Pharisaic accusation was based on Jesus's disciples picking the ears of grain on the Sabbath (12:1), whereas the second accusation targeted Jesus himself for healing on the Sabbath (12:9). In both scenarios Jesus responds positively; but the Pharisees' ignorance is reflected in their conspiring to murder Jesus, instead of a good deed (12:14). As a result, Jesus withdrew both from the grain field and their synagogue. Nonetheless, the Pharisees (or their representatives) would approach Jesus again with the same accusatory stance.

The story line of Matthew 12:22-30 exhibits three interconnected opinions which arose from what Jesus did to a demon-possessed blind and mute man (Matthew 12:23a). Unlike the previous incidents, Matthew avoids mentioning the identity of the demon-possessed man and where Jesus did this miracle. Instead, the Evangelist focuses on three outcomes of the episode, namely, the crowd's response (Matthew 12:23), the Pharisees' reaction (Matthew 12:24) and Jesus's interpretation and illustration of the Pharisees' reaction (Matthew 12:25-30)²⁴.

3.3.1. The Crowd's Response Matthew 12:22-23

Matthew narrates that the crowds reflect a sense of amazement (12:23), being speechless – ironically like the mute man, because Jesus had done something unique and unprecedented. But this is not the first time Matthew mentions the people's understanding and their emotional reaction. Matthew does this on a number of occasions, showing that the majority respond positively toward Jesus's teachings and deeds (Matthew 9:8; 33; 12:23 cf. 21:9). In fact, Matthew also remarks how Jesus continuously expresses his compassion and sensitivity toward the crowd. For instance:

1. the moral or ethical values around which the Sermon on the Mount is established speaks loudly for the community's good and their wellbeing (Matthew 5-7);
2. Jesus' teaching and healing were addressed to the crowds (Matthew 4:23-25; 9:38; 12:15, 16, 23; 20:29); Jesus's feeding the multitude in the wilderness confirms the same reality (Matthew 14:13-21);

²⁴ Davies and Allison (1991:334) classify Matthew 12:22-37 as the crowd's response to Jesus, the Pharisees' response to Jesus and Jesus' response to the Pharisees. Also see Turner's (2008:315) view; and others like Francis Wright Beare (1981:276).

3. Jesus' mission commission to Jews and Gentiles further encompasses his view on the majority (Matthew 10:5ff; 28:18-20); and
4. Jesus makes no secret of his love for his people in general, even on the way to death (Matthew 26:55). However, this does not suggest that the majority remain loyal to Jesus's teaching; hence they too are often caught rejecting Jesus (cf. Matthew 27: 17, 25).

On the other hand, the people seem unsure about the identity of the miracle doer (exorcist), but still for some reason, they associated him with David (Matthew 12:23b). Beare (1981:277) says, "Son of David is a favourite term of Matthew..." and Matthew makes around nine references to David. The occurrence, therefore, does not happen accidentally. For instance,

1. The genealogy narrative in Matthew begins with David, the royal covenant recipient_ and ends in Jesus's birth, promise fulfiller (Matthew 1:1; 20; cf. 2 Samuel 7:14; Matthew 5:17);
2. Those in need called Jesus to have mercy upon them in reference to David (Matthew 9:27; 15:22; 20:30);
3. Jesus further hints at the implication of David's calling him Lord (Matthew 22:43-45); and
4. The majority acclaims Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem as the honourable king like David (Matthew 21:9, 15). In short, most of these people have acknowledged that Jesus, the son of David, is the Messiah (Senior 1998:141).

In the same way, in Matthew 12:23b the crowd guesses that Jesus is no less than the Son of David. Smith (1989:164) suggests that "...that is a strong word and a sad word to the Pharisees." In like manner, according to France (2007:477), the Pharisees have known "the dangerous state of public response to Jesus, and decided to stamp on it before it is too late." All these observations imply that the people are awestruck, which really shakes the Pharisees' convictions. Furthermore, there may be some reasons behind the people's question whether Jesus can be the Son of David; and this in turn put forward the Evangelist's reinterpretation of the OT material.

One reason for their question is that the Hebrew Bible testifies that David himself was an exorcist (1 Samuel 16:23). If Jesus heals the mute person and restores his well-being by casting out a demon, like David, the crowd finds nothing wrong in associating him with their

ancestor. The kingdom of God or more specifically, the Messianic era comes to fulfilment in this. For another reason, exorcism was not a completely strange practice at the time of Jesus. Senior (1998:141) explains that the Jewish tradition believed that Solomon, son of David, was regarded as an exorcist who had exercised power over evil spirits. In case this appears an awkward experience to Matthew's reader, he intentionally warns by telling them that the "sons" of Pharisees are still interested in the practice (cf. Matthew 12:27). Unlike the Pharisees, the mass reaction signals that they have considered Jesus' act as one of the distinguishing features of the Messianic age. Thus it entails the restoration of mental, physical, spiritual peace and prosperity. Turner (2008:320) comments that the majorities' response stands to the contrary of the Pharisees' plan.

3.3.2. The Pharisees' Reaction Matthew 12:24

Contrary to the crowd, the Pharisees diligently denounce Jesus' act as unacceptable (Matthew 12:24). Logically, if the people's acknowledgement did not happen overnight, the Pharisees' refusal too was a process. It requires discussion and a decision to trap Jesus (Matthew 12:14; cf. 22:15; 27:20). The Pharisees had already withdrawn themselves from heeding what God was doing in Jesus through the Holy Spirit (Matthew 9:34; 10:25; 12:14). Possibly as a result of their malicious conviction, in Matthew 12:24 they attribute Jesus's casting out a demon and restoring the health of mute man to Beelzebub. In Turner's (2008:320) words, the Pharisees did not view Jesus' work as Messianic but as demonic.

By implication the Pharisees conclude that Jesus exercises power in league with Beelzebub. In effect this demonstrates that one can work miracles only with some sort of power, especially a supernatural power. In Matthew's context this could happen either in alliance with God (the most probable) or with Beelzebub or another demonic power (the least probable), but not both at the same time (Matthew 6:24 cf. 12:26). Therefore the only possible explanation they can offer to the crowd is Jesus' allegiance to Satan (Keener 1997:229). Martin and David (1997:1077) define "Satan" or "Beelzebub" as a "powerful, hostile, supernatural enemy of God. In the OT and NT Satan is regarded as the one who viciously works against God's purpose and who brings indictment or slanders (Job 1:6-8; Zechariah 3:1-2; 1 John 2:13, 14, 3:12; cf. Revelation 12 and 13). Thus equating the Messiah's miraculous deeds with the adversary of God means that the Pharisees wilfully decided to go into the opposite direction.

Matthean scholars propose different explanations on the conclusion drawn by the Jewish religious leaders. Turner (2008:320) claims, "They do not deny the reality of Jesus's miracles

but attribute them to Satan instead of God.” France (2007:475) shares a similar view: “...the Pharisees, unable to deny his power, questioning its source.”²⁵ Davies and Allison (1991:335) comment that “...what the Pharisees are interested in above all is keeping others from belief.” For Westerholm (2010:645) annoyed by the crowd’s suggestion, the Pharisees intentionally dismissed it and attributed Jesus’ miraculous deed to Beelzebub. The exorcist is not the Messiah, Son of David, nor is his power from God, not fulfiller of hopes for God’s burdened people “but an instrument of the arch-demon” (Beare 1981:276; Smith 1981:165). Hare’s (1993:138) impression is in accord with the above scholars.²⁶

In sum, the following points can be deduced. First, Jesus has really performed miracles and evoked both conviction and condemnation. Second, the crowd is astonished by the performance and wonder whether Jesus could be the Son of David. Third, as Turner and France note, the Pharisees, unable to deny the miracles, attribute Jesus’s power to Satan. Fourth, the Pharisees’ unbelief and tireless attempts to keep people from believing have established the very essence of their effort. Among the six woes which Jesus has pronounced upon these religious leaders in Matthew 23:13-30, Matthew interlocks one of the woes with the Pharisees’ driving intent: they strive to make disciples who will inherit hell instead of the kingdom of God (Matthew 23:15). Finally, neither the crowd’s suspense nor the Pharisees’ denial thwarts the Messiah’s mission. Regardless of the outward mixed responses, he perseveres, teaching, healing and exercising authority over human infirmity and satanic domains because he is empowered by the Holy Spirit.

3.3.3. The Messiah’s Response Matthew 12:25-30

Jesus’ response aims to allocate to the Pharisees where the reality of the power lies. Maybe for this very reason, Matthew allocates only two verses (Matthew 12:23, 24) to the other side of the arguments – the crowd’s amazement and the Pharisees’ annoyance – and emphasises Jesus’ explanation and illustration (Matthew 12:25-30). It has three implications. First, Jesus knew what the Pharisees were thinking (Matthew 12:25). Second, he hits back that the Pharisees’ argument lacks either logic or a practical perspective. And third, he hints at the significance of sensitivity and loyalty to biblical testimonies. The following discussion expands mainly on the second and third points.

²⁵ France (2007:475) further notes that the Pharisees’ accusation was meant to destroy Jesus’ credibility in the eyes of the God-fearing public.

²⁶ Hare (1993:138) explains that “Thus in Matthew’ it is fear that the masses will accept Jesus as their Messiah that provokes the blasphemous charge...”

Regarding the second case, the Pharisees accused Jesus of exploiting demonic power to drive out a demon (David and Allison 1991:337; Senior 1998:141). Jesus views this argument as both illogical and impractical (Matthew 12:25-26). Logically, if Jesus casts out a demon by the power of the demon, then Satan's kingdom can no longer be sustained. Another way to put this would be that any fatal division on large (like a kingdom) or in small (household or groups) scales would disrupt the success of a King or a householder. Far from gaining good things from a satanic source, the Jewish tradition believed that infirmity could be incurred because of demonic possession (Beare 1981:277). Furthermore, some background studies on the Mediterranean world show that "miracle workers were being accused of using their power to gain riches or to harm people" (Kolenkow 1976:105-110; Talbert 2010:154). Against this backdrop, Jesus' miraculous deeds aim to help others and far from longing for grandeur; he warns the beneficiaries not to publicise what he has done for them. So, since Satan never works against himself and the Pharisees did not accuse Jesus of the inappropriate use of power, their accusation clearly has no logical ground.

From the practical point of view, Jesus asks whether the Pharisees' own exorcists (whom Jesus calls "your sons") were empowered by Satan (Turner 2008:321). In reality this provides no good option either to them or their children or it would mean taking a stand against their own exorcists (Westerholm 2010:643; Senior 1998:141). Likewise, if the Pharisees have exorcists whom themselves are recognised as loyal Jews, they could only attribute the divine power working in Jesus to be demonic. Again, practically it remains hard to draw two unparalleled conclusions from comparable convictions. But Jesus extends his argumentation from logical and practical touch lines to a more solid Scriptural reality. And it is here that Jesus publically reveals the secret behinds his miraculous performances.

Refuting the accusation and denying being in league with Satan (Matthew 12:25-27), Jesus uncovers the source of his power, viz. the power of the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:27). In the development of Matthew's Gospel narrative this is the first overt statement of this fact. This relationship between Jesus and the Holy Spirit underlines Matthew's understanding of the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus's miraculous ministry. Jesus' apologetic explanation in Matthew 12:27 is that he certainly does miracles by the Holy Spirit in Matthew 12:22 cf. 12:18; 3:17. The question therefore is whether it is possible or not to incorporating the reference in 12:27 with other miraculous accounts in Matthew's Gospel.

Admitting the difficulty, this study endeavours to argue for the appropriateness of corroborating other miraculous deeds in Matthew's Gospel with what Jesus has said in Matthew 12:27. From the vantage point of this study, the following two arguments support this position.

The first takes heed of what has been done in the previous chapters of this study. Especially in Chapter Two, the researcher attempted to indicate how the Holy Spirit accompanied Jesus in most crucial aspects of his life and ministry. The chapter indicated that the Holy Spirit had played a dynamic role in Jesus' conception, temptation, mission and ministry. Thus one can argue with Turner (2008:321) and Wenham and Blomberg (1986:361-400), that the Holy Spirit has been "empowering [Jesus] for ministry since his baptism in fulfilment of Isaiah 42:1." Matthew's reflecting on the role of the Holy Spirit here in Matthew 12 therefore does not happen accidentally. Rather it is part of his narrative development.

The second argument prompts us to explore Matthew 8:3; 9:34 and 10:25 and other related passages in line with 12:22-27. Some Matthean scholars like Davies and Allison and France, propose a somewhat contentious interpretation. For Davies and Allison (1991:334) the reason for Matthew's addition of the reference to a blinded man is unclear. It is not clear whether he desires to repeat the parallel in 9:27-31 or prepare for 20:29-34. They also question whether Matthew simply wants to create some distance between 12:22-24 and its doublet in 9:32-34. Davies and Allison take this last option to be more plausible.

As these scholars have recognised, Matthew may use the blind man's story either to tell parallel episodes or to prepare for an upcoming one in 20:29-34. Nevertheless, Davies and Allison do not directly address whether Jesus did these miracles by the power of the Holy Spirit or not.

By contrast, France (2007:476-479) begins from the conviction that the Pharisees' accusation was malicious because at the end it stands against the Holy Spirit, by whose authority Jesus acts. Second, France considers Jesus as a known exorcist and physical healer. According to France's assessment, Matthew consistently reports some of the exorcisms in the ministry of Jesus and his disciples. In the previous encounters Matthew annotates the summary of Jesus's exorcism in 4:24; 8:16; 10:1; 8:28-34 and 9:32-34. After Chapter 12, Matthew follows the same routine (Matthew 15:2-28; 17:14-20 and 20:29-34). Third, most directly applicable to this study, France (2007:477) argues that "The present case is therefore representative of a recognized aspect of Jesus' ministry..." Thus in reference to France, I want to reflect further

on some common elements found between Matthew 12:22-27 and other miraculous accounts, to find the matrix which fixes the role of the Holy Spirit in Jesus's miraculous ministry.

1. As was true with Jesus' teaching, the crowds were both companions of and beneficiaries from his miraculous deeds in Matthew's Gospel. As France (2007:478) notes, in most exorcism and healing narratives Matthew reports that the people's feedback was constructive. That they really put faith in Jesus seems disputed, but the Evangelist's occasional positive portrayal of the majority's response reinforces the impression. In any case, people had followed Jesus and been affected by his preaching, teaching and miracles (see Matthew 4:24-25; 9:35 cf. 12:23).
2. The crowds did not only accompany and benefit from Jesus' acts by the power of the Holy Spirit passively but they demonstrate also their perception actively. They were: "...astonished" (Carson 1984:287; France 2007:477), "...in stark" (Turner 2008:320; Westerholm 2010:643) and "...wonder" (Senior 1998:141; Smith 1989:164) and they see him as the Messiah. France (2007:477) suggests, "They were beginning to draw the conclusion which Jesus had expected John the Baptist to draw from his miracles" (Matthew 11:2-6). What stimulates them the most is that Jesus has been teaching and doing miracles with an authority unparalleled by his contemporaries (Matthew 9:8, 33; 12:23a). Then it suffices to say, among other things, the secret behind Jesus' unparalleled miraculous deeds is found in his empowerment by the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:28 cf. 12:18; 3:17).
3. In most of these scenarios, the Pharisees endeavour to downplay both Jesus' action and people's reaction. They say, "This is blasphemous talk" (Matthew 9:3); "...He casts out demon by the prince of demons" (Matthew 9:34; 12:24); "they plot to kill him" (Matthew 12:14) and finally "Then the Pharisees went and took counsel how to entangle him in his talk" (Matthew 22:15). In my view, this textual and contextual interconnection was meant to provide an interpretative key which unlocks the writer's rhetorical skill and accelerates the reader's imagination.
4. The terminology Jesus uses and the feeling he demonstrates towards the Pharisees forces the reader to assume, like France, that Matthew 12:22-32 is a representative of other accounts. These include Jesus' foreknowledge: "But Jesus knowing their thought..." (Matthew 9:5; 12:25) and "But Jesus knew of this [the Pharisees' plot to kill him] and left the place" (Matthew 12:15). Moreover, Jesus warns his disciples to expect even worse opposition from their religious leaders. He frankly puts this in

comparison saying, “If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more malign those of his household” (Matthew 10:25).

Here Jesus does not seem to prophesy only that the disciples’ future hold has no relevance to their current situation. He is indeed describing their present circumstances. The following support this interpretation. First, in the narrow context (Matthew 10:5-23), while sending the disciples on their mission, Jesus cautions them about hostile receptions and persecution. But he promises that the “Father’s Spirit” or the “Holy Spirit” will accompany them. Jesus’ speech in Matthew 10:24-25 could suggest either that he had heard of or had already experienced some sort of hostility from the Pharisees. In the broader context, however, Jesus knew what the Pharisees were planning to accomplish (Matthew 10:25 cf. 12:24). Taken together, Jesus was not only aware of the Pharisees negative reaction toward his miraculous ministry: he also states that the Holy Spirit will accompany his disciples’ in their missionary journey.

5. From the OT point of view, the dialogue between the prophet Elijah and his disciple Elisha in power retention suggest the possibility of cooperation (2 Kings 2:9-15). At the verge of Elijah’s departure and Elisha’s succession, the former asks the latter, whether he opts to request something ahead of his ascension. Elisha immediately asks for a “double share of Elijah’s Spirit.” According to Deuteronomy 21:15-17, “double share” is one more portion than is normally distributed (cf. Brueggeman 2000:295). Elisha’s request is bold and quick but Elijah was uncertain whether his disciple would be honoured in getting what he long for; because “he is not the one to assign” (Brueggeman 2000:295). At the end of the story, however, the narrator of 2 Kings tells his reader that Elisha was granted with the “Spirit of Elijah” (2 Kings 2:15). In my view, the “Spirit of Elijah” refers the divine Spirit rather than a human spirit. But what do Matthew 12:27 and 2 Kings 2:9 and 15 have in common?

First, Elijah’s spirit refers to the entity with which he was installed and which empowers him, God’s Spirit in the OT sense (cf. Choon-Leong Seow 1999:176). *Second*, the incident underscores the charismatic nature of the prophetic ministry (Hobbs 1985:27). *Third*, like Jesus’ miraculous ministry in Matthew’s Gospel, those who observed Elijah and Elisha doing wonders were profoundly astonished (1 Kings 18; 2 Kings 3; 4 and 6). *Finally*, I regard that 2 Kings 2:9 and 15 attest that Elijah and Elisha had performed miracles because of this divine Spirit. Otherwise their act would be exposed to various imaginations. Therefore, the Spirit of God was behind these

prophets' miraculous phenomenon although it was mentioned only in a couple of verses.

Then, if Jesus performs miracles by God's Spirit, not only is the Pharisaic logic irrational but also importantly, the kingdom of God, has drawn near (Matthew 12:28). Truly then the presence of God's kingdom is now operative in their midst with the miracle-working power, the Holy Spirit. Smith (1998:165) notes that "... if Satan is suffering defeat, only one power can be credited... the kingdom of God." Thus making the right choice is therefore wisdom. Westerholm (2010:643) claims, "To oppose this work of Jesus – indeed, even to fail to align oneself with it – is to side with the powers of evil." This is true because, as Montague (1976:306) writes, "The point for Matthew's church thus seems to be: healing and exorcisms done by the Spirit of God are signs of the in breaking of God's kingdom."

Jesus illustrates the surpassing of this power and the arrival of the kingdom of God using a parable of tying the "strong man" and plundering his goods (Matthew 12:29). However, the identity of the strong man raises question among Matthean scholars. Three prominent interpretations exist. Scholars like Gundry (1994:236) and Senior (1998:142) interpret the "strong man" as Jesus himself. Others like Carson (1984:290), Turner (2008:321), France (2007:480) and Hare (1993:140); just to mention a few, view the "strong man" to be Satan. And finally, Filson (1977:150) has considered the strong one to be "the Holy Spirit, by whose power Jesus expels the demons."

This study goes with the second interpretation for the following reasons. *First*, Jesus is not simply a strong man, otherwise the majority, including demons, would not be astonished in Jesus' teaching and miracles (Matthew 7:28; 8:31; 9:33 and 15:31). *Second*, as Gundry (1994:236) himself puts it, John the Baptist acclaims that Jesus is the "stronger" one who will baptise both with fire and Spirit (Matthew 3:11). However, Matthew 12:29 reminds us that it is the strong man's power and his household which fall in danger at the arrival of a more powerful or "stronger" man. Turner (2008:221) writes, "His preaching, teaching and miraculous deeds have been encroaching upon Satan's territory." *Third*, in being empowered by the Holy Spirit (Morris 1992:336), Jesus has engaged in setting free people from Satan's, the strong man, captivity and from other infirmities. *Fourth*, Jesus expels the demons by the power of the Holy Spirit as Filson claims above; but the comparison was made between Jesus and Satan, not between the Holy Spirit and evil spirits or demons. *Finally*, in the OT, the Exodus narrative resembles the imagery of tying up the "strong man", Pharaoh, and releasing

the captives, the Israelites (Exodus 5-15). The prophet Isaiah uses similar symbolic language to portray God's rescuing of his people from their oppressors (Isaiah 49:24-25).

3.3.4. Summary Note

In summary, Matthew 12:22-30 restates an extended and intensified conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. In the earlier discussions these Jewish religious leaders depicted themselves as protectors of the law and attempted to prove that Jesus was working against it (Matthew 12:1-14). Jesus in turn showed that enriching people's lives or doing good deeds is more a moral than a ritual performance. In the midst of the narrative Matthew inserts Jesus' imbuelement with the Holy Spirit which was manifested in his accomplished mission and character formation. The current conflict in Matthew 12:22-30 happens because of Jesus doing miracles being empowered by the Holy Spirit.

In this passage Jesus has freed a blind, demon-possessed man and restored his well-being. The event elicits a mixed response among the members of the audience. On the one hand, the crowds are wordless with astonishment. On the other, the Pharisees contemptuously dismiss Jesus's miraculous act and accuse him of being in league with Satan. Finally, Jesus contests the Pharisees accusation and confirms that he is doing miracles by the power of the Holy Spirit. This signals the advent of God's kingdom.

3.4. The Messiah Defends the Holy Spirit

3.4.1. The Term Blasphemy

Silva (2014:515) writes that the term blasphemy is often used in Greek, meaning, "...slandorous language that defames or damages someone else's reputation." Blasphemy thus refers to injurious speech or ill-speaking which defiles or damages someone's reputation or identity. Important to this thesis, therefore, both the Pharisees and Jesus were aware and sensitive of such speech or acts. The Jewish religious leaders often accuse Jesus and hold him accountable for blasphemous thoughts and deeds (Matthew 9:3, 34; 10:25; 12:24; 26:65). Jesus on his part, admits that any sin, even a sin against him, will be pardoned, but he warns the Pharisees (Matthew 12:31-32) for their "misrepresenting faith in God as faith in the devil" (Silva 2014:517).

Jesus and the Pharisees thus have one view in common on the matter; that blasphemy goes against someone and not something. In the context of Matthew, the Pharisees' speech is clearly a defamation of the Holy Spirit's identity and status. Silva (2014:517) notes that the

issue of unforgivable sin “has been the subject of much questions.” At the outset, the focus of this study, therefore, is not to provide an optimum answer on what constitute the so-called unforgivable sin. Neither it intend to address the whole semantic field of the term “blasphemy”; like the interpretation of “the Son of Man” and Jesus’ speech in regarding sins²⁷ (cf. Davies and Allison 1991:344-349). Rather it aims to investigate how intentionally working, speaking or rejecting God’s working in Christ through the manifestation of the Holy Spirit becomes a serious matter²⁸.

3.4.2. The Consequence of Blasphemy

This study has raised the issue of why Jesus became provocative toward the Jewish religious leaders (Matthew 12:31-32). Thus it seems proper to mention some of the key points from the previous discussions. The task has a dual purpose: on the one hand, it would clue the reasons behind Jesus’ provocativeness and; on the other hand, it would suggest the way Jesus defends who the Holy Spirit is.

1. Matthew’s reader cannot disregard the work of the Holy Spirit in Jesus’ life and ministry. In fact as Montague (1976:304; cf. Hawthorne 1991:53-56; Hare 1993:138) notes, “It causes Matthew no embarrassment to present Jesus in his traditional relationship to the Spirit.” According to Matthew, along with the Synoptic Gospels’ tradition, Jesus was conceived by the Holy Spirit²⁹ (Matthew 1:18,) and identified as the one who would baptise with the Holy Spirit and fire (3:11). The Messiah was initiated by the Holy Spirit and led into the wilderness by the Spirit to be tempted by the devil (cf. Matthew 3:16-17; 4:1).
2. In Matthew’s narrative development the Holy Spirit does not only take the initiative but rather accompanies Jesus throughout his ministry. Montague (1976:304) rightly says, “Matthew presents Jesus’s ministry not only as preaching and teaching but also healing and delivering.” Thus, at least in the latter case, there could be little doubt that the Holy Spirit plays a decisive role in the ministry of Jesus (Matthew 4:23; 9:35).

²⁷ According to Davies and Allison (1991:347) there are three types of interpretations which Matthean scholars have been following. See also Turner’s (2008:323-324) conclusion.

²⁸ Silva (2014:517) saw the act as declaring war on God.

²⁹ Hawthorne (1991:66) sees that “the Spirit of God who in the beginning was present in order to bring the first creation into existence (Genesis 1:2) is the same Spirit who comes once again to bring the new creation into being in the conception of Jesus.” This implies that “...the Holy Spirit was the energizing factor by which Jesus was conceived within the virgin-womb of Mary; the Holy Spirit was the divine creative element by which the fashioning of Jesus’ humanity was begun.”

Otherwise, Jesus would hardly state that he is casting out demons by the Spirit of God³⁰ (Matthew 12:27).

3. Especially in 12:15-30 Matthew makes plain that Jesus, as anointed Messiah, was imbued and empowered by the Spirit of God or the Holy Spirit, a fact which is in line with Matthew 3:16-17 and 17:5; cf. 12:18.
4. In almost all their encounters with Jesus, the Pharisees openly doubt and disregard what Jesus is doing, but they evidently plan to destroy him (Matthew 9:34; 10:25; 12:14). Their conclusion in Matthew 12:24, attributing God's power to a demon, proves their wilful and persistent resistance. Specifically, they refuse to acknowledge the arrival of God's kingdom which is now manifested in their midst through Jesus' miraculous deeds (Matthew 12:28). In fact, Dunn (1998:140) claims where the kingdom of God is to be found: it is not where Jesus is, but rather where the Spirit is. Hare (1993:139) also affirms that "...the kingdom of God has been inaugurated in the Spirit-empowered ministry of Jesus."
5. In contrast to the Pharisees' the amazed crowds' muse on whether this man could be the son of David (Matthew 12:23 cf. 9:8, 33; 21:9). Davies (1993:95) suggests that the crowd's response is positive, "...to which the reader is encouraged to answer yes." In Matthew's presentation even "demons" recognized Jesus in his relation to God (Matthew 8:29).
6. Jesus reveals the source of power as the Spirit of God (see, the Messiah's response in Chapter Three under 3.3.3). Having defended himself, Jesus pursues the Pharisees charge as being illogical and impractical. It is thus fitting both logically and theologically that Jesus associates the miraculous deeds with his relation to the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:28-30), and he proceeds, "...with a number of warnings to the Pharisees" (Meier 1980:135-136).

Meier points out that Jesus' speech in Matthew 12:31-32 carries three interrelated cautions. First referring to Matthew 9:36 Meier notes that Jesus warns that those who reject him will be scattered and lost. In Meier's (1980:135) own words, "To refuse to decide positively for Jesus is already to have decided against him..." Second, in the context of Matthew 12:31-32,

³⁰ Dunn (1975:44) says Matthew 12:27 makes one of at least two references in which Jesus refers directly to his cure...in both cases, (see Matthew 12:27 and Luke 11:19f; cf. Mark 3:28f) he seems to give some explanation for his success as an exorcist, no doubt because of the Holy Spirit.

Jesus's warning goes with the reference to the unforgivable sin³¹. Here Meier (1980:135) states the reason why the act of blasphemy could be serious: "Since the Holy Spirit is the source of repentance and forgiveness, to blaspheme the Holy Spirit and to reject his clear operations within one's range of experience is to close off from all hope of salvation." Third, Jesus warns that the Pharisees' resolute act is a clear manifestation of who they are. In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus had taught the identification of a tree by its fruit (Matthew 7:16-20 cf. 12:33-34), and he applies similar terminology right after the pronouncement against a blasphemous act (Matthew 12:33-37). By implication the Pharisees' rejection of the Holy Spirit in whose power Jesus casts out demons or does miracles, reveals their natural convictions.

The act of blasphemy and its consequences were not unfamiliar to ancient Israel. In providing Jesus' emotion and position on the Pharisees' blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, Matthew seems to be echoing the OT Scriptures intentionally. Leviticus 24:10-23 and Numbers 15:30-31 warn Israelites and their allies not to make any injurious speech against God.

Maintaining a proper relationship with God, usually via the sacrificial systems, is pivotal in Leviticus. One epic sin which pollutes that relationship and would lead the subject into grave danger is blasphemy. Leviticus 24:10-23 carries the overall notion of such sacrilege. In this passage, however, the identity of the blasphemer and the consequences of blasphemy are specified more clearly than the specific terminologies or manner by which the man cursed God. Some OT commentators, like Milgrom (2004:292) and Gaebelien (1990:631) stated that whether the man in Leviticus 24:10-23 curse God in private or public, and how he did this was unclear³².

If Leviticus strives to preserve the right association with God, the book of Numbers in general resonates with all sorts of improper actions and their consequences. Specifically Numbers 15:30-31 comprises the impression of "reproaching the Lord" and "despising the Word of the Lord". The narrator of Numbers calls it "a definite" or "an intentional" sin which

³¹ For Hill (1972:218) "The unforgivable 'the blasphemy against the Spirit' is the affirmation that the divine presence and power which inspires the work of Jesus is demonic." And Hill believes that this to be the correct interpretation in the context.

³² Like Balaam in Numbers 22-24, the man may have engaged in some curse precedents....it may have been an angry cursing of Israelite man and his God (Gaebelien 1990:631); Presumably, the name of God would be used, and one would say something like "may God be damned." This could be done either privately or publicly, or, in the context of Leviticus, both. In any case, the outcome is the same (Milgrom 2004:292).

could be done not by lack of knowledge or ignorance³³. Interestingly in Numbers the blasphemer is held accountable for despising both the name of the Lord and the Word of the Lord.

These two biblical texts, Leviticus and Numbers, share certain elements. The first one is context: the Exodus event and the wilderness wandering. The former narrative echoes all the mighty deeds or miracles of the divine which climaxed in instituting the law and granting the covenant in Sinai. The latter narrates all the divine disciplinary reactions to the Israelites' unfaithfulness. Second, the act and consequence of blasphemy is inclusive, applying both to native Israelites and alien sojourners (Numbers 15:29). By implication, the act of execution shows that Israelites and Gentiles alike, who enjoy God's miraculous deliverance from the Egyptian captivity and other subsequent forms of divine protection and provision must be held accountable. Third, the issue is not all about the manner (private or public) in which the act of blasphemy was performed, but concerns the motive: intentionally failing to heed what the Lord has done or said. Last, Matthew's allusions indicate his purpose as follows.

First, neither the Pharisees nor their OT precursors had disappointed God because of their ignorance. Rather, they saw and experienced God's salvific intervention in and through his agents, Jesus and Moses respectively. Unfortunately they wilfully and knowingly blaspheme God's name and his restoring acts. Second, blasphemy, already considered as unpardonable sin, holds accountable both Jews and Gentiles. On the one hand, it exposes what the Pharisees' destiny will look like. On the other hand, however, it is also applicable to Matthew's Jewish and Gentile congregations and it advises them not to risk the penalty. Lastly, in the OT, Moses ordered all Israelites to stone anyone who blasphemed the Lord and his Word (Leviticus 24:10-23; Numbers 15:30-31). In the NT, Jesus holds the Pharisees accountable for blaspheming the Holy Spirit (Matthew 12:31-32). Jesus thus puts the "Lord" and the "Holy Spirit" on a similar level. Walter (1990:125-126) is on the right track when he associates Numbers 15:30-31 and Matthew 12:31-32. Speaking against the Holy Spirit is no less than speaking against God. It amounts to consciously provoking God and his agent.

³³ The Hebrew idiom is "sin with a high hand," indicating a posture of arrogance, blasphemy, and revolt. Its punishment is death. Such a person is gone! (Gaebelein 1990:830). In the journal *"Toward Recovering the Old Testament"* Walter (1990:125-126) also associates this passage with Matthew 12:31-32 and sees the act as unpardonable sin.

3.4.3. Summary Note

Defined as injurious speech against a deity or lack of reverence, blasphemy is known to both OT and NT readers. The object of blasphemy, determined by the context, is the divine God/Spirit and his status which does nothing with impersonal object. In the context of Matthew 12:31-32 and his OT citations, the one who is blasphemed is the Holy Spirit and the Lord respectively. Though the issue of unpardonable sin is far from being exhausted among the scholars, Matthew presents the slander of the Holy Spirit as an intentional sin. Thus Jesus' emotional speech seems justifiable from what he has been doing (cf. Matthew 12:1-31) and the way the Pharisees are reacting (cf. Matthew 9:34; 10:25; 12:14, 24). The Israelites were told to stone one who slanders God and Jesus assures the Pharisees to expect something parallel. In the OT, those who had experienced God's protection and provision, but courageously opted to curse God were liable to divine judgement. In like manner, those who wilfully resist and transfer the scatological work of the Holy Spirit in Jesus, to a demon, will forfeit their right to God's salvific agenda (Matthew 12:32).

Finally, Jesus underscores the seriousness of the issue in Matthew 12:33-45. The parables of "tree" and "treasure" (Matthew 12:33-37) suggest that a fruit resembles the tree and one's thought or action accords with her/his inner personality. As a result, (1) Jesus refuses to give additional signs (12:38-40); (2) he states that responsiveness to divine actions is the way to escape divine judgement (Matthew 12:41-42); (3) meanwhile he declares that his value is above that of Solomon and the Temple; and (4) he compares the Pharisees and their scribes with a wicked generation. In the context of Matthew 12, one of the signs of this wicked generation could be unbelief and thereafter refusal to accept the scatological working power of the Holy Spirit.

Chapter 4: Conclusion and Contribution to contemporary Matthean Studies

4.1. Conclusion

It was just after the advent of modern studies that the dominance of Matthew's Gospel over other Synoptic Gospels started to be questioned, in favour of Mark. It is not just Matthew as a whole that received less attention than in the past. But the role of the Holy Spirit in Matthew's Gospel in general and in 12:15-32 in particular, has received little scholastic attention. Behind this neglect there seems to be a consensus on the Christological dominance due to the Evangelist's infrequent use of the term Holy Spirit. This study, using Hays' "reading backward," though not in an exclusive sense, therefore propose to contribute towards such theological and practical gaps.

Pivotal to this thesis, therefore, is Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit in line with Jesus' miraculous ministry in Matthew 12:15-32 through intertextual references, intended to complete two separate but related issues. First, the researcher investigated the pneumatological texts in Matthew which appear before and after Matthew 12:15-32; and secondly, the researcher dealt with Matthew 12:15-32 in light of the broader and narrower contexts and Matthew's OT allusions or direct quotations.

Regarding the first, Matthew does mention, though infrequently, the "Holy Spirit" or just the "Spirit," with or without an adjective in a number of occasions. In Matthew's narrative development, those pneumatic references occur in very decisive settings. To be specific:

1. The Evangelist has already introduced his readers to something theologically or culturally strange, viz. the inclusion of Gentile (profaned) matriarchs (cf. Matthew 1:2-6). Ironically, he does this to suggest something even stranger: God becoming human and drawing near to humanity for greater significance, to save humanity. In theological language the act of God becoming human is called "incarnation." Interestingly, Matthew never hesitates to ascertain that the Holy Spirit is the sole agent who enables such a divine becoming human (Matthew 1:18-20). It thus appears that if God has fully revealed himself through Jesus Christ's incarnation, there could have been no incarnation without the Holy Spirit's intervention.
2. Following the Baptist's prophecy that the Messiah himself would baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire and Jesus' coming out of the water, God's Spirit descends upon

him (Matthew 3:11, 17). God already convinced Jesus' parents, Mary and Joseph, that the baby's conception and birth will be by the Holy Spirit; Jesus' baptism by John the Baptist in Jordan River would accomplish the same purpose on a regional or national level. The Holy Spirit who facilitates Jesus' incarnation now also accompanies him in his identification with the people and with his purpose. If one takes Jesus' temptation narrative in Matthew 4:1 as a continuation of the baptismal testimony in 3:17, obviously the same Spirit takes the lead and secures the victory. This incident can rightly be viewed as occurring at the level of the spiritual realm. Jesus' family, Israel as a nation and other creations, angelic and demonic as well, became aware that the God of Abraham and David had decided to reveal Himself in Jesus through the Holy Spirit.

3. The final references, in preceding and succeeding chapters, appear in relation to Jesus' commissioning his disciples to evangelize Israel and the Gentiles respectively (Matthew 10:20 and 28:18-19). In 10:20 Jesus addresses his disciples, predicting and warning them that both frightening and encouraging situations await them in their mission. Thus negatively, they will be persecuted by their fellow Jews, most probably by Jewish religious leaders. Positively, the Father's Spirit will accompany them in assisting, enabling and speaking through them or on their behalf.

The study noted that the first chapter of the First Gospel is important for different reasons, one of which is associating Jesus with sinners, women and marginalized people. Likewise, Matthew 28 in general and 20:18-20 in particular are crucial: for one reason, the scene is decorated with the insertion of women, as it is in Matthew 1; and Jesus commissioned his disciples to preach, teach and make disciples in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. In short, in the first three pneumatic references (Matthew 1:18-20, 3:11, 17 and 4:1) Matthew reminds his reader what the Holy Spirit has done to Jesus, whereas in the second two references (Matthew 10:20 and 28:18-19) he presents the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus' disciples, the Jewish and the Gentile mission. It is thus the researcher's position that the Holy Spirit plays a critical role in Jesus' trial (Matthew 26:41).

Matthew 12:1-30 generally narrates the conflict which occurred between the Pharisees and Jesus. In this narrative the Pharisees make two separate but related cases as the crux of the conflict. First, they attempt to accuse Jesus of breaching one of the most pertinent Jewish identity markers, the Sabbath (Matthew 12:1-14). In response Jesus simply explains how he is acting in accord with the Scriptures, and he criticizes them for being inconsistent. In Jesus'

criticism the Pharisees' mere ritualism is disclosed in being insensitive toward their fellow Jews, as they did for their property. Jesus draws a three-point conclusion: (1) the Scripture is more flexible than they think; (2) God prefers and appreciates mercy rather than mere ritualistic performances; (3) regardless of the specific day, doing good to save human life is permissible. Taken together, Jesus should have been appreciated instead of accused, but the religious leaders decide to go in the opposite direction – they plot to kill Jesus (Matthew 12:14).

Second, the Pharisees downplay Jesus' miracles by God's Spirit and instead accuse him of using demonic power to cast out a demon. In Matthew 12:27 Jesus takes a counter-action which ascertains the Pharisees are too late to make such a claim. For one reason, they have seen or, at least, heard that he was accompanied by the Holy Spirit at his baptism. This also happened just as the confirmation of John the Baptist's testimony (Matthew 12:11, 16-17). In fact, the incident can be further connected with Jesus' conception, temptation narrative and other miraculous deeds in Matthew. Furthermore, Matthew quotes Isaiah 42:1-4 and corroborates its fundamentals with Messianic expectations and fulfilment, which includes the Messiah's imbuelement and empowerment by the Holy Spirit and his acts of restoring the well-being of his community. Jesus manifested such notions on several occasions (see Matthew 4:23; 9:35; 12:15-16). This, Jesus doing miracles by the power of God's Spirit, in turn realizes the advent of God's kingdom in their midst.

Finally, Matthew, whose interpretation of the Gospel materials is highly shaped by his OT reading, presents Jesus' miraculous ministry in conjunction with the Holy Spirit. Thus the Messiah was conceived, baptized, overcame temptation and did miracles by/through the Holy Spirit. The Pharisees however persevere in resisting and Jesus is thus given no second chance. Their actions are blasphemy, an injurious speech, or a willful thought and an act against God the Holy Spirit.

4.2. Contribution to contemporary Matthean Study

This study has contributed the following to the study of Matthew.

First, Matthew and his community are both well aware of the Holy Spirit and the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to Jesus. The matter does not merely seem, therefore, all about Jesus and Jesus only, as Kingsbury (1998:32 cf. Luz 1998:172) suggests. Neither the Jews nor the Gentile Christians expect a Spiritless Messiah who would inaugurate a Spiritless kingdom

(cf. Dunn 1998:140). Whatever interpretation should be given to Matthew's regard for the Holy Spirit, the Evangelist establishes a strong connection between Jesus and the Holy Spirit. Although the Christological dominance is undeniable in Matthew's Gospel, this should not be an excuse not to appreciate and experience the way in which the Holy Spirit is presented in Matthew's Gospel (cf. Badcock 1997:22-23; cf. Keener 2009:716).

Second, in pneumatological studies differentiating between the divine and human Spirits is one of the challenges. In Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit, however, this does not seem to be challenging. Despite their numerical scarcity, almost all his references point toward the divine Spirit or the Holy Spirit. Matthew unambiguously refers to the human spirit only twice in 5:3 and 22:44. On the one hand, this implies any conscious injurious speech against the Holy Spirit holds the conspirator accountable, as it did the Pharisees. On the other hand, it demands that the reader of Matthew's Gospel honour and worship the Holy Spirit in the same manner like God the Father and the Son. This also means that studying and reflecting on the matters of the Holy Spirit is not an assignment for Pentecostals alone, but should be a task to all Matthean scholars and its ordinary readers as well. For my part, though I am not from a Pentecostal background, I harbour two great concerns towards the Western theological orientation and the African pneumatological experience.

In the West, following the reason-driven and industry-based revolution of the 18th century; theological thinking and reflection shifted from how to practice to how to know. The Enlightenment remained happy in promoting an objective reason which discourages any subjective experience (cf. Powell 2009:5; Frei 1974:1). As a result, in most of the Western world the Holy Spirit and issues related to him have encountered either a lack of interest or negligence because, among other things, looking for an objective reason tempt to resist or neglect any religious and individual experiences (cf. Badcock 1997:257). The situation is worse in Africa. Being traditional in most aspects of Christian life, getting in touch with something advantageous here and now is highly welcomed, often without reason or experimentation. In the context of our discussion, those who considered themselves empowered by the Holy Spirit might be misusing or abusing not only the spiritual gift but the Spirit himself. Therefore the bold claim I want to make is that the Holy Spirit is the least appreciated person in the West and the most manipulated person in Africa. The Evangelist's presentation of the Holy Spirit, in Matthew's Gospel in general and in 12:15-32 in particular in relation to Jesus's miraculous ministry, would suggest that having a balanced understanding of the solution between pneumatology and Christology is important. Also it

seems here that Badcock's (1997:22-23) taking a minimal position on Matthew's presentation of the Holy Spirit and Charette's (2000:56) emphasis on the power aspect of the Holy Spirit should be addressed.

Third, Matthew's Gospel is often blamed for its pervasive masculinity. In modern and postmodern eras, therefore, addressing sex and gender issues takes a long stance. Some feminist scholars like Phyllis Trible, critique the Bible and social constructions in general for being predominantly patriarchal (Collins 2005:76-78). Reading Matthew's Gospel in light of how the Evangelist presents the Holy Spirit however reveals the following. First, in the genealogical account (Matthew 1), Matthew already informed his reader that some of the Saviour Jesus's ancestors were sinners and even Gentile women. Mary, the one who gave birth Jesus through the Holy Spirit, was also a woman (Matthew 1:18-2:1-15). Second, in Matthew's Gospel women also constitute part of Jesus's disciples and benefited from his teaching and miraculous deeds (Matthew 8:14-15; 9:20-26; 11:11; 14:21; 15:21-28). Lastly, Matthew pays tribute to those women who persevered in attending Jesus's trial, and declares that they became the first to experience the resurrected Jesus (Matthew 28:1-20). The Holy Spirit thus never sets aside women, Gentiles or sinners. Thus the good news is that neither sexism nor racialism hinders God from achieving his purpose: there and then; here and now in Christ through the Holy Spirit.

Finally, one may wonder whether the conclusion I came to and the supposed contributing points could have any relation with my personal Christian experience. I reply, partially to say yes and no. On the one hand, my background, evangelical and Baptist, belief system (in Scriptures – OT and NT – Trinity and spiritual gifts) could have been reflected in my reading in some way. However, I also take a moderate view concerning reading Matthew's Gospel from a Christological point of view, experiencing the Holy Spirit and acknowledging that the Holy Spirit and Jesus have used both men and women. Thus the Holy Spirit is one of the persons in the Godhead who willingly imbued and empowered not only Jesus but also all sinners, women, men, Jews and Gentiles. Sadly, however, wilfully resisting and rejecting incorporation with this personal power will inevitably make one accountable.

5. References

- Alkier, S. 2005. *From text to intertext: intertextuality as a paradigm for reading Matthew*.
URI:<http://hdl.handle.net/2263/11888>.
- Allan, W. C. and Grensted L. W. 1929. *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Allison, D. C. 2005. *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation past and present*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Badcock, G. D. 1997. *Light of Truth & Fire of Life: A Theology of the Holy Spirit*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Barker, K. L. and J. R. K. III. 1994. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Abridged Edition of New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.
- Bauer, D. & Powell, M.A. 1996. *Treasures New and Old: Recent Contribution to Matthean Study*. Atlanta, Ga.: School Press.
- Bauer, D. R. 1988. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Beale, G. K. and Carson D. A. (Eds) 2007. *Commentary of the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Beare, F. W. 1981. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher.
- Beetham, C. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*: 2015 [Online]. Available: <https://www.crossway.org/books/colossians-and-philemon-tpb-1> [2015, Jun 30]
- Bernard, C. L. and William S. V. 1985. *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in biblical Texts SBL Semeia Studies*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Beuken, W. A. M. 1972. O Kaiser, Der Konigliche, FRLANT 70. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blenkinsopp, J. 2002. *The Anchor Bible Isaiah 40-55: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Doubleday: The Anchor Bible.

Bornkamm, G. 1970. *The Authority to Bind and Loose in the Church in Matthew's Gospel: The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel, in Jesus and Man's hope*. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, vol. I.

Boxall, I. 2014. *Discovering Matthew: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Bruner, F. D. 1987. *Matthew: A Commentary Volume 1 The Churchbook Matthew 1-12*. Dallas: word Publishing.

_____ 1990. *Matthew: A Commentary Volume 1 The Churchbook Matthew 13-28*. Dallas: word Publishing.

Carson, D.A. 1984. *The Expositor's Commentary with the International Version of the Holy Bible in twelve Volumes: Volume 8: Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House.

Carter, W. 2000. *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political Religious Reading*. England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Cartledge, T. W. 2001. *Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary: 1 & 2 Samuel*. Macon, Georg: Smyth & Helwys.

Charette, B. 2000. *Restoring Presence: The Spirit in Matthew's Gospel*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Collins, J. J. 2005. *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Combrink, H. J. B. 1981-83. *The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative*. Tyndale Bulletin Vol. 32-34.

Cope, O. L. 1976. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Associate.

Danker, F. W. 2000 (Ed.). *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature_3rd edition (BDAG)*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Davies, W. D. 1964. *The setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Davies, W. D. and D. C. A. 1988. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew: In Three Volumes vol. I Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited.

Davies, W. D. and D. C. A. 1991. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew: In Three Volumes vol. II Commentary on Matthew VIII-XVIII*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Limited.

Decock, P. B. 1999. *The scriptures in the book of Revelation*, *Neotestamentica* 33, 373-410

Dunn, J. D. G. 1975. *Jesus and The Spirit: A Study of Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. Bloomsbury: SCM Press.

_____ 1998. *The Christ and Spirit: Pneumatology Volume 2*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

_____ (Editor). 2003. *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Enslin, M. R. 1931. *The Five Books of Matthew: Bacon on the Gospel of Mathew*. *The Five The Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Apr., 1931), pp. 67-97.

Evans, C. A. 2012. *Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Evans, C.A. and S.E. Porter (Eds). 2000. *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Illinois: Intervarsity Press.

Farmer, W. F. 1998. *The International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

France, R. T. 1989. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press.

_____ 2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

_____ 2008. *Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary*. 1st Ed. Downers Grove, Illinois: IVP Academic.

Frei, H. W. 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

- Fitzgerald, J T. 1972. *The temptation of Jesus: the testing of the Messiah in Matthew*. *Restoration Quarterly* 15, 3–4, 152–160.
- Garrett, S. R. 1998. *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Gaebelein, F. E. 1990. *The Expositor's Bible Commentary with the New International Version of the Holy Bible: In Twelve Volumes vol. 2 Genesis-Numbers*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Goldingay, J. 2007. *Psalms Volume 2 Psalms 42-89*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.
- Green, B. J. K. B. and N. P. (Eds.). 2013. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Nottingham, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Green, J., McKnight, S. & Marshal, I.H. 1992. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels (IVP)*. Nottingham, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Gundry, R. H. 1975. *The use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel with Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____ 1976. *Soma in Biblical Theology*: NTSMS 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____ 1982. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- _____ 1994. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Goslinga, C.J. 1986. *Bible Student's Commentary: Joshua and Judges* (translated by Togtman). Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Grogan, G. V. 1986. *Expositor's Bible Commentary with: The New Interpretational Version of the Bible in Twelve Volumes 6 (Isaiah-Ezekiel)*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Hagner, D. A. 1993. *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 33a, Matthew 1-13*. Dallas, Texas: Word Books, Publishers.

Hare, D. R. A. 1993. *Matthew Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Louisville: John Knox .

Harrington, D. J. 1991. Sacra Pagina Series Vol.1: The Gospel of Matthew. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

Hawthorne, G. 1991. *The Presence & The Power*: Dallas: Word Publishing.

Hays, R. B. 2005. *The Conversion of the imagination: Paul as interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

_____ 2009. *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

_____ 2014. *Reading Backward: Figural Christology and the fourfold Gospel witness*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

_____ 2016. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

Hell, J. P. 1991. *The Death and Resurrection of Jesus: A Narrative- Critical Reading of Matthew 26-28*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Hengel, H. 2000. *The Four Gospels and One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International.

Hengel, M. 1985. *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*. ET, London: SCM.

Herzog, W. R. 2000. *Jesus, justice, and the reign of God: A ministry of liberation*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press.

Hill, D. 1972. *The Gospel of Matthew*. London: Oliphants.

_____ 1980. "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology." *Journal of Studies of the New Testament* 6:2-16.

_____ 1982. *New Century Bible Commentary based on the Revised Standard Version: The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ.

Holladay, C. R. 2017. *Introduction to the New Testament Reference Edition*. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press.

Howell, B. D. 1990. *Matthew's Inclusive Story: A Study in the Narrative Rhetoric of the First Gospel*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Hummel, R. 1963. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Johnson, M. D. 1988. The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press..

Just, F. *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament E.N.T.E.R. New Testament Educational Resources 2017 [Online]. Available: <https://catholic-resources.org/Bible/HolySpirit.htm> [2017, Jul 14].*

Keener, S. C. 1997. *Matthew*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press.

_____ 2009. *The Gospel of Matthew with A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

_____ 2014. *IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament, second edition*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press.

Kilpatrick, G. D. 1966. *The origin of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: At the Clarendon

Kingsbury, J. D. 1975. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. 1st Ed. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress.

Kingsbury, J. D. 1975. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

_____ 1977. *Matthew: A Commentary for Preachers and Others*. Guildford, London: Fortress Press.

_____ 1986. *Matthew: As Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

_____ 1998. *Matthew*. Nappanee: Evangelical Publishing House.

Klein, R. W. 1983. *Word Biblical Commentary Volume 10 1 Samuel*. Waco, Texas: Word Books, Publisher.

Kolenkow, L. B. 1976. *A Problem of Power: How Miracle Doers Counter Charges of Magic in the Hellenistic World: In SBL 1976 Seminar Paper, ed. George MacRae*. Missoula: MT: Scholar Press.

- Lategan, B. C. and Vorste, W. S. 1985. *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in biblical Texts SBL Semeia Studies*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Levison, J. R. 2009. *Filled with Spirit*. Cambridge, U.K.: W.B. Eerdmans Publication Company.
- Linder, B. 1963. *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM.
- Louw, J. P. and Nida, E. A. 1988. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies.
- Luz, U. 2005. *Studies in Matthew*. Grand Rapid, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____ 1989. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Mare, W. H. 2004. *New Testament Background Commentary: A New Dictionary of Words, Phrases, Situations in Biblical Order*. Fearn: Mentor (Christian Focus Publications).
- Marshall, H., V. R., C. B. (Editors). 2012. *The Spirit and Christ in the New Testament and Christian theology: Essays in honor of Max Turner*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Meier, J. P. 1975. *Salvation History in Matthew: In Search of a Starting Point*. CDQ 37: 203-13.
- _____ 1991. *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church, and Morality in the First Gospel*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Menken, M. J.J. 2004. *Matthew's Bible: The Old Testament Text of the Evangelist*. Utrecht: Leuven University Press.
- Milgrom, J. 2004. *A Book of Ritual and Ethics: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Montague, G. T. 1976. *Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishing.
- Morris, L. 1992. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Moyise, S. 2002. *Intertextuality and Biblical Studies: A Review*. ISSN 1609-9998= verbum et Ecclesia Jrg 23(2).

_____ 2002. *Intertextuality and Biblical Studies: A Review*. ISSN 1609-9982= VERBUM ET ECCLESIA JRG 2342 Open Access Journals (DOAJ).

Nolland, J. 2005. *The Gospel of MATTHEW: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Powell, M. A. 2009. *Methods for Matthew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powell, M. A. 1990. *What is Narrative Criticism - A New Approach to the Bible by N. T Wright (Foreword), Mark Allan Powell (25-Feb-1993)*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.

Senior, D. 1983. *What are they saying about Matthew?* New York: Paulist Press.

_____ 1998. *Abingdon New Testament Commentary: Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Seow, C. L. 1999. *The New Interpreter's Bible: General Articles and Introduction, commentary, and Reflections for Each Book of the Bible Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books in the Twelve Volume: Vol. III*. Nashville: Abingdon press.

Silva, M. (Ed.). 2014. *New International Dictionary of New Testament and Exegesis Volume One (A-D)*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.

_____ 2015. *New International Dictionary of New Testament and Exegesis Volume Four*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.

Smith, R. H. *Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament: Matthew*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Publishing House

Spencer, R. (Ed.). 1980. *Orientation by Disorientation: Studies in Literary Criticism and Biblical Literary Criticism presented*. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: The Pickwick Press.

Stanton, G. (Ed.). 1995. *The Interpretation of Matthew*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Stendahl, K. 1968. *The school of ST. Matthew and Its use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Stock, A. 1994. *The Method and Message of Matthew*. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press.

Studebaker, S. M. 2006. *PNEUMA: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies*, Volume 28, No. 1, Spring 2006.

Talbert, C. H. 2010. *Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

Thomas, W. H. G. 1976. *The Holy Spirit of God*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Toussaint, S. D. 1981. *Behold the King: A Study of Mathew*. Portland: Multnomah Press.

Turner, D. L. 2008. *Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: B Baker Academic.

_____. 2008. *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic.

Uytanlet, S. K. and K. 2017. *Matthew: A Pastoral and Practical Commentary*. Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Langham Global Liberty.

Wallace, D. B. *Matthew: Introduction, Argument, and Outline 2004 [Online]*. Available: <https://bible.org/seriespage/matthew-introduction-argument-and-outline> 2004, Jun 23].

Walters, D. W (ed.). 2008. *Go Figure! Figuration in Biblical Interpretation*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publication.

Watts, J. D. W. 1987. *Word Biblical Commentary volume 25 Isaiah 34-66*. Waco, Texas: Word Books Publisher.

Wenham, T. D. and C. B. 1986. *Gospel Perspectives, Volume 6*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Westerholm, S. 2010. *New Interpreter's Bible: One Volume Commentary*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

